PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING AND ITS EFFECT ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ROLE STRESS OF STAFF IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the College of Human Resources and Education

of

West Virginia University

In Cooperation with Marshall University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of Doctor of Education

by

Norma Seay Gray

Morgantown and Huntington

West Virginia

1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my sincere appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Neil Gibbins for his valuable guidance in the writing of this dissertation, and to Dr. Ermel Stepp for sharing his expertise in computer analysis. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Margaret Campbell, Dr. Bill Gordon, and Dr. Richard Meckley for their input and for their willingness to assume the time-consuming task of serving on my dissertation committee.

A special word of thanks is expressed to my husband, Howard Gray, and to my two sisters, Thelma Seay and Kathleen Linn, for their patience, devotion and faith during my doctoral studies.

I am grateful for the sanction and support of the Region III Child Development Board and the Board of Directors of Children's Place, Inc., and for the cooperation of a very capable staff. I am particularly indebted to Lou Ann Fenney and Jeannie Woodruff for managing both agencies so efficiently during my leave of absence.

As the recipient of the Golden Anniversary Scholarship award in 1984, I am especially indebted to the Delta Kappa Gamma Society International. This financial contribution has made the attainment of a doctoral degree much less stressful and I am greatly appreciative.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Appendices

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Tables (Continued)

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table

CHAPTER 1

Description of the Study

Decision making is an integral part of any organization. Every facet of a formal organization is affected by the decision-making process utilized by that organization. Because decisions impact on a number of people in an organization, theorists in the human relations field have discouraged autocratic decision making by top level management and encouraged involving subordinates in the decision-making process of the organization.

During the past four decades, participative decision making has slowly gained prominence in many organizations. While participative decision making is becoming more prevalent, such participation is seldom monitored to determine if the level of involvement and the decisional areas are appropriate. Although several research studies have revealed a positive relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction, only a limited amount of research has examined the relationship between participation and stress.

It is important to recognize that participation in the decision-making process of an organization is not always appropriate, nor is it always desired by employees. Alutto and Belasco found in their survey of public school

teachers that there were three levels of participation in the decision-making process: deprivation, saturation and equilibrium.[1] Teachers viewed themselves as deprived when they were not involved in making decisions to the degree they believed was ideal, and saturated when they were asked to participate in decision making to a greater degree than they desired. A state of equilibrium was reached only when teachers were involved to the degree they perceived as ideal. The authors also found that the teachers who were at the deprivation level were less satisfied (as measured in terms of willingness to stay with the school) than those at the saturation and equilibrium levels.

In examining the relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among clerical workers in a university, Wheeless found that these employees neither expected nor desired to be involved in the decision-making process of the organization.[2] Conway's research findings pointed to dissatisfaction

---

[1] Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (Winter 1972), 46.

[2] Virginia Eman Wheeless and Others, "An Analysis of the Contribution of Participative Decision Making and Communication with Supervisor as Predictors of Job Satisfaction," Association for Institutional Research Forum, Denver, Col., May 1982.

among teachers who overparticipated in decision making, as well as those who were decisionally deprived.[3]

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman observed that the degree of job satisfaction experienced by teachers not only related to perceived deprivation, saturation, and equilibrium, but also to the types of decisions they were being asked to make.[4] In their study, the decisional areas were divided into two categories: managerial (administrative functions of the school), and technical (instructional tasks). It was concluded that teachers perceived greater satisfaction in participating in technical decisions but were less involved in both technical and managerial decisions than they perceived as ideal. The researchers also investigated the relationship of participation in decision making to role stress, as perceived by the participants. Role stress was defined as two factors: role ambiguity (uncertainty about job responsibilities and having little influence or authority), and role overload (having too much to do). Mohrman and others found that

---

[3] James A. Conway, "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Schools as Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (March 1976), 138.

[4] Alan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman, "Participation in Decision Making: A Multi-dimensional Prospective," Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (Winter 1978), 26.

participation in technical type decisions related negatively with role ambiguity and had no relationship with role overload. Furthermore, participation in managerial decision making had no significant relationship to either role ambiguity or role overload.[5]

This study focused on the decision-making process in child development programs in the United States and the effect of this process on job satisfaction and role stress (role ambiguity and role overload), as perceived by the staff. The decision-making process was examined as to the decision issue (both programmatic and managerial decisions), and the decision-making mode (individual or group decision). These factors were analyzed to determine if they related to perceived deprivation, saturation or equilibrium and if employees' perceptions of deprivation, saturation or equilibrium resulted in job satisfaction, role ambiguity, or role overload.

Statement of the Problem

There were two primary purposes of this investigation. One was to examine the relationship of staff participation and desire to participate in the decision-making process of an organization to perceived job satisfaction and role stress of teachers in child

---

[5] Mohrman, pp. 25-27.

development agencies in the United States. The other purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the level of satisfaction derived from participating in the decision-making process and the methods, or modes, by which decisions were made in these organizations.

Hypotheses

The major hypotheses of this study were as follows:

1. There is no significant relationship in the degree of actual participation in the decision-making process of the organization and the degree of ideal participation as perceived by staff on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study.

2. There is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and perceived level of intrinsic satisfaction experienced by staff concerning their jobs.

3. There is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of extrinsic satisfaction experienced by staff concerning their jobs.

4. There is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of

decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of role ambiguity experienced by the staff.

5. There is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of role overload experienced by staff.

6. There is no significant relationship between the level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation and the decision-making modes used by child development agencies on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study.

7. There is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean intrinsic satisfaction scores.

8. There is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean extrinsic satisfaction scores.

9. There is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean role ambiguity scores.

10. There is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean role overload scores.

Definition of Terms

Child development agency denotes an organization which provides services to children under six years of age. The services provided by this type of organization may be one or more of the following: education, therapy, and/or child care in a non-residential setting. Child development agencies included in this study were day care centers, preschool handicapped programs, Head Start programs, private or public kindergartens, and private or public nursery/preschool programs. Both profit and non-profit agencies were included in this study.

Decision issue refers to an item or task about which a decision should be made. The decision issues in this study concern either functional (or programmatic) tasks of a teacher or managerial tasks of an administrator.

Decision-making mode pertains to the manner or method by which decisions are made within an organization. The decision-making mode surveyed in this study included: (1) autocratic (decision made by an administrator without input from subordinates); (2) consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with others); (3)

majority agreement (decision made by a majority of those persons affected by it); (4) consensus (decision made by consensus in a group meeting); and (5) delegated (decision delegated to subordinates by administrator).

Decision-making satisfaction designates the difference between the actual amount of participation experienced in making a decision and the amount of participation perceived as ideal. Three levels of decision-making satisfaction were considered in this study: deprivation (less participation than perceived as ideal); saturation (more participation than perceived as ideal); and equilibrium (as much participation as perceived as ideal).[6]

Extrinsic satisfaction signifies the extraneous facets of job satisfaction. Extrinsic satisfaction includes such factors as respect from superiors, feeling of being informed, amount of supervision received, and the opportunity to participate in determining methods, procedures, and goals.[7]

Intrinsic satisfaction refers to the facets of job satisfaction which are inherent in the job. Intrinsic satisfaction factors include the feelings of self-esteem

---

[6] Conway, p. 21.

[7] Mohrman, pp. 21-26.

and worthwhile accomplishment which are brought about because of the job, and the opportunity for personal growth which the job offers.[8]

Job satisfaction implies the sense of fulfillment a person experiences because of his/her job. In this study, job satisfaction is designated by two factors: extrinsic satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction.

Role ambiguity indicates the presence of multiple or uncertain feelings about a person's job role. The feelings surveyed in this study include being unclear about job responsibilities, not having information to carry out job responsibilities, having too little authority, not knowing what is expected, and having little influence on supervisor's decisions.[9]

Role overload is the term used in this study to express the feelings of not having enough time to do all that is required in one's role, and/or that the amount of work to be done reduces the quality of the job performance.[10]

---

[8] Mohrman, pp. 21-26.

[9] Mohrman, pp. 21-23.

[10] Mohrman, pp. 21-23.

Role stress refers to the pressure or strain a person feels because of his/her particular job role. In this study, role stress was specified as role ambiguity and/or role overload.

Justification of the Study

Research indicates that participation in the decision-making process of an organization can be both satisfying and stressful. This study attempted to determine in which decision issues teachers in child development agencies wanted to participate, and whether stress was brought about by under-participation or over-participation in the decision-making process. It was deemed important by the researcher to know whether teachers preferred to be involved in making decisions only on certain key issues, or if they preferred to be involved in a particular manner or mode of decision-making. This information should provide insight to administrators regarding appropriate decision issues and decision-making modes to be incorporated in the organizational decision-making process.

This study extended the research initiated by Alutto and Belasco and continued by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman and by Conway by involving a category of human service organizations which had not previously been surveyed concerning participation in decision making. The results

of this study should provide administrators of child development agencies with information on the general trend of participative decision making in other similar agencies, and should give them direction in planning decision making in their own organizations.

This study extended prior research by relating satisfaction with the degree of participation in decision making, not only to the multiple factors of job satisfaction and role stress, but to the manner or mode in which decisions were made in an organization. These findings should be of benefit to practicing administrators, and to theorists and educators who are responsible for planning and implementing preparation programs for future administrators.

Limitations of the Study

Three of the instruments used in this study (the Decisional Participation Scale, the Satisfaction Scale, and the Role Stress Scales), were designed to measure the perceptions of the respondents. The variables measured in these instruments may have been perceived differently by the individual respondents, thus resulting in biased responses.

One of the instruments, the Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes, was limited to five decision-making modes. In reality, there are numerous other

methods for making decisions, but these five were judged by the researcher as the most commonly used modes by which decisions are made in organizations.

It must be pointed out that factors other than the level of satisfaction in the degree of participation experienced in decision making may have impacted on the perceived job satisfaction and/or role stress of the respondents. This study was limited to identifying the relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction and role stress.

The child development programs surveyed in this study were varied in organizational structure and programmatic goals. Some were non-profit agencies with governing boards. Others were private, for profit organizations in which policies were determined by the owner. Some agencies provided a planned, sequential educational program. Some offered intervention programs for handicapped children. Some offered custodial care only. The only commonality among the programs surveyed may have been that they served preschool-aged children in group situations.

All the decision situations included in the Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale and the Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes may not have been experienced by all the participants. This may have resulted in some "guessing" and/or in some questions

remaining unanswered.

Overview of the Study

This chapter presented an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the hypotheses, definitions of terms, justification of the study and the limitations of the study.

Literature related to participative decision making, job satisfaction, and stress is reviewed in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 outlines the design of the study, including a description of the instruments used in gathering data and the methodology by which the data was collected.

Chapter 4 presents the data and an analysis of the data. Chapter 5 summarizes and discusses the implications of the study.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Chapter 2 consists of a review of selected research and literature. Included in this survey were studies concerning participative decision making, job satisfaction/morale, and job/role stress.

Background

This research study was undertaken to determine what effect, if any, that satisfaction (or lack of satisfaction) in the decision-making process of child development agencies had on teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and role stress. It was also proposed by the researcher to ascertain what method, or mode, of decision making was utilized most often in child development agencies and to determine if there was a significant relationship between the teachers' level of satisfaction in participating in decision making and the mode of decision making used in their organizations.

1. What is the theoretical basis for employee participation in the decision-making process of organizations?

2. How is participation defined, as it relates to decision making?

3. What modes of participation in decision making are expounded by theorists?

4. What research has been reported in the area of participative decision making, particularly as it relates to job satisfaction and/or job/role stress?

5. What aspects of employee and/or job satisfaction have been studied by researchers?

6. What does the literature reveal concerning employees' perceived job stress or role stress?

Participation in Decision Making

Historical and Theoretical Perspective

Employee participation in the decision-making process of organizations came to the forefront in the 1940's as part of the human relations theory of administration. The human relations school of thought emphasized the importance of sharing the decision making of an organization with those who were directly affected by the decisional outcomes. Managers were encouraged to be attuned to the social needs of the employees. Etzioni pointed out that the basic premise of the human relations approach was that a happy, satisfied employee was a more cooperative and efficient employee.[11]

---

[11] Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 39.

Concurrent with the human relations movement was the emergence of the social science theory. The social science theorists pointed out that informal organizations exist within formal organizations and both are inter-dependent. The formal organizations exist in order to accomplish specific goals. Informal organizations exist to meet personal needs of self-respect and satisfaction.[12]

Barnard was one of the first to apply the social science theory to administrative theory. He claimed that an administrator of any organization must work within ". . .a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" and that cooperation in an organization depends on accomplishing the purpose of the organization and fulfilling the employees' personal motives.[13]

With both human relations theorists and social science theorists championing the need to involve sub-ordinates in the decision-making process of their organizations, a number of research-studies were initiated in the forties and fifties. These studies primarily

---

[12] Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Liphan and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process, (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 40-42.

[13] Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 60-72.

examined whether or not participation in decision making brought about any change in productivity or morale. Both increased productivity and high morale were viewed as beneficial to the organization, as well as to the employee.

One of the earliest studies on the effect of participation in decision making was conducted by Coch and French in 1948. Workers at the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation were divided into three matched groups: one group (Group A) was told about changes that must be made, but the workers were not allowed to participate in the decisions concerning those changes; Group B was told the reasons changes needed to be made and a representative number were allowed to help plan the changes; and in Group C, all workers were given the opportunity to help plan the changes. In groups B and C, production was greatly increased, and turnover, absenteeism, and grievances were reduced. In Group A, whose members did not participate in the decision making, there was no improvement in production, and turnover, absenteeism and grievances increased. When Group A was later given total representation in decision making, productivity increased.[14]

---

[14] Lester Coch and John French, Jr., "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, I (1948), 512-32.

In a large scale national survey of teachers in 1951, Chase found that teachers who participated regularly in decisions concerning curriculum, students, and teachers' salaries were more enthusiastic about their school system than those who had little involvement in decision making.[15]

Human relations training for managers flourished in the forties and fifties and most of the research concerning participative decision making focused on leadership aspects. During this period when most researchers were studying leader behaviors (democratic vs. autocratic), participation in decision making continued to be encouraged as the more democratic style of leadership. The effectiveness of democratic leadership, or participative management, was examined in terms of employee satisfaction and increased productivity.

Hage's axiomatic theory of organizations in 1965 led to renewed interest in the effects of participative management. Research studies began to focus on the structure of the organization and the relationships among the various job roles. Included in Hage's four properties that represented the means for accomplishing the goals of an organization was centralization. Centralization was

---

[15] Francis S. Chase, "The Teacher and Policy Making," Administrator's Notebook, 1 (May 1952), 1.

concerned with where decisions were made and by whom. The more the decision-making process was distributed among the members of the organization, the less centralized the power of authority.[16] Stewart's and Miskel's study supported this theory. They found that schools that have more participative processes and more decentralized decision-making structures were the most effective and had the highest level of job satisfaction.[17]

During the sixties and seventies, the concept of participative decision making was further refined and developed. Bridges theorized that if subordinates had a high personal stake in the decision, their interest in participating in the decisional process would be high but, if subordinates were involved in decisions which were outside their area of expertise, they would be frustrated.[18]

This theory was tested by several researchers in the seventies and eighties. Alutto and Belasco found that

---

[16] Jerald Hage, "An Axiomatic Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, X (December 1965), 292-96.

[17] David Stewart and Cecil Miskel, "Changing the Organizational Structure to Affect Perceived Bureaucracy, Organizational Processes, Loyalty, Job Satisfaction, and Effectiveness," American Educational Research Association, New York, N. Y., 4-8 April 1977.

[18] Edwin M. Bridges, "A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship," Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (1967), 51-53.

teachers did not have an equal desire to participate in decision making. They asked teachers to respond to twelve decisional situations, indicating whether they participated and whether they wanted to participate in making each of these decisions. The findings in this study also revealed that those who felt that they participated less than they wanted were less satisfied with their jobs and that those who participated as much or more than they desired, experienced high satisfaction.[19]

Other Related Research Studies

Conway explored further the question of preference of teachers concerning participation in the decision-making process of their schools. Using an adapted version of the Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale and Likert's Profile of a School to test the relationship between levels of participation in decision making and teachers' satisfaction, Conway found that both deprivation and over-participation lead to increased teacher dissatisfaction. Conway concluded that "administrators must match the desire for participation of the

---

[19] Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (Winter 1967), 52.

individual with the opportunities to realize those desires."[20]

The findings in Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman's study on participation in decision making in schools indicated that teachers preferred being involved in making decisions in the technical domain (i.e., the instructional process and classroom management) to being involved in managerial type decisions.[21]

Throughout the past four decades in which subordinates' participation in the decision-making process has been advocated, not all research has indicated that participation is beneficial. Patchen found in his Tennessee Valley Authority study that, while there was a strong association between participation and acceptance of changes, the relationship between participation and satisfaction was negative.[22]

---

[20] James A. Conway, "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Schools as Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (March 1976), 130-139.

[21] Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman, "Participation in Decision Making: A Multidimensional Perspective," Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (Winter 1978), 20.

[22] Martin Patchen, Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the Job (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 244.

Morse and Reimer's study of a non-union industrial organization revealed that there was increased satisfaction in the participative decision-making groups, but that there was a greater increase in productivity in the divisions which used a highly centralized, unilateral decision-making process.[23] Lischeron and Wall found that increased participation of shop-floor employees in management decision making did not result in greater employee satisfaction nor did it increase the desire to participate.[24]

A study of costs and benefits of teacher participation in decision making was conducted by Duke, Showers, and Imber. According to the responses to their questionnaire, most of the teachers were not anxious to participate in decision making and they gained little satisfaction if they did participate. A majority were skeptical about whether shared decision making made any real difference.[25]

---

[23] Nancy C. Morse and Everett Reimer, "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (1956), 129.

[24] Joe A. Lischeron and Toby D. Wall, "Employee Participation: An Experimental Field Study," Human Relations, 28 (Dec. 1975), 880.

[25] Daniel L. Duke, Beverly K. Showers, and Michael Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement," Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (Winter 1980), 102-104.

In one extensive review of research studies conducted during the past forty years on participation in decision making, the authors concluded that decision-making participation led to increased satisfaction and productivity. However, there was more evidence in support of increased satisfaction than increased productivity. Locke and Schweiger also contended that ". . .the effectiveness of PDM depends upon numerous contextual factors. . ."[26]

Modes of Decision Making

Participation in decision making is a phrase which encompasses a broad range of involvement levels. While it suggests joint decision making, it does not define who participates, how many participate, or to what degree they are involved in determining the final decision. At the very least, participation means that the administrator solicits opinions from one or more subordinates before making a decision. At the very most, it means that the administrator and subordinates discuss and agree on a decision and that each participant has equal influence in determining the final decision.

---

[26] Edwin A. Locke and David M. Schweiger, "Participation in Decision Making: One More Look," in Research in Organizational Behavior, ed. B. M. Straw (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1979), p. 325.

Locke and Schweiger pointed out that participation can be forced by law or by contracts which require negotiation between labor and management, or participation can be on a voluntary basis. They also suggested that participation can be formal (committees, boards, councils) or informal; and that it can be direct (with every employee having the opportunity to be involved) or indirect (with a few being elected to represent all employees).[27]

Swanson identified three types of group structures which define the method of participation. One is the democratic-centralist, in which the subordinates have input in decision making but the leader makes the decision. The second is parlimentarian, where all members have an equal vote and the decision is determined by majority vote. The third type is participant-determining, which requires total consensus of the group in making the final decision.[28]

Bridges outlined four modes of decision-making: (1) announcing, (2) testing, (3) soliciting, and (4) delegating. With the announcing mode, the administrator makes the decision and informs the subordinates. In

---

[27] Locke and Schweiger, p. 275.

[28] Guy E. Swanson, "The Effectiveness of Decision-Making Modes," Adult Leadership, 8 (June 1959), 49-50.

testing, the administrator presents a tentative decision to the employees for their reaction, but maintains the right to make the final decision. In using the soliciting mode, the administrator presents the problem and asks for possible solutions. The administrator makes the final decision, which may or may not be one of the solutions suggested by subordinates. When the delegating mode is used, the administrator gives the right to make the decision to other employees.[29]

Devlin was of the opinion that the degree of participation in decision making followed along a continuum from no involvement to teachers supplying information but administrators making the decision, to teachers being consulted although the administrator still made the decision, to lastly, teachers making the decision.[30]

The seven levels of decision making noted by Wood include two autocratic and three consultative modes, as well as participatory and delegated decision making. In the first two levels of autocratic decision making, the administrator makes the decision. The administrator may

---

[29] Edwin M. Bridges, "Teacher Participation in Decision Making," Administrator's Notebook, XII (May 1964), 1.

[30] Barbara Seeley Devlin, "Democratic Leadership: Guidelines for School Administrators," Administrator's Notebook, XXIX (1980-81), 1.

make the decision and then share it with subordinates or she/he may provide information to subordinates before making the decision but not ask for suggestions. In the three consultative modes, information is requested from subordinates but they are not asked for advice; or they are asked to give advice, although the administrator does not necessarily take their suggestions when making a decision; or the advice solicited from subordinates is taken into consideration in making the final decision. The participatory mode requires that both the administrator and the subordinates discuss the problem together until they reach an agreement on a solution. In the delegated decision-making mode, the administrator provides any necessary information and then allows the subordinates to have complete control in making the final decision.[31]

Job Satisfaction

The term "job satisfaction" signifies that the attitudes an employee has about his/her job are positive. It is a rather nebulous term which cannot be easily measured. It must take into consideration the needs, values, expectations and perceptions of each individual.

---

[31] Carolyn J. Wood, "Participatory Decision Making: Why Doesn't It Seem to Work?," The Educational Forum, 49 (Fall 1984), 60-61.

In defining job satisfaction, Locke observed that both "job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing.[32]

Theoretical Background

Two theories on needs which were proposed during the past four decades need to be discussed as they relate to job satisfaction. Both Maslow's theory of needs and Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory have greatly influenced the development of satisfaction measurements and empirical research on job satisfaction.

Maslow's theory of needs identified five basic needs of human beings: physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization. Maslow claimed that these needs were in hierarchian order and that only after one need is met, will the desire to meet the next need occur.[33]

Baron pointed out that Maslow's theory, as it applies to job satisfaction, ". . .suggests that workers will be most satisfied with their jobs when they permit them to

---

[32] Edwin A. Locke, "What Is Job Satisfaction?," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (1969), 316.

[33] Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality, 2nd rev. ed., (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 91-92.

satisfy the needs corresponding to their current position in the need hierarchy."[34] If a person who was seeking to meet physiological needs was able to satisfy these needs because his/her earnings were adequate, he/she would report satisfaction with the job. Another person working the same job in the same organization for the same salary may report dissatisfaction with his/her job because it was not meeting his/her need for self-esteem.

Locke concluded from his review of job satisfaction studies that research findings offered little support of Maslow's theory that satisfaction of needs occurred in a fixed order. Locke further claimed that "it is not necessarily what a man needs but what he values most strongly that dominates his thoughts and actions."[35]

Herzberg proposed a theory on causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction based on needs. The motivator-hygiene theory evolved from a study of engineers and accountants who were asked to describe when they felt satisfied and when they felt dissatisfied with their jobs. The areas which were most often referred to as

---

[34] Robert A. Baron, Behavior in Organizations, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1983), p. 209.

[35] Edwin A. Locke, "Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction," in Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, ed. Marvin D. Dunnette (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), p. 1309.

sources of satisfaction but seldom mentioned as sources of dissatisfaction were labeled by Herzberg as motivators. These motivators included the work itself, achievement, promotion, recognition, and responsibility. The areas most often referred to as sources of dissatisfaction but seldom as causes of satisfaction were labeled hygienes. The hygienes included interpersonal relations, working conditions, company policies and salaries.[36]

From this study Herzberg theorized that satisfaction was acquired primarily from motivators (work itself, achievement, promotion, recognition, and responsibility), and dissatisfaction was derived for the most part from hygienes (interpersonal relations, working conditions, company policies and salaries). He further defined two classes of human needs: physical needs and psychological growth needs.

While these two human needs theories form the basis of most of the empirical research, a majority of the studies have not supported Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory.[37] Medved pointed out that many of those

---

[36] F. Herzberg, B. Mausner and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, (New York: Wiley, 1959), cited by Edwin A. Locke, "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction" in Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, ed. Marvin D. Dunnette (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), pp. 1309-10.

[37] Locke, p. 1318.

researchers ". . .also concluded that worker satisfaction and dissatisfaction exist on a single continuum. . ."[38] In other words, the factors that invoke the most satisfaction can also cause the most dissatisfaction when they are not present. In Medved's study, based on Herzberg's theory, he found that teachers responding to the survey were most motivated by the achievement and responsibility of the work itself, but were also most dissatisfied with their lack of recognition (which is a motivator factor which Herzberg claimed would not cause dissatisfaction, if absent).[39]

The concept of value also enters into the process of determining job satisfaction. The values (desires, wants) one person has differ from the values of others. Locke emphasized the need to consider a person's values, as well as his needs when he claimed that "while his needs confront man with the requirement of action, his values determine his actual choices and emotional reactions."[40]

Locke best summarized the importance of considering both needs and values in evaluating job satisfaction in the following statement:

---

[38] James A. Medved, "The Applicability of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory," Educational Leadership, 39 (April 1982), 555.

[39] Medved, p. 555.

[40] Locke, p. 1304.

> It is hypothesized that job satisfaction results from the appraisal of one's job as attaining or allowing the attainment of one's important job values, providing these values are congruent with or help to fulfill one's basic needs.[41]

Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction

Locke categorized the multiplicity of job satisfaction factors into two major areas: events and conditions; and agents. Events and conditions included: the work itself (opportunity to use one's abilities and learn new skills, the amount, variety and difficulty of the work, responsibility, and autonomy); pay; promotion; recognition; and working conditions. Agents included: self-esteem; supervision; and management of the organization itself.[42]

Baron listed the following factors as important influences on job satisfaction: challenging work, rewards, recognition, good working conditions, concerned supervision, positive interpersonal relations, effective company policies, job security, pay, participation in decision making, autonomy, and avoidance of role ambiguity.[43]

---

[41] Locke, p. 1319.

[42] Locke, p. 1319-28.

[43] Baron, p. 214.

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman viewed satisfaction from two perspectives: intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction included the factors of self-esteem, opportunity for growth, accomplishment, and expectations. Extrinsic satisfaction covered supervision, information about job, and participation in determining goals, methods and procedures.[44]

In Chase's investigation of factors which contributed to satisfaction among teachers in 200 school systems in 43 states, he concluded that salaries and other fringe benefits could contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. He noted that the salary factor was not rated by the teachers as one of the major factors influencing satisfaction.[45]

Harap surveyed twenty school systems to determine what factors affected teacher morale. He found that ". . .a good salary scale and reasonably small classes were the most potent factors creating satisfaction."[46] Good administration and shared decision making were also strong factors which led to job satisfaction.

---

[44] Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman, p. 22.

[45] Francis S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXII (Nov. 1951), 131.

[46] Henry Harap, "Morale," The Nation's Schools, 63 (June 1959), 75.

Several studies have examined the leadership factor and its effect on job satisfaction. Those that have been discussed earlier in this chapter include research conducted by Lischeron and Wall, Patchen, Chase, and Harap. Some research explored the relationship between organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction. Examples of such research by Morse and Reimer, Conway, and Miskel were reported in this chapter.

Job satisfaction and participation in decision making have been linked in a number of research studies, including those mentioned earlier in this study (Alutto and Belasco, Lischeron and Wall, Conway, Mohrman, Cooke and Mohrman, Morse and Reimer, and Patchen). Another study which looked at the factor of involvement in decision making and both professional satisfaction and career satisfaction was conducted in seventy public schools in Canada. Hewitson found that high degrees of decision-making participation were significantly related to professional satisfaction(autonomy) but were not significantly related to career satisfaction.[47] An investigation by Devlin, in which 315 teachers were involved, revealed that participation in decision making

---

[47] Hal Hewitson, "Participative Decision Making for Teachers - Placebo or Panacea?," The Australian Journal of Education, 22 (June 1978), 203.

was significantly related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job tension.[48]

In summary, job satisfaction was generally found to be the result of multiple factors, each being difficult to extricate from the others. Accurate assessment of job satisfaction has been further confounded by the individual's own needs, values, expectations and perceptions.

Role Stress

The term "stress" is another concept which is difficult to delineate. There are a variety of meanings attached to the word "stress," but the focus of this study will be on the factors which have the potential of causing feelings of ambiguity and overload on the part of the employee.

Conceptual Background

Stress occurs when a demand is made on an individual that is perceived as beyond his/her capabilities to respond and where failure to respond has perceived consequences. McGrath notes that "stress involves an interaction of person and environment" and when a demand is presented ". . .the extent to which that demand is

---

[48] Devlin, p. 2.

stressful depends on several things."[49] He pointed out that the individual must first perceive the demand, must then interpret it ". . .in relation to his ability to meet the demand, circumvent, remove, or live with the constraint, or effectively use the opportunity."[50] Lastly, the individual must see the consequences of dealing with the demand as more desirable than the consequences which might result from ignoring it.[51]

Baron claimed that ". . .stress occurs only to the degree that the persons involved in a situation perceive it to be harmful, threatening, or challenging."[52] It is possible for stress factors to be present, yet not be perceived as stressful to every individual who is exposed to the stressors.

McGrath offered the following six propositions concerning social and psychological factors in stress:

> Theme 1: Cognitive Appraisal. . . .
>
> Stress is contingent upon the person's perception of the situation. . .

---

[49] Joseph E. McGrath, "Stress and Behavior in Organizations," in Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, ed. Marvin D. Dunnette (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), p. 1352.

[50] McGrath, p. 1352.

[51] McGrath, p. 1352.

[52] Baron, p. 291.

Theme 2: Experience. Past experience. . . or practice or training in responses to deal with the situation can operate to effect the level of. . . stress from a given situation. . .

Theme 3: Reinforcement. . . . Past successes and failures can operate to reduce or enhance. . . the level of. . . stress from a given situation. . .

Theme 4: The Inverted U. There is non-linear, . . . perhaps inverted, U-shaped relationship between the degree of stress. . . and quality of performance. . . . This theme hypothesizes that, at low levels of arousal, performance is poor; that increases in stress up to some optimal level. . . enhance performance; but that further increases in stress beyond that optimal level lead to performance decrements. . .

Theme 5: Task Differences. The nature of the tasks or activities in which the person is involved, and the relationship of those activities to the stressor conditions, influence. . . the relationships between. . . stress, task performance, and ensuing consequences.

> Theme 6: Interpersonal Effects. The presence or absence of. . . other persons in the situation influence both the. . . stress, and behavior in response to stress, in several partially conflicting ways. . . . Other people may be sources of potential. . . self-esteem and other interpersonal rewards. Other people may be sources of potential facilitative or contrient interdependence with respect to performance of task. . .[53]

Causes of Stress

Stress can be caused by any number, or one of any number, of factors. While it would be difficult to separate out any one cause of stress in a particular situation, it may be beneficial to know some of the primary factors perceived by researchers as stressors, or causes of stress.

Johns listed the following conditions that are common stressors: heavy work load; heavy responsibility; conflict between professional and organizational demands; lack of authority; poor working conditions; job

---

[53] McGrath, pp. 1353-54.

insecurity; role ambiguity; and interpersonal incompatibility.[54]

Burke found that the following four stressors (which he called functional stressors) were positively related to satisfaction: excess responsibility; not feeling qualified; excessive work load; and making decisions which affect others. He also found nine stressors (dysfunctional stressors) which were related to dissatisfaction. These included: inadequate information about job duties, opportunities for promotion, status, and how to perform job; lack of power or control over the work situation; fear that someone else might get the job the person wants; slow job progress; and unreasonable pressure to improve job performance.[55]

Allen, Hitt and Greer surveyed four business firms to determine the relationship between stress and organizational effectiveness, using the stressors identified by Burke. They found a negative relationship between stress and organizational effectiveness. Their findings on groups of people in organizations did not support McGrath's proposition that there was a U-shaped

---

[54] Gary Johns, Organizational Behavior (Glenville, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1983), p. 167.

[55] R. J. Burke, "Occupational Stresses and Job Satisfaction," The Journal of Social Psychology, 100 (1976), 242-44.

relationship between stress and performance levels of individuals.[56]

McGrath designated six sources of stress. Task-based stress included difficulty of the task, ambiguity and overload. Role-based stress encompassed conflict, ambiguity and overload as they related to the individual's role. Another source was stress relevant to the work situation, such as the effects of too many workers or not enough workers. The physical environment (temperature, comfort), and the social environment (privacy, isolation) were also considered sources of stress. The stress within a person which he brings to the situation, such as anxiety, was also a source of stress.[57]

Fletcher and Payne contended that job stress of teachers was the result of a balance between three factors: job demands, supports and constraints (encouragement from supervisors and family, satisfaction, training, job security, time available, etc.). They concluded that the overall stress of teachers was

---

[56] R. Douglas Allen, Michael A. Hitt, and Charles R. Greer, "Occupational Stress and Perceived Organizational Effectiveness in Formal Groups: An Examination of Stress Level and Stress Type," Personnel Psychology, 35 (Summer 1982), 367-69.

[57] McGrath, p. 1369.

reduced, despite high levels of demand, because they also have high levels of support and low levels of constraint.[58]

Components of Role Stress

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman viewed role stress as both role ambiguity and role overload. Role ambiguity was determined on the basis of the following perceptions, or feelings: too little authority; unclear about job responsibilities; not enough information to carry out job; lack of influence over decisions and actions relevant to job responsibilities; and not knowing what people expect.[59] In their survey of teachers' participation in decision making, they found that there was a negative relationship between decision making and role ambiguity when teachers participated as much as they thought they should. However, there was high role ambiguity when teachers participated in decision making less than they thought they should.[60]

---

[58] Ben C. Fletcher and Roy L. Payne, "Levels of Reported Stressors and Strains Amongst Schoolteachers: Some U. K. Data," Educational Review, 34 (Nov. 1982), 267.

[59] Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman, p. 23.

[60] Mohrman, pp. 24-25.

Johns claimed role ambiguity occurred when ". . .the goals of one's job, or the methods of performing it, are unclear to an employee."[61] He pointed out that role ambiguity exists less often among those that are in the lower levels of the organization because job responsibilities are usually quite explicit, but it can happen when supervision is weak or inconsistent.[62]

Locke explained the concept of role ambiguity as ". . .the degree to which role expectations are vague, unclear, or undefined."[63] Baron defined role ambiguity as ". . .stress from uncertainty."[64]

According to McGrath, role ambiguity has become prevalent, primarily because organizations have become larger and more complex. He listed a number of other sources of role ambiguity, including high rates of change in technology, social structures, and personnel; lack of communication within the organization; and methods used to evaluate job performance.[65]

---

[61] Johns, p. 158.

[62] Johns, p. 159.

[63] Locke, "Nature and Causes of Satisfaction," p. 1328.

[64] Baron, p. 281.

[65] McGrath, p. 1387

Another factor of role stress is role overload. Overload was found to be as prevalent as ambiguity in most organizations, but very little has been written about the sources or effects of role overload.[66]

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman denoted three causes of perceived overload: thinking that the amount of work to be done interferes with the quality of the work; feeling that there is not enough time to do everything everyone asks; and feeling that there is not time to get things done. In their study of the effect of decision-making participation on job satisfaction and role stress, they found that there was no relation between participation in decision making and role overload, or between satisfaction and role overload.[67]

McGrath suggested that overload results in less stress than might be expected, except when the overload causes a sizable reduction in quality of role performance, and/or an inability to perform all or some of the role demands.[68]

Therefore, it could be said that, while research to date has shown that both role ambiguity and role overload

---

[66] McGrath, p. 1387.

[67] Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman, pp. 21-23.

[68] McGrath, p. 1388.

are present in most modern organizations, role overload seldom results in any detrimental effects on performance or satisfaction. However, role ambiguity does result in dissatisfaction and may also cause poor job performance.

Summary

Chapter 2 presented a review of the literature related to this study. The review was divided into the following categories: participation in decision making, modes of decision making, job satisfaction and role stress.

The literature indicated that participation of subordinates in the decision-making process of organizations has become increasingly prevalent during the past four decades and that decision-making participation does result in job satisfaction. However, participation in decision making to a lesser degree than desired often results in role ambiguity. Participating in decision making to a greater degree than desired does not result in role ambiguity or role overload.

CHAPTER 3

Design and Methodology of the Study

This chapter deals with the design and methodology of the study. It includes a description of the instrument, the procedure for selecting the sample and collecting the data, and an explanation of the statistical procedures to be used in researching the hypotheses.

Description of the Instruments

As stated in Chapter One, it was the primary purpose of this study to examine the relationship of the level of satisfaction derived from participating in the decision-making process of an organization to perceived job satisfaction and role stress of teachers in child development agencies in the United States. It was further proposed to investigate the relationship between level of satisfaction gained from participative decision making and the methods, or modes, by which decisions were made within these organizations.

In this study, the independent variable of decision making consisted of four areas to be considered: (1) actual participation in decision making; (2) ideal participation in decision making; (3) the decision issue;

and (4) the decision-making mode. The actual and ideal participation in decision making was measured by a modified version of the Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale (Appendix A). The decision issues were the twelve programmatic and managerial issues included in the Decisional Participation Scale. The decision-making modes used by child development agencies in each of the twelve decision issues were determined through the Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes (Appendix B) developed by the researcher.

The dependent variable of job satisfaction was measured by the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Satisfaction Scales (Appendix C). The dependent variables for role ambiguity and role overload were measured by the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Role Stress Scales (Appendix D).

A discussion of the background and development of the instruments and their reliability and validity follows.

Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale

The Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale, developed in 1972, was designed to measure the frequency of actual participation and the respondent's opinion of whether or not the actual amount of participation was ideal. The first version of this instrument required a yes or no answer on actual and ideal participation on each

of the twelve decisions concerning common issues in schools. Conway modified the original instrument in 1976 by combining two decision issues into one, eliminating one item, and adding another. The response format was also changed from "yes" or "no" to "never," "sometimes," "often," and "always." In 1978, the measurement was further modified by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman with some changes in terminology and response format. The Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman version was the basis of the instrument used in this study. Again some changes were made in terminology to make it more appropriate for child development programs. (Examples of terminology changes were: substituting the words "program or center" for the word "school", and substituting the words "materials and equipment" for the word "texts." Table 1 lists the decision issues used in this study.

The modified Decisional Participation Scale was designed to survey how frequently the respondents participate and how frequently they think they should participate in each of the twelve decision areas. The response format was a Likert-type scale ranging from "never" to "always." The twelve decision issues included both programmatic (or instructional) and managerial (or administrative) concerns.

In response to a request for normative data on the original Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale,

Table 1

Decision Issues in Revised Decisional Participation Scale

1. Hiring new staff.
2. Planning program or center budget.
3. Resolving learning problems of individual children.
4. Determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.
5. Establishing general instructional policies.
6. Establishing classroom disciplinary policies.
7. Resolving employee grievances.
8. Planning new buildings and facilities.
9. Resolving problems with community groups.
10. Determining staff salaries.
11. Selecting specific instructional materials and equipment.
12. Determining specific professional assignments.

Dr. Joseph Alutto, Dean of the School of Management at the University of Buffalo, replied that ". . . over some sixteen studies the stability of responses to items (with one month between administrations) has ranged from .75 - .92."[69] The correspondence to and from Dr. Alutto was included in Appendix E.

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Satisfaction Scales

The Satisfaction Scales were designed to measure eight facets of perceived intrinsic or extrinsic satisfaction. These job satisfaction factors are listed in Table 2. The response format of the Satisfaction Scales was a six-point scale from "low" to "high."

The reliability of the Satisfaction Scales was determined by Mohrman, Cooke and Mohrman in their 1978 survey of public school teachers. In a recent communication from A. M. Mohrman, he supplied additional information on this study showing the pre-test and post-test results on the Satisfaction Scales of both the control group of teachers and the group that participated in an organizational development intervention program. There was a significant increase in intrinsic satisfaction (at the .01 level) and a significant increase in extrinsic

---

[69] Letter received from Joseph A. Alutto, Dean, School of Management, University at Buffalo, 11 March 1985.

Table 2

Job Satisfaction Factors

Intrinsic Satisfaction	Extrinsic Satisfaction
1. Feeling of self-esteem.	1. Amount of respect you receive from your superiors.
2. Opportunity for personal growth.	2. Feeling of being informed in your job.
3. Feeling of worthwhile accomplishment.	3. Amount of supervision you receive.
4. Your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job.	4. Opportunity for participation in determination of methods, procedures, and goals.

satisfaction (at the .001 level) in the 120 teachers in the intervention group. The control group's t test results showed no significant change between the pre- and post-test.[70] This communication and information were included in Appendix F.

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Role Stress Scales

The Role Stress Scales were designed to measure two factors: role ambiguity and role overload. The eight items on the Role Stress Scales (five for role ambiguity and three for role overload) are listed in Table 3. Participants were asked to rate these role stress items on a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "always."

The reliability of the Role Stress Scales was determined by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman in their study on the decision-making participation of public school teachers. Additional information of this study was obtained from A. M. Mohrman. The post-test results showed that there was no significant difference in perceived role overload in either the control group of teachers or the group that participated in an organizational development intervention program. However, the post-test results did show a significant decrease in

---

[70] Letter received from A. M. Mohrman, Research Scientist, Center for Effective Organizations, University of Southern California, 14 March 1985.

Table 3

Role Stress Factors
Role Ambiguity
1. Feeling you have too little authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to you.
2. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.
3. The fact that you cannot get information needed to carry out your job.
4. Feeling unable to influence your immediate superior's decisions and actions that affect you.
5. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.
Role Overload
1. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.
2. Feeling that you do not have time to do everything that others ask of you.
3. Feeling that you do not seem to have enough time to get things done.

perceived role ambiguity (at the .05 level) in the teachers in the intervention group, while the control group showed no significant difference between the pre- and post-test (Appendix F).[71]

Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes

The Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes, developed for use in this study, was designed to solicit information from the participants on what decision-making modes were used in their organizations. The twelve decision issues from the Decisional Participation Scale were used as the basis of the survey, and participants were asked to mark the appropriate answer as it related to their agency. The choices of decision-making modes were: (1) autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from subordinates); (2) consultative (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers); (3) majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll); (4) concensus (decision made by total agreement in group meeting); and (5) delegated (decision delegated by administrator to subordinates). This instrument was tested for readability and content validity through a pilot study.

---

[71] Ibid.

Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine the content validity of the Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes and to determine the readibility of the instructions for all four instruments. The four instruments were compiled as a single questionnaire. (See Appendix G for questionnaire.)

The pilot study was conducted with teaching staff from two child care centers in Huntington, West Virginia. These centers were not eligible to be included in the sample population. Participants were informed as to the purpose of the pilot study and were asked to complete the questionnaire and comment on the readibility and clarity of the questionnaire. The participants were also asked to note the amount of time needed to complete the questionnaire.

A total of eight teachers participated in the pilot study and responded to questions concerning the clarity of the questionnaire and suggestions regarding the questionnaire. Five of the eight participants said there were questions they did not understand. Two of these respondents thought the wording of the questions in Section III on role stress was confusing. Two teachers were not certain how to answer the section on how decisions were made in their organizations because some of the situations had not occurred in their centers. One

teacher did not understand the second question in the first section because planning program and planning budget required two separate answers. There were also two suggestions to include "not applicable" as a response, and one suggestion to include all of Section III on one page so that it would be easier to complete.

These responses by the field study participants were considered by the researcher. While it was agreed that the double negative format of the Role Stress Scales was more difficult to comprehend, there appeared to be no better method of stating these questions. No changes were made concerning the uncertainty of how to answer questions when the respondents had not yet experienced some of the decision situations, since this was considered a limitation to be expected in any field study. It was decided not to add the choice of "not applicable" to the responses in the questionnaire in order to maintain consistency with the three prior studies which used one to three of the instruments included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was rearranged so that Section III was contained on one page.

Procedure for Selecting Sample

One of the primary problems in this study was that of defining the population from which the sample of child development programs would be selected. There was no

central listing of child development agencies in the United States, nor was there any one state or federal agency responsible for the myriad programs that are broadly labeled as child development programs. Some programs, particularly special programs for handicapped preschoolers, were under the jurisdiction of public schools or mental health agencies. Head Start programs were sometimes in the public school system but most were administered by community action agencies. The majority of child development programs in the United States were found to be child care centers/agencies, and were individually operated, usually under the auspices of a non-profit organization such as a civic or religious group. There appeared to be a number of "for profit" programs, particularly franchised child care centers. These were generally managed locally.

With such a fragmented population, it was decided that the best procedure for locating a population that would represent all child development agencies in the United States was to contact the agency responsible for licensing child care centers in each state. All child care centers (both profit and non-profit) must meet certain standards of licensing set by each state, and many of the Head Start and handicapped programs must also be licensed under these regulations. The agency mandated with this licensing responsibility in each state was

usually the department of human services, office of child development, or children's bureau.

There are probably as many child development programs in the United States as there are elementary schools. In order to limit the population and still be able to select a representative sample, the licensing agency in each state capital was requested to supply the names of the four largest child care/child development programs in that city. It was necessary that each program be large enough to have at least three teachers to participate in this study. A list of state agencies that license child care centers was compiled from the National Directory of Children's Services.[72] The licensing agencies in each of the fifty states were contacted by letter (Appendix H) requesting information on the four largest child development programs in their capital cities. These letters were mailed on December 12, 1984. A follow-up mailing was sent to twenty-four non-respondents on January 10, 1985. When only three more responses to the request for information were needed to meet the projected 70% response level, it was decided to contact state licensing agencies by phone until six persons agreed to send the names of the four largest child development

---

[72] National Directory of Children's Services, (Washington, D. C.: CPR Directory Services Company, 1983).

programs in their capital cities. These contacts were made on January 30, 1985 from an alphabetical list of state agencies which had not responded.

The initial selection of the sample was made from the compiled lists of child development programs sent by licensing agencies from thirty-six states. A random selection was made by computer of two programs in each state for a total of seventy-two programs. Twenty-eight additional programs were randomly selected from a pool of all the programs which were not chosen in the first random selection. The sample population totaled one hundred programs.

The administrators of these one hundred programs were mailed letters (Appendix I) on February 6, 1985, asking them to select three staff to complete the survey. The participants were to be selected by the following criteria: (1) each staff person must have the primary responsibility for a classroom of children (not an assistant teacher or aide); and (2) they must have been employed by the agency for the longest length of time and for at least one year. A packet of three survey questionnaires, return envelopes and postage were included with the letter.

Two follow-up letters were mailed to the child development programs which had not responded to the initial request. One hundred eight (108) completed

questionnaires from thirty-eight (38) programs were returned.

Because a 50 percent return (or 150 responses) had been projected and the initial survey had resulted in only a 36 percent response from the teachers, it was decided that additional programs should be contacted in order to secure an adequate number of survey participants. Since the population of child development programs had been narrowed to a sample selection by the state licensing agencies, it was deemed justifiable to select for the second mailing those programs which had not been contacted in the first survey, plus programs from the lists from six additional states which had been received after the first random sample had been made. Fifty-seven (57) packets were mailed to the administrators of these programs, requesting their cooperation and including three questionnaires for teachers to complete. This mailing was made on April 12 and was followed-up with two reminders, one on April 25 and another on May 2, 1985.

A total of four hundred ninety-eight questionnaires were sent to one hundred sixty-six (166) child development programs in forty-one (41) states.

Table 4 displayed the distribution by state of the number of child development programs and the number of teachers that participated in the survey. A total of two hundred thirteen (213) questionnaires were completed by

Table 4

Distribution by State of The Number of Child Development Programs and the Number of Teachers Participating in the Study

State	Number Programs	Number Teachers
Alabama	2	5
Alaska	1	1
Arizona	2	7
Arkansas	3	8
Colorado	2	6
Connecticut	2	5
Deleware	3	9
Georgia	1	3
Hawaii	2	6
Idaho	2	5
Illinois	4	12
Iowa	2	6
Kansas	2	5
Kentucky	1	3
Michigan	3	9
Missouri	3	8
Nebraska	2	6
New Hampshire	3	7
New Jersey	2	6
New Mexico	1	3
New York	1	3
North Carolina	1	3

Table 4 (Continued)

State	Number Programs	Number Teachers
North Dakota	4	12
Ohio	2	7
Oregon	3	8
Pennsylvania	1	2
South Carolina	2	5
Tennessee	4	12
Texas	2	5
Utah	1	3
Virginia	4	12
Washington	2	4
West Virginia	3	8
Wisconsin	3	8
Wyoming	1	1
TOTAL	76	213

teachers in seventy-six (76) child development programs in thirty-five states. This represented a 43 percent response from the teachers; a 46 percent response from the programs; and an 85 percent response from the states. While the return did not meet the projected 50 percent response level, two hundred thirteen (213) participants was believed to be an adequate number for statistical treatment.

Data Analysis Procedures

The organization of the data received from the respondents of this survey was determined by the format of the questionnaire. The questionnaire used to collect data for this study was designed to obtain the perceptions of child development teachers concerning the degree of their participation in the decision-making process, the level of their satisfaction in decision-making participation, their job satisfaction and role stress. Additionally, the questionnaire elicited information from these teachers about the decision-making mode used in their organizations on each of the listed decision issues. Supplemental data pertaining to the type of child development agency by which the respondents were employed and the length of work experience of the respondents were also gathered from the questionnaire to assure that the respondents met the criteria established

by the researcher and to determine the variety of child development programs involved in the study.

The level of satisfaction in the degree of participation in decision-making on each of the twelve decision issues for each respondent was derived from the Decisional Participation Scale. Respondents were asked how frequently they actually participated in making each decision listed in the scale and how frequently they thought they should participate. The level of satisfaction in the degree of participation in decision making on each of the twelve decisions was derived by subtracting the "ideal" (how frequently they thought they should participate) from the "actual" (how frequently they actually participated).

The degree of job satisfaction (both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction) was derived from the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Satisfaction Scales by determining the means on both categories of satisfaction from the ranked value responses of each participant in the study.

The degree of role stress (role ambiguity and role overload) perceived by each respondent was determined by computing the means scores of each of the two categories as derived from the ranked value responses on the Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Role Stress Scales.

The Pearson correlation was used to measure the relationship between the level of satisfaction in decision-making participation on each of the twelve

decision issues and the four dependent variables of intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload.

The method, or mode, of decision-making utilized by the respondents' organizations on each of the twelve decision issues was derived from the responses to the Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes. The chi square test of significance was used to determine the relationship between the decision-making mode most often used on each decision issue and the level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation.

Individual respondents were also divided into three categories, depending on their level of satisfaction in their participation in decision-making on each of the twelve decision issues. Each individual respondent received a level of decision-making satisfaction score on each of the twelve decision issues. There were nine possible scores ranging from -4 to +4 on each decision issue. Scores -4 to -2 were categorized as the deprivation level. Scores -1, 0 and +1 were classified as the equilibrium level (i.e., satisfied with the degree of participation). Scores +2 to +4 were categorized as the saturation level. Responses were grouped by the three levels of satisfaction (deprivation, equilibrium and saturation) on each decision issue in order to examine the relationship between the level of participation

satisfaction and the dependent variables of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role overload. One-way analysis of variance was the statistical method used to determine this relationship.

Summary

Chapter 3 presented a description of the instruments used in collecting data for the study, and discussed the pilot study, the procedure for selecting the sample and the collection of the data. In addition, the statistical methods employed in testing the hypotheses of this study were presented.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Results of the Analysis of Data

This chapter presents a discussion of the techniques utilized in analyzing the data collected in the survey of teachers in child development programs. It includes the results of the analysis of data and an exposition of the tables showing these statistics. Tests of the hypotheses are also included.

Analysis of Data Techniques

Three statistical procedures were employed in analyzing the collected data. The Pearson correlation was utilized in testing the first five hypotheses. The chi square was applied to test Hypothesis Six, and one-way analysis of variance was used to test the remaining four hypotheses. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to compute these statistics.[73] The tests of significance were made on the preselected probability level of .05.

The Pearson correlation is considered the most reliable method of computing correlation coefficients and

---

[73] Statistical Analysis System User's Guide, (Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, Inc., 1972).

is particularly appropriate to use with interval data. In this study, the CORR procedure from the SAS computer program was used to measure the relationship between the degree of actual participation in the decision-making process of child development organizations and the degree of participation perceived to be ideal by the teachers on each of the twelve decision issues listed on the questionnaire.[74] The null hypothesis was accepted if the significance level exceeded .05. If the probability was .05 or less, the null hypothesis was rejected, and it was concluded that there was a significant relationship in the degree of actual participation and the degree of ideal participation as perceived by the teachers on a specific decision issue.

The Pearson correlation is also an appropriate statistical technique for examining the relationships of categories between the level of satisfaction in decision-making participation on each of the twelve decision issues and the four dependent variables of intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload. If the probability of significance was .05 or less, the null hypothesis was rejected, and it was concluded that there was a significant relationship between

---

[74] Ibid., pp. 501-512.

the level of decision-making satisfaction on a particular decision issue and one of the dependent variables (intrinsic or extrinsic job satisfaction, or role ambiguity or overload).

Chi square is an appropriate test of significance when comparing frequencies occurring in several different categories. This test compares the number of frequencies actually observed with the number of frequencies which would be expected if all groups were equal, in order to determine if they are significantly different.

The chi square test was applied in this study to examine the relationship between the level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation and the decision-making modes used by child development agencies on each of the twelve decision issues included in the survey. If the chi square were significant, the null hypothesis was rejected, and it was concluded that there was a significant relationship between a particular level of decision-making satisfaction (deprivation, equilibrium, or saturation) and a specific decision-making mode (autocratic, consultative, majority agreement, consensus, or delegated).

Simple, or one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making satisfaction on the

mean scores of intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload on each of the twelve decision issues. The GLM (General Linear Models) procedure from the SAS library was utilized for this analysis.[75]

In applying ANOVA to the data, the sources of the variation of the scores is attributed to both the variance between the groups and the variance within the groups. In this study, it was assumed that the means of each of the decision-making satisfaction groups (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation) on each of the twelve decision issues would be different. One-way analysis was applied to determine if the difference in means represented a true difference (variance among the groups), or if the difference was due to chance (variance within the groups). If the variance among the groups, or levels, of decision-making satisfaction on a decision issue differed to a greater degree than would be expected by chance (.05 or less), the null hypothesis was rejected, and it was concluded that the level of decision-making satisfaction had a significant effect on the dependent variable (intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity, or role overload) on that particular decision

---

[75] SAS User's Guide: Statistics, (Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, Inc., 1982), pp. 139-199.

issue. If the variance within the groups (error variance) and the variance among the groups did not differ more than would be expected by chance, it was concluded that the degree of decision-making satisfaction had no significant effect on the dependent variable, and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Exposition of Tables

The data in Table 5 illustrated the probability of significance levels by computing the correlation coefficient between the degree of actual participation in decision-making and the degree of ideal decision-making participation as perceived by teachers in child development agencies on each of the twelve decision issues. As shown in the table, the probability level on each of the twelve decision issues was 0.0001. Since the correlations between actual and ideal participation in decision making were significant at the .05 level of confidence, the null hypothesis of Hypothesis One was rejected. These data indicated that there was a significant relationship between the degree of actual participation in the decision-making process of the organization and the degree of ideal participation as perceived by staff on each of the twelve decision issues: hiring, planning budget, resolving learning problems, determining instructional methods, establishing instructional policies,

Table 5

Intercorrelations of Perceived Degree of Actual Participation in Decision-Making with Perceived Degree of Ideal Participation on the Twelve Decision Issues

Decision Issues	N	Correlation Coefficient	Probability Level
1. Hiring New Staff	208	0.7953	0.0001
2. Planning Budget	206	0.7455	0.0001
3. Resolving Learning Problems	211	0.7786	0.0001
4. Determining Instructional Methods	207	0.7639	0.0001
5. Establishing Instructional Policies	206	0.7717	0.0001
6. Establishing Classroom Disciplinary Policies	204	0.8179	0.0001
7. Resolving Employee Grievances	210	0.7320	0.0001
8. Planning New Facilities	206	0.6603	0.0001
9. Resolving Problems with Community Groups	204	0.7868	0.0001
10. Determining Staff Salaries	209	0.5488	0.0001
11. Selecting Instructional Materials and Equipment	205	0.5996	0.0001
12. Determining Professional Assignments	204	0.7287	0.0001

Note: Probability of Significance Level .05.

establishing disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments.

Table 6 showed the number of responses in each of the three levels of decision-making satisfaction (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation) on each of the twelve decision issues. The total number of responses in the data set was 213. The greatest number of responses on each of the decision issues were in the equilibrium category, which meant that a majority of the respondents were satisfied with the amount, or level, of their participation in the decision-making process of their organizations. The number of responses in the equilibrium group ranged from one hundred twenty-seven (61%) who were satisfied in the degree of participation in determining salaries to two hundred (95%) who were satisfied with the amount of participation they experienced in resolving learning problems. The second largest number of responses was in the deprivation level, which ranged from eleven (5%) who indicated they were not as involved as they thought they should be in making decisions about learning problems to eighty-two (39%) who thought they should be more involved in determining salaries. The number of responses in the saturation category was sparse. None of the respondents

Table 6

Number of Responses in the Three Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Each Decision Issue

Decision Issues	Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction		
	Deprivation	Equilibrium	Saturation
1. Hiring	37	170	1
2. Budget Planning	46	159	1
3. Learning Problems	11	200	0
4. Instructional Methods	12	188	7
5. Instructional Policies	25	178	3
6. Classroom Discipline	13	190	1
7. Employee Grievances	36	169	5
8. Facility Planning	59	147	0
9. Community Problems	38	166	0
10. Salaries	82	127	0
11. Instructional Materials	22	182	1
12. Professional Assignments	37	165	2

Note: Total number of observation in data set = 213.

experienced saturation in the decision-making process concerning learning problems, facility planning, resolving problems with community groups, and salaries. Only one (1) respondent was at the saturation level on decisions concerning hiring, budget planning, classroom discipline and instructional materials; two (2) on professional assignments; three (3) on instructional policies; five (5) on employee grievances; and seven (7) on instructional methods.

The correlations between the independent variable of satisfaction in decision-making and the four dependent variables of intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role overload were displayed in Table 7. These data showed that the null hypothesis for Hypothesis Two and Three were rejected on every decision issue except on instructional methods. There was a significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation and both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction on decisions concerning hiring, budget planning, learning problems, instructional policies, classroom discipline, employee grievances, facility planning, community problems, salaries, instructional materials, and professional assignments. The data in Table 7 also indicated that the correlations between satisfaction in decision-making and role ambiguity were

Table 7

Intercorrelations of Satisfaction in Decision Making with Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload

Decision Issues	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction		Extrinsic Job Satisfaction		Role Ambiguity		Role Overload	
	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level
1. Hiring	206	0.0002	197	0.0001	205	0.0001	204	0.0101
2. Budget Planning	204	0.0001	196	0.0001	205	0.0007	203	0.0270
3. Learning Problems	208	0.0001	200	0.0001	208	0.0001	207	0.0024
4. Instructional Methods	205	0.2941	199	0.4880	204	0.0342	203	0.0341
5. Instructional Policies	203	0.0016	198	0.0006	203	0.1473	202	0.0754
6. Classroom Discipline	201	0.0006	196	0.0001	201	0.0053	200	0.2670
7. Employee Grievances	207	0.0245	199	0.0006	207	0.0006	206	0.0149
8. Facility Planning	204	0.0002	195	0.0001	203	0.0001	202	0.0029
9. Community Problems	201	0.0109	193	0.0002	201	0.0002	200	0.0017

Table 7 (Continued)

Decision Issues	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction		Extrinsic Job Satisfaction		Role Ambiguity		Role Overload	
	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level	N	Prob. Level
10. Salaries	206	0.0001	198	0.0001	206	0.0001	205	0.0010
11. Instructional Materials	202	0.0009	198	0.0001	202	0.0002	201	0.0164
12. Professional Assignments	201	0.0001	193	0.0001	201	0.0001	200	0.0001

Note: Probability of significance level .05.

significant at the .05 level of confidence on every decision issue except determining instructional policies. The null hypothesis was rejected on Hypothesis Four and it was concluded that there was a significant relationship between the perceived level of decision-making satisfaction and the perceived level of role ambiguity on the following eleven decision issues: hiring, budget planning, learning problems, instructional methods, classroom discipline, employee grievances, facility planning, community problems, salaries, instructional materials, and professional assignments. Analysis of the data in Table 7 concerning the relationship between satisfaction in decision-making and role overload revealed that the null hypothesis for Hypothesis Five was rejected on every decision issue except two: instructional policies and classroom discipline. There was a significant relationship between perceived decision-making satisfaction and role overload at the .05 level on decision issues concerning hiring, budget planning, learning problems, instructional methods, employee grievances, facility planning, community problems, salaries, instructional materials, and professional assignments. The data in this table indicated that, on nine of the twelve decision issues, a majority of the teachers perceived high intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and low role ambiguity and overload.

The next eleven tables depicted the frequency and percent of each of the decision-making modes (autocratic, consultation, majority agreement, consensus, and delegated) selected by respondents as the primary method used by their organizations on each of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study. These twelve tables also categorized these data according to the level of satisfaction in decision-making participation (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation).

Table 8 showed that, on the issue of hiring, 53 percent of the 206 respondents listed the autocratic decision-making mode as the one most frequently used by the organizations of all the groups (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation). Over 81 percent of the respondents were in the equilibrium group. Of the 168 in the equilibrium group, 81 indicated satisfaction when decisions about hiring were autocratic (made by the administrator without input from teachers), while 73 indicated satisfaction when agency decisions about hiring were made by the administrator after consultation with the teachers. The mode most often used by the deprivation group was autocratic (28 out of 37 responses). There was only one respondent in the saturation group and that response was in the delegated mode.

Table 9 indicated that almost 60 percent of the 201 respondents listed autocratic as the decision-mode most

Table 8

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 1. Hiring New Staff

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	28	7	0	0	2	37
Percent	13.59	3.4	0	0	0.97	17.96
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	81	73	8	5	1	168
Percent	39.32	35.44	3.88	2.43	0.49	81.55
Saturation Group						
Frequency	1	0	0	0	0	1
Percent	0.49	0	0	0	0	0.49
Total						
Frequency	110	80	8	5	3	206
Percent	53.40	38.83	3.88	2.43	1.46	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

often used by their agencies when planning budgets. Almost 60 percent were in the equilibrium group. Of the 154 responses from the equilibrium group, 89 used the autocratic mode and 46 used the consultation mode. The remainder of the responses from the equilibrium group were scattered throughout the other modes. The mode most often used by the deprivation group was autocratic (31 out of 46 responses). The one response in the saturation group was listed under the delegated mode.

Table 10 presented data which indicated that almost 2 percent of the 210 teachers in the child development agencies responding to the survey used the consultation mode when resolving learning problems. Almost 95 percent of the respondents were in the equilibrium group. The mode used most often by the 199 respondents in the equilibrium group was consultation (102 responses). The mode most often listed by the deprivation group was consultation (7 out of 11 responses). There was no saturation group on this decision issue.

Table 11 showed that, when determining appropriate instructional methods, over 40 percent of the 203 respondents indicated that consultation was the mode of decision-making most often used in their agencies. Over 90 percent of the respondents on this issue were in the equilibrium group. Of the 184 responses from this group, 76 used the consultation mode. There were twelve

Table 9

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 2. Planning Budget

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	31	8	0	6	1	46
Percent	15.42	3.98	0	2.99	0.50	22.89
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	89	46	9	5	5	154
Percent	44.28	22.89	4.48	2.49	2.49	76.62
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	1
Percent	0	0	0	0	0.50	0.50
Total						
Frequency	120	54	9	11	7	201
Percent	59.70	26.87	4.48	5.47	3.48	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 10

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 3. Resolving Learning Problems

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	1	7	0	1	2	11
Percent	0.48	3.33	0	0.48	0.95	5.24
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	3	102	28	25	41	199
Percent	1.43	48.57	13.33	11.90	19.52	94.76
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total						
Frequency	4	109	28	26	43	210
Percent	1.90	51.90	13.33	12.38	20.48	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 11

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 4. Determining Appropriate Instructional Methods

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	3	4	3	2	0	12
Percent	1.48	1.97	1.48	0.99	0	5.91
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	9	76	26	23	50	184
Percent	4.43	37.44	12.81	11.33	24.63	90.64
Saturation Group						
Frequency	1	2	1	0	3	7
Percent	0.49	0.99	0.49	0	1.48	3.45
Total						
Frequency	13	82	30	25	53	203
Percent	6.40	40.39	14.39	12.32	26.11	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

responses listed from the deprivation group (3 in autocratic, 4 in consultation, 3 in majority agreement and 2 in consensus). There were seven responses from the saturation group (1 in autocratic, 2 in consultation, 1 in majority agreement and 3 in delegated).

In Table 12, the data indicated that 39.8 percent of the 201 respondents used the consultation mode in establishing instructional policies. There were 175 respondents in the equilibrium group on this decision issue, with the largest number (76) listing consultation as the mode most often used by their organizations. The mode most often used by 11 of the 23 respondents in the deprivation group was autocratic. There were 3 responses in the saturation group (one each in consultation, consensus and delegated).

The data displayed in Table 13 showed that 39 percent of the 196 responses on the issue of establishing classroom disciplinary policies indicated that consultation was the mode most often used in making this decision. A total of 184 of the 196 respondents were in the equilibrium group, and 75 of this group used the consultation mode. There were only 11 respondents in the deprivation group, with 5 responses listed under autocratic. Only one response was recorded in the saturation group.

Table 14 presented data on the decision-making mode most often used in resolving employee grievances. Of the

Table 12

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 5. Establishing Instructional Policies

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	11	3	2	4	3	23
Percent	5.47	1.49	1.00	1.99	1.49	11.44
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	29	76	17	20	33	175
Percent	14.43	37.81	8.46	9.95	16.42	87.06
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	1	0	1	1	3
Percent	0	0.50	0	0.50	0.50	1.49
Total						
Frequency	40	80	19	25	37	201
Percent	19.90	39.80	9.45	12.44	18.41	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 13

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 6. Establishing Classroom Disciplinary Policies

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	5	2	0	1	3	11
Percent	2.55	1.02	0	0.51	1.53	5.61
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	17	75	25	23	44	184
Percent	8.67	38.27	12.76	11.73	22.45	93.88
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	1
Percent	0	0	0	0	0.51	0.51
Total						
Frequency	22	77	25	24	48	196
Percent	11.22	39.29	12.76	12.24	24.49	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

202 respondents, over 42 percent used consultation and 39 percent used autocratic. There were 162 respondents in the equilibrium group on this decision issue, with 76 listing consultation as the most frequently used mode and 51 selecting the autocratic mode. There were 36 in the deprivation group and 26 of these listed autocratic and 10 listed consultation. There were only four responses in the saturation group.

Table 15 showed that the autocratic mode was used by 60 percent of the respondents, when planning new facilities. Over 71 percent (or 143) of the 201 responses were in the equilibrium group. Of these 143 responses, 80 used the autocratic mode. There were 58 respondents in the deprivation group, with the majority (41) using the autocratic mode. There were no responses listed in the saturation group.

In Table 16, the data indicated that over 58 percent of the 196 respondents used the autocratic mode when resolving problems with community groups. There were 160 respondents in the equilibrium group on this decision issue, with 92 selecting autocratic as the mode used most often by their organizations. The mode most often used by 23 of the 36 respondents in the deprivation group was autocratic. There were no responses in the saturation group.

Table 14

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 7. Resolving Employee Grievances

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	26	10	0	0	0	36
Percent	12.87	4.95	0	0	0	17.82
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	51	76	10	21	4	162
Percent	25.25	37.62	4.95	10.40	1.98	80.20
Saturation Group						
Frequency	2	0	0	0	2	4
Percent	0.99	0	0	0	0.99	1.98
Total						
Frequency	79	86	10	21	6	202
Percent	39.11	42.57	4.95	10.40	2.97	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 15

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 8. Planning New Facilities

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	41	12	3	2	0	58
Percent	20.40	5.97	1.49	1.00	0	28.86
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	80	39	12	6	6	143
Percent	39.80	19.40	5.97	2.99	2.99	71.14
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total						
Frequency	121	51	15	8	6	201
Percent	60.20	25.37	7.46	3.98	2.99	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 16

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 9. Resolving Problems with Community Groups

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	23	9	2	1	1	36
Percent	11.73	4.59	1.02	0.51	0.51	18.37
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	92	42	16	7	3	160
Percent	46.94	21.43	8.16	3.57	1.53	81.63
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total						
Frequency	115	51	18	8	4	196
Percent	58.67	26.02	9.18	4.08	2.04	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 17 presented data on the decision-making mode most often used when determining staff salaries. Of the 200 respondents, over 77 percent used the autocratic mode. There were 122 in the equilibrium group on this decision issue, with 97 listing the autocratic mode. The greatest number of responses in the deprivation group on any of the twelve issues was registered on this issue of salaries. Of the 78 responses in the deprivation group, 58 listed autocratic as the mode most often used. There were no responses in the saturation group.

Table 18 displayed the responses from 197 teachers on the issue of selecting instructional materials and equipment. Over 47 percent (93) of the responses indicated that consultation was the mode most often used in their organizations. Of the total 197 respondents, 174 were in the equilibrium group, and 84 listed consultation as the mode used most often. Of the 22 responses in the deprivation group, 9 selected consultation and 7 listed the autocratic mode. There was only one response in the saturation group.

In Table 19, the data indicated that over 40 percent of the 202 respondents used the consultation mode when determining professional assignments, closely followed by over 36 percent using the autocratic mode. There were 163 in the equilibrium group on this issue, with 72 listing the consultation mode and 50 listing the

Table 17

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 10. Determining Staff Salaries

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	58	11	0	6	3	78
Percent	29.00	5.50	0	3.00	1.50	39.00
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	97	12	2	1	10	122
Percent	48.50	6.00	1.00	0.50	5.00	61.00
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total						
Frequency	155	23	2	7	13	200
Percent	77.50	11.50	1.00	3.50	6.50	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 18

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 11. Selecting Instructional Materials and Equipment

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	7	9	0	3	3	22
Percent	3.55	4.57	0	1.52	1.52	11.17
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	11	84	22	23	34	174
Percent	5.58	42.64	11.17	11.68	17.26	88.32
Saturation Group						
Frequency	0	0	1	0	0	1
Percent	0	0	0.51	0	0	0.51
Total						
Frequency	18	93	23	26	37	197
Percent	9.14	47.21	11.68	13.20	18.78	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

Table 19

Modes of Decision Making Used by Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction on Decision Issue 12. Determining Professional Assignments

Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction	Aut.	Cnsl.	M.A.	Csus.	Del.	Total
Deprivation Group						
Frequency	22	10	1	2	2	37
Percent	10.89	4.95	0.50	0.99	0.99	18.32
Equilibrium Group						
Frequency	50	72	9	9	23	163
Percent	24.75	35.64	4.46	4.46	11.39	80.69
Saturation Group						
Frequency	2	0	0	0	0	2
Percent	0.99	0	0	0	0	0.99
Total						
Frequency	74	82	10	11	25	202
Percent	36.63	40.59	4.95	5.45	12.38	100.00

Note: Decision-making mode selected from five choices:

(1) Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

(2) Consultation (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

(3) Majority agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

(4) Consensus (decision made by consensus in group meetings).

(5) Delegated (decision-making delegated by administrator to individual teachers).

autocratic mode. Of the 37 responses in the deprivation group, 22 used the autocratic mode and 10 used the consultation mode. There were only two responses in the saturation mode.

Table 20 presented a summary of the decision-making modes most often used by the respondents on each of the twelve decision issues. The data indicated that the autocratic mode was most often used by the total respondents surveyed in this study on hiring, budgeting, planning facilities, resolving community problems, and determining salaries. The mode most often used by the total respondents on decisions concerning learning problems, instructional methods, instructional policies, discipline, grievances, instructional materials and professional assignments was consultation. The mode most often used by the equilibrium group on each of the decision issues was the same as that used by the total respondents. The data on the deprivation group indicated that the autocratic mode was used most often on every decision issue except three (learning problems, instructional methods, and instructional materials). On these three issues, consultation was the mode most frequently used by the deprivation group. Because there were fewer than five responses in any of the decision-making modes for the saturation group, these data were not definitive and therefore, were not included.

Table 20

Decision-Making Modes Most Often Used by the Survey Respondents on the Twelve Decision Issues

Decision Issue	Decision-Making Mode Most Often Used			
	Total Respondents	Deprivation Group	Equilibrium Group	Saturation Group
1. Hiring New Staff	Autocratic	Autocratic	Autocratic	*
2. Budget Planning	Autocratic	Autocratic	Autocratic	*
3. Learning Problems	Consultation	Consultation	Consultation	*
4. Instructional Methods	Consultation	Consultation	Consultation	*
5. Instructional Policies	Consultation	Autocratic	Consultation	*
6. Classroom Discipline	Consultation	Autocratic	Consultation	*
7. Employee Grievances	Consultation	Autocratic	Consultation	*
8. Facility Planning	Autocratic	Autocratic	Autocratic	*
9. Community Problems	Autocratic	Autocratic	Autocratic	*
10. Salaries	Autocratic	Autocratic	Autocratic	*
11. Instructional Materials	Consultation	Consultation	Consultation	*
12. Professional Assignments	Consultation	Autocratic	Consultation	*

* Count less than 5 in any of the decision-making modes for the saturation group.

The chi square was used to measure the relationship between the teacher's level of satisfaction in decision making and the decision-making modes used by child development agencies. Table 21 displayed the chi square and the probability of significance level on each of the twelve decision issues. The data indicated that the chi square of the level of decision-making satisfaction and the decision-making modes used by the child development organizations surveyed in this study was significant at the .05 probability level on the following decision issues: hiring, budget planning, instructional policies, classroom discipline, employee grievances, salaries and instructional materials. However, the chi square was not statistically significant on the following decision issues: learning problems, instructional methods, facility planning, community problems, and professional assignments.

The data in the next eleven tables depicted the means and standard deviations of each of the decision-making satisfaction groups (deprivation, equilibrium and saturation) on intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload on each of the twelve decision issues. The means indicated the average rating of each of the decision-making satisfaction groups on each of the job satisfaction and role stress scales. The standard deviations represented the

Table 21

Chi Square of Teachers' Level of Decision-Making Satisfaction and Decision-Making Modes Used by Organizations on Each of the Twelve Decision Issues

Decision Issues	Chi Square	Probability Level
1. Hiring New Staff	17.55	0.0248
2. Budget Planning	39.48	0.0001
3. Learning Problems	5.13	0.2738
4. Instructional Methods	14.16	0.0776
5. Instructional Policies	18.03	0.0210
6. Classroom Discipline	18.22	0.0196
7. Employee Grievances	55.54	0.0001
8. Facility Planning	5.26	0.2617
9. Community Problems	1.16	0.8854
10. Salaries	10.0	0.0404
11. Instructional Materials	24.76	0.0017
12. Professional Assignments	14.82	0.0626

Note: Probability of significance level .05.

variability of the scores (or rating responses). If the standard deviation (or variance) was small, the scores were close together and clustered around the mean. If the standard deviation was large, the scores were more dispersed.

In Table 22, on the decision issue of hiring, the mean scores of 19.95 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.73 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means scores of 17.51 and 15.53 on intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction for the deprivation group. The standard deviations for both satisfaction scales were smaller for the equilibrium group than for the deprivation group. On the ambiguity and overload scales, the mean scores of 12.0 and 9.11 for the deprivation group were higher than the mean scores of 8.86 on ambiguity and 7.62 on overload for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations were smaller for the equilibrium group than for the deprivation group. There was only one score for the saturation group on the two satisfaction scales and the two role stress scales. The data in this table indicated that the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

Table 23 presented the means and standard deviations on the four scales on the decision issue of budget

Table 22

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 1. Hiring New Staff

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	37	17.51	5.27	34	15.53	5.31	36	12.0	5.55	36	9.11	3.40
Equilibrium Group	168	19.95	3.93	162	18.73	4.30	168	8.86	3.71	167	7.62	3.19
Saturation Group	1	20.0	-	1	17.0	-	1	9.0	-	1	6.0	-

planning. The means of 20.22 on intrinsic and 18.95 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the mean scores of 17.17 and 15.95 for the deprivation group. The mean scores of 10.93 on ambiguity and 8.63 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the mean scores of 8.89 and 7.54 on the two role stress scales for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations were smaller on all four variables for the equilibrium group than for the deprivation group. There was only one score on each of the four scales for the saturation group. These data in Table 22 revealed that the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

In Table 24, on the issue of resolving learning problems, the means of 19.76 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.48 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 14.0 and 12.82 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations on the two satisfaction scales were small for both the equilibrium and deprivation groups. The means of 14.0 on ambiguity and 10.45 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 9.14 and 7.69 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviation for both decision groups was small on ambiguity but on overload, the standard deviation which displayed the highest

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 2. Planning Budget

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	46	17.17	5.36	43	I5.95	5.59	46	10.93	4.7	46	8.63	3.47
Equilibrium Group	157	20.22	3.64	152	18.95	4.02	158	8.89	3.99	156	7.54	3.16
Saturation Group	1	13.0	-	1	16.0	-	1	14.0	-	1	14.0	-

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 3. Resolving Learning Problems

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	10	14.0	4.83	11	12.82	4.49	11	14.0	4.65	11	10.45	3.56
Equilibrium Group	198	19.76	4.09	189	18.48	4.47	197	9.14	4.06	196	7.69	3.19
Saturation Group	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-

deviation from the mean was that of the deprivation group. There were no scores for the saturation group. The data indicated that, on resolving learning problems, the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

Table 25 depicted the means and standard deviations on the satisfaction and stress scales on the decision issue of determining instructional methods. The means of 19.76 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.4 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 17.17 and 15.82 for the deprivation group and the means of 17.43 and 15.14 for the saturation group. The standard deviations on the two satisfaction scales were small for all three decision-making satisfaction groups. The means of 11.08 on ambiguity and 9.17 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 9.25 and 7.78 for the equilibrium group. The means of 9.43 on ambiguity and 7.71 on overload for the saturation group were almost the same as the means for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations were small for all three decision groups on ambiguity and overload. The data in this table indicated that, on determining instructional methods, both the equilibrium and the saturation groups perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and

Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 4. Determining Instructional Methods

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	12	17.17	4.41	11	15.82	4.6	12	11.08	4.21	12	9.17	3.88
Equilibrium Group	186	19.76	4.21	181	18.4	4.57	185	9.25	4.3	184	7.78	3.25
Saturation Group	7	17.43	5.5	7	15.14	4.91	7	9.43	3.41	7	7.71	3.04

overload than the deprivation group.

The statistics in Table 26 showed that, on establishing instructional policies, the means of 19.91 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.59 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 17.63 and 16.16 for the deprivation group and the means of 17.33 and 16.33 for the saturation group. The standard deviations were small for all three decision groups in both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. The means of 13.67 on ambiguity and 10.0 on overload for the saturation group were higher than the means of 9.8 and 8.7 for the deprivation group and the means of 9.14 and 7.71 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviation showed greater variance in the scores on ambiguity for the saturation group than for the equilibrium and deprivation groups. On overload, the standard deviations for all three groups were small. These data revealed that, on establishing instructional policies, the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic job satisfaction and greater extrinsic job satisfaction than either the deprivation or saturation groups. According to the data in this table, the deprivation group perceived slightly higher intrinsic job satisfaction and slightly lower extrinsic job satisfaction than the saturation group. The saturation group perceived greater role

Table 26

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 5. Establishing Instructional Policies

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	24	17.63	3.82	25	16.16	4.77	24	9.8	3.56	23	8.7	2.98
Equilibrium Group	176	19.91	4.29	170	18.59	4.51	176	9.14	4.26	176	7.71	3.3
Saturation Group	3	17.33	3.51	3	16:33	5.03	3	13.67	6.03	3	10.0	3.0

ambiguity and role overload than either the deprivation or equilibrium groups. The equilibrium group perceived less role ambiguity and role overload than the deprivation group.

Table 27 displayed the means and standard deviations on the satisfaction and stress scales on the decision issue of establishing classroom disciplinary policies. The means of 19.78 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.59 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 15.69 and 13.46 on the deprivation group. The standard deviations on both satisfaction scales were smaller for the equilibrium group than the deprivation group. The means of 12.08 for ambiguity and 8.75 for overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 9.18 and 7.74 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviation on ambiguity was smaller for the equilibrium group and the standard deviations of both groups on overload were small. There was only one score for the saturation group on each of the four variables. The data in this table indicated that, on establishing classroom disciplinary policies, the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

In Table 28, on the issue of resolving employee grievances, the means of 19.8 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.65 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium

Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 6. Establishing Classroom Disciplinary Policies

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	13	15.69	5.74	13	13.46	5.24	12	12.08	5.73	12	8.75	3.55
Equilibrium Group	187	19.78	4.09	182	18.59	4.41	188	9.18	4.09	187	7.74	3.25
Saturation Group	1	14.0	-	1	11.0	-	1	13.0	-	1	10.0	-

group were higher than the means of 18.26 and 16.14 for the deprivation group. However, while the mean of the deprivation group on intrinsic satisfaction was higher than the mean of 16.4 for the saturation group, the mean of 17.6 on extrinsic satisfaction for the saturation group was higher than the mean of 16.14 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations on both satisfaction scales were smallest for the equilibrium group and smaller for the deprivation group than the saturation group. The mean of 12.0 on ambiguity for the saturation group was the highest mean, with the 11.57 mean for the deprivation group next highest, and the 8.79 mean of the equilibrium group was the lowest. The standard deviations on ambiguity were smaller for the saturation group than the equilibrium group, and smaller for the equilibrium group than the deprivation group. The means on overload were similar for two groups (8.89 for the deprivation group and 8.8 for the saturation group), and the mean of 7.57 for the equilibrium group was the lowest. The standard deviations on overload were identical for the deprivation and saturation groups, and the equilibrium group showed the lowest deviation from the mean. The data in Table 28 revealed that, on resolving employee grievances, the equilibrium group perceived greater job satisfaction and less role stress (ambiguity and overload) than the deprivation and saturation groups. However, the deprivation

Table 28

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 7. Resolving Employee Grievances

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	34	18.26	4.91	35	16.14	4.85	35	11.57	4.88	35	8.89	3.27
Equilibrium Group	168	19.8	4.07	159	18.65	4.47	167	8.79	3.81	166	7.57	3.21
Saturation Group	5	16.4	5.18	5	17.6	6.19	5	12.0	3.08	5	8.8	3.27

group perceived higher intrinsic job satisfaction and less ambiguity than the saturation group, and the saturation group perceived greater extrinsic job satisfaction and slightly less role overload than the deprivation group.

The statistics in Table 29 on planning new facilities showed that the means of 20.06 on intrinsic satisfaction and 19.04 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 17.88 and 15.98 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations for the equilibrium group were smaller than those for the deprivation group on both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. The means of 11.05 on ambiguity and 8.54 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the 8.7 and 7.48 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviation for the equilibrium group showed less variance from the mean on ambiguity, but the deprivation group showed slightly less variance from the mean on overload than the equilibrium group. There were no saturation group scores on any of the four variables. The data in this table indicated that the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

In Table 30 on the issue of resolving problems with community groups, the means of 19.69 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.64 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 18.22 and

Table 29

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 8. Planning New Facilities

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	58	17.88	5.2	58	15.98	5.32	58	11.05	5.24	57	8.54	3.12
Equilibrium Group	146	20.06	3.75	137	19.04	4.0	145	8.7	3.52	145	7.48	3.27
Saturation Group	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-

16.08 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations on these two satisfaction scales were small for both the deprivation and equilibrium groups. The means of 11.16 on ambiguity and 9.11 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 8.91 and 7.56 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations for both decision groups were small on ambiguity and overload. There were no scores for the saturation group. The data indicated that, on resolving problems with community groups, the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

Table 31 depicted the means and standard deviations on the satisfaction and stress scales on the decision issue of determining staff salaries. The means of 20.65 on intrinsic satisfaction and 19.37 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 17.66 and 16.31 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations on the two satisfaction scales were small for both the equilibrium and the deprivation groups. The means of 11.06 on ambiguity and 8.85 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 8.32 and 7.19 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations were small for both groups on ambiguity and overload. The data in this table indicated that, on determining staff salaries, the equilibrium group perceived greater

Table 30

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 9. Resolving Problems with Community Groups

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	37	18.22	4.77	36	16.08	5.27	38	11.16	4.88	37	9.11	3.04
Equilibrium Group	164	19.69	4.19	157	18.64	4.36	163	8.91	3.94	163	7.56	3.29
Saturation Group	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-

Table 31

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 10. Determining Staff Salaries

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	80	17.66	4.75	80	16.31	5.08	80	11.06	4.87	79	8.85	3.26
Equilibrium Group	126	20.65	3.5	118	19.37	3.86	126	8.32	3.4	126	7.19	3.15
Saturation Group	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-

intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group.

The statistics on Table 32 showed that, on selecting instructional materials and equipment, the means of 19.8 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.66 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 16.82 and 14.27 for the deprivation group. The standard deviations were smaller for the equilibrium group. The means of 12.45 on ambiguity and 9.71 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 8.99 and 7.72 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations for the deprivation group showed greater variance in the scores on ambiguity and overload than the equilibrium group. There was only one response in the saturation group on the job satisfaction scales and the role stress scales on this decision issue. According to the data recorded in this table, the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and lower ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group on the issue of selecting instructional materials and equipment.

Table 33 displayed the means and standard deviations on the satisfaction and stress scores on the decision issue of determining professional assignments. The means of 20.22 on intrinsic satisfaction and 18.96 on extrinsic satisfaction for the equilibrium group were higher than the means of 16.19 and 14.58 for the deprivation group.

Table 32

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 11. Selecting Instructional Materials and Equipment

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	22	16.82	6.04	22	14.27	5.61	22	12.45	5.99	21	9.71	4.03
Equilibrium Group	179	19.8	3.95	175	18.66	4.31	179	8.99	3.82	179	7.72	3.12
Saturation Group	1	18.0	-	1	16.0	-	1	12.0	-	1	10.0	-

Table 33

Means and Standard Deviations on Job Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales from Respondents in Deprivation, Equilibrium, and Saturation Levels of Decision-Making Satisfaction Concerning Decision Issue 12. Determining Professional Assignments

Levels of Satisfaction in Decision-Making	Job Satisfaction						Role Stress					
	Intrinsic			Extrinsic			Ambiguity			Overload		
	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.	N	Mean	St. Dev.
Deprivation Group	37	16.19	5.16	36	14.58	4.96	37	12.51	4.66	35	9.4	3.59
Equilibrium Group	162	20.22	3.69	157	18.96	4.24	162	8.76	3.86	163	7.62	3.14
Saturation Group	2	15.0	1.41	0	--	-	2	10.0	0.0	2	6.5	0.71

The standard deviations were small for both groups. The means of 12.51 on ambiguity and 9.4 on overload for the deprivation group were higher than the means of 8.76 and 7.62 for the equilibrium group. The standard deviations were small for both groups. There were only two scores in the saturation group on intrinsic satisfaction, none on extrinsic satisfaction and two on ambiguity and overload. The data in this table indicated that the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group on the issue of determining professional assignments.

The data in these eleven tables revealed that on all twelve decision issues the equilibrium group perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than the deprivation group. There were only three decision issues which listed more than two scores from the saturation group, and those ranged from three to seven scores. These data were not definitive and therefore were not included in the analysis.

In order to determine if there was a significant difference among the three decision-making satisfaction groups (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation) on the mean scores on intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload, one-way

analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied.[76] The data on each of these forty-eight analyses was included in the computer analysis of the data in the appendices.

In the ANOVA procedure, the model represented the variance between the three decision-making satisfaction groups, and the corrected total was the sum of these two variances. The mean square (sum of squares divided by the degree of freedom) for the model was divided by the mean square for the error to get the F value. If the variance between the three decision-making satisfaction groups (model) and the variance within the groups (error) was greater than would be expected, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there was a significant difference among the three decision-making satisfaction groups on the dependent variable. The greater the difference between the model variance and the error variance, the larger the F value. If the model variance and the error variance were not significantly different, the null hypothesis was accepted, and it was concluded that any difference between the three decision-making satisfaction groups was due to chance. The probability of significance level (PR> F) was determined at .05.

---

[76] SAS User's Guide: Statistics, (Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, Inc., 1976), pp. 119-137.

Table 34 displayed the probability levels of the F values in the one-way analysis on each of the twelve decision issues by intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload. This table presented the following information:

1. On the decision issue of hiring new staff, the probability levels among the three decision-making satisfaction groups (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation) by intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload were significant at the .05 level.

2. On the decision issue of budget planning, the probability levels among the three decision-making satisfaction groups by intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and by role ambiguity and overload were significant at the .05 level.

3. On the issue of resolving learning problems, the probability levels between the deprivation and equilibrium groups by the two job satisfaction variables and the two role stress variables were significant at the .05 level. (There were no scores for the saturation group.)

4. On the issue of determining instructional methods, the probability levels among the deprivation, equilibrium and saturation groups by intrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity and overload were not

Table 34

Probability Levels of the F Values in the One-Way Analysis on the Decision Issues by Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, Extrinsic Job Satisfaction, Role Ambiguity, and Role Overload

Decision Issues	Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	Role Ambiguity	Role Overload
1. Hiring	0.0068*	0.0010*	0.0002*	0.0384*
2. Budget planning	0.0001*	0.0005*	0.0008*	0.0230*
3. Learning problems	0.0001**	0.0001**	0.0002**	0.0059**
4. Instructional methods	0.0541	0.0433*	0.3569	0.3654
5. Instructional policies	0.0310*	0.0357*	0.1520	0.2073
6. Classroom discipline	0.0017*	0.0001*	0.0486*	0.4662
7. Employee grievances	0.0430*	0.0143*	0.0004*	0.0744
8. Facility planning	0.0010**	0.0001**	0.0003**	0.0354**
9. Community problems	0.0613	0.0026**	0.0029**	0.0098**
10. Salaries	0.0001**	0.0001**	0.0001**	0.0004**
11. Instructional materials	0.0079*	0.0001*	0.0010*	0.0242*
12. Professional assignments	0.0001*	0.0001**	0.0001*	0.0109*

* Significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean scores of the decision issue.

** Significant difference between the deprivation and equilibrium groups in decision-making participation on the mean scores of the decision issue. (No responses in the saturation level of decision making.)

statistically significant at the .05 level, but by extrinsic satisfaction the probability level was significant.

5. On the issue of determining instructional policies, the probability levels among the three decision satisfaction groups by intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were significant at the .05 level. However, the probability levels on this decision issue by role ambiguity and overload were not statistically significant at the .05 level.

6. On the issue of classroom discipline, the probability levels among the three satisfaction groups by intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and role ambiguity were significant at the .05 level; but by role overload, the probability level was not statistically significant.

7. On the issue of resolving employee grievances, the probability levels among the three satisfaction groups by intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and role ambiguity were significant at the .05 level; but by role overload, the probability level was not statistically significant.

8. On the issue of planning facilities, the probability levels between the deprivation and equilibrium groups by the two job satisfaction variables and the two role stress scores were significant at the .05 level. (There were no scores on the saturation group on this issue.)

9. On the issue of resolving problems with community groups, the probability levels between the deprivation and equilibrium groups by extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity and overload were significant at the .05 level; but by intrinsic job satisfaction, the probability level was not statistically significant. (There were no scores for the saturation group.)

10. On the issue of determining salaries, the probability levels between the deprivation and equilibrium groups by the two job satisfaction variables and the two role stress variables were significant at the .05 level. (There were no scores for the saturation group.)

11. On the issue of determining instructional materials, the probability levels among the three decision satisfaction groups by the two job satisfaction variables and the two role stress variables were significant at the .05 level.

12. On the issue of determining professional assignments, the probability levels among the three decision participation groups by the two job satisfaction variables and the two role stress variables were significant at the .05 level.

Tests of the Hypotheses

1. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship in the degree of actual

participation in the decision-making process of the organization and the degree of ideal participation as perceived by staff on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study. Analysis of the Pearson correlation revealed that there was a significant relationship (at the .05 level) between the two variables on every decision issue. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

2. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and perceived level of intrinsic satisfaction experienced by staff concerning their jobs. The Pearson correlation indicated that there was a significant relationship (at the .05 level) on eleven of the decision issues. The null hypothesis was rejected on the following eleven decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. The null hypothesis was accepted on one decision issue: determining instructional methods.

3. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of extrinsic satisfaction experienced by staff concerning their jobs. Correlation statistics demonstrated that there was a significant relationship between the two variables on eleven of the twelve decision issues. The null hypothesis was rejected on the following eleven decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. The null hypothesis was accepted on one decision issue: determining instructional methods.

4. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of role ambiguity experienced by the staff. Correlation statistics indicated that there was a significant relationship

between decision-making satisfaction and role ambiguity on eleven of the twelve decisions. The null hypothesis was rejected on the following eleven decision issues: hiring new staff; planning budget; resolving learning problems; determining instructional methods; establishing classroom disciplinary policies; resolving employee grievances; planning new facilities; resolving problems with community groups; determining staff salaries; selecting instructional materials; and determining professional assignments. The null hypothesis was accepted on one decision issue: establishing instructional policies.

5. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the perceived level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study and the perceived level of role overload experienced by staff. Correlation statistics indicated that there was a significant relationship between decision-making satisfaction and role overload on ten of the twelve decisions. The null hypothesis was rejected on the following ten decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, establishing instructional methods, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting

instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. The null hypothesis was accepted on the following two decisions: establishing instructional policies and establishing classroom disciplinary policies.

6. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the level of satisfaction in the degree of decision-making participation and the decision-making modes used by child development agencies on any of the twelve decision issues surveyed in this study. The chi square statistics indicated that there was a significant relationship between the level of decision-making satisfaction and the decision-making modes used by the child development agencies surveyed in this study on seven of the twelve decision issues. The null hypothesis was rejected on the following seven decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, determining staff salaries, and selecting instructional materials and equipment. The null hypothesis was accepted on the following five decision issues: resolving learning problems, determining instructional methods, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, and determining professional assignments.

7. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean intrinsic satisfaction scores. The statistical data of the one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups on the mean intrinsic satisfaction scores on seven of the twelve decision issues; and there was a significant difference between the deprivation and equilibrium groups on the mean intrinsic satisfaction scores on three of the decision issues. On the basis of the data available on the three decision participation groups, the null hypothesis was rejected on the following ten decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. On the basis of the data available on the three decision participation groups, the null hypothesis was accepted on the following two decision issues: determining instructional methods, and resolving problems with community groups.

8. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium,

and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean extrinsic satisfaction scores. The statistical data of the one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups on the mean extrinsic satisfaction scores on seven of the twelve decision issues; and there was a significant difference between the deprivation and equilibrium groups on the mean extrinsic satisfaction scores on five of the decision issues. On the basis of the data available on the three decision participation groups, the null hypothesis was rejected on all twelve decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, determining instructional methods, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments.

9. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean role ambiguity scores. The statistical data of the one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups on the mean role ambiguity

scores on six of the twelve decision issues; and there was a significant difference between the deprivation and equilibrium groups on the mean role ambiguity scores on four of the twelve decision issues. On the basis of the data available on the three decision participation groups, the null hypothesis was rejected on the following ten decision issues: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. On the basis of the data available on the three participation groups, the null hypothesis was accepted on the following two decision issues: determining instructional methods and establishing instructional policies.

10. The null hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation groups in decision-making participation on the mean role overload scores. The statistical data of the one-way analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium and saturation groups on the mean role overload scores on four of the twelve decision issues; and there was a significant difference between the deprivation and

equilibrium groups on the mean role overload scores on four of the decision issues. On the basis of the data available on the three decision participation groups, the null hypothesis was rejected on the following eight decisions: hiring new staff, budget planning, resolving learning problems, planning new facilities, resolving problems with community groups, determining staff salaries, selecting instructional materials and equipment, and determining professional assignments. On the basis of the data available on the three participation groups, the null hypothesis was accepted on the following four decision issues: determining instructional methods, establishing instructional policies, establishing classroom disciplinary policies, and resolving employee grievances.

Summary

Chapter 4 explained the techniques utilized in analyzing the data collected in this study. The results of the analysis of the data were displayed in tables and discussed. Tests of the ten hypotheses were also included.

CHAPTER 5

Summary and Implications

This chapter consists of a brief review of the purpose of the study, the procedures utilized in collecting the data, the conclusions based on the analysis of the data, and the implications for further study.

Summary

This study examined the relationship between satisfaction in the decision-making process of child development agencies and teachers' perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, role ambiguity and overload. This research also included an investigation of the methods, or modes, of decision-making most often used by child development agencies to determine if there was a significant relationship between the teachers' level of satisfaction in participating in decision making and the mode of decision making used in their organizations.

Three of the four scales used in this survey had been used in prior research studies. The Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale was used to determine the level of decision-making satisfaction of each of the participants. The Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman scales were

used to measure intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, and role ambiguity and overload of the participants. An instrument for gathering the data on the decision-making modes used by the child development agencies included in this study was developed by the researcher. These four instruments were compiled in a questionnaire and pilot tested.

The state agency responsible for licensing child care/child development programs in each state was requested to send a list of the four largest programs in their capital city. This list was compiled and a random sample was selected to participate in this study. When two follow-up letters failed to secure an adequate sample for the study, the remaining programs on the list were asked to participate. A total of one hundred sixty-eight (168) programs in forty-one (41) states were mailed a packet containing three questionnaires. A total of two hundred thirteen (213) teachers from seventy-six (76) child development programs in thirty-five (35) states participated in this research.

Findings and Conclusions

The findings and conclusions derived from analysis of the data and testing of the hypotheses are reported in the following section. The probability level of all tests was predetermined at the .05 level.

Analysis of the correlations between actual and ideal participation in decision making demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between these two variables on each of the twelve decision issues. It was evident that a significant majority of the teachers in the child development programs were clearly involved in the decision-making process of their organizations to the degree they wanted to be involved. Of those teachers who felt they were not as involved as they wanted to be in the decision-making process of their organizations, more were dissatisfied with their lack of participation concerning issues which are usually considered managerial decisions (salaries, facilities, budgets, community problems, professional assignments, hiring and grievances), rather than technical (or programmatic) decisions.

Analysis of the correlations between satisfaction in decision-making participation and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction indicated a significant relationship on each of the decision issues except instructional methods. Teachers who perceived high satisfaction in decision-making participation also perceived high intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction on a majority of the decision issues.

Analysis of the correlations between satisfaction in decision making and role ambiguity revealed that there was a significant relationship on every decision issue

except instructional policies. The correlations between satisfaction in the decision-making participation and role overload showed that there was a significant relationship on each of the decision issues except instructional policies and classroom discipline policies. Teachers who perceived high satisfaction in decision-making participation perceived low role ambiguity and overload on a majority of the decision issues, and teachers who perceived dissatisfaction in decision-making participation perceived high role ambiguity and overload.

It was therefore concluded that, on a majority of the decision issues, teachers who were satisfied with the degree to which they were involved in the decision-making process perceived greater job satisfaction and less role stress than teachers who felt they were not as involved as they wanted to be in making decisions.

Analysis of the survey data on the decision-making modes most often used on each of the twelve decision issues indicated that decisions concerning hiring, budgeting, facilities, community problems and salaries were made most often by the administrators of the child development programs without input from the teachers. Decisions concerning all the technical issues (learning problems, instructional materials and discipline), as well as the managerial issues of professional assignments and grievances, were most often made by the administrator

after consultation with the teachers. It was apparent that a majority of the teachers in child development programs were not involved in the decision-making process of their organizations to any greater degree of participation than providing input to the administrator, who then made the decision.

Analysis of the chi square data on the three levels of decision-making satisfaction and the five decision-making modes demonstrated a significant relationship between the level of decision-making satisfaction and the decision-making modes used by the respondents on the decision issues of hiring, budget planning, instructional policies, discipline, employee grievances, salaries and instructional materials. The chi square statistics also indicated that there was no significant relationship between the level of decision-making satisfaction and the decision-making modes on the decision issues of learning problems, instructional methods, facilities, community problems, and professional assignments.

Although the statistical data indicated that there was a significant relationship between the level of decision-making satisfaction and the decision-making modes used on seven of the eleven decision issues, these data cannot be regarded as definitive. Because the chi square test applied to the frequency counts required the total expected responses to be evenly distributed between three

decision-making satisfaction levels and five decision-making modes, and the reported frequency counts were clustered primarily in one decision-making satisfaction level and two decision-making modes, this resulted in over 20 percent of the cells in each table having counts less than five (5). Consequently, the data on the chi square were analyzed with caution, and no conclusion was offered regarding the relationship of the three levels of decision-making satisfaction and the five decision-making modes. It could not be determined, without qualification, that either satisfied or dissatisfied teachers were in organizations which used a particular mode on certain decision issues.

The one-way analysis on each of the twelve decision issues by intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity and role overload revealed that there was a significant difference among the deprivation, equilibrium and saturation groups on intrinsic satisfaction on every issue except instructional methods and community problems; on extrinsic satisfaction on all twelve decision issues; on role ambiguity on every issue except instructional methods and instructional policies; and on role overload on every issue except instructional methods, instructional policies, classroom discipline policies and employee grievances. It was determined that, on a majority of the decision issues, the difference among the deprivation,

equilibrium and saturation groups on the mean scores of the four variables (intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role overload) represented a true difference, or variance, among the groups and that the difference among the groups was not due to chance.

Discussion

Two basic premises formed the thesis of this investigation. One premise was that a significant relationship existed between teachers' satisfaction in the decision-making process of their organizations and their perceptions of job satisfaction and role stress. The other premise was that there was a significant relationship between the teachers' level of satisfaction in participating in decision making and the mode, or method, of decision making used in their organizations. The following section is a discussion of the conclusions and inferences which were offered by the researcher, based on the results of the investigation of these two propositions.

First, it must be pointed out that most of the teachers surveyed in this study were satisfied with the degree to which they participated in making decisions in their organizations. Actual participation and perceived ideal participation was strongly peaked on equilibrium. There was nothing in this study or in prior studies to

suggest that the instrument used to determine satisfaction in decision-making participation was other than adequate. However, the scoring of the responses in this study may have caused this leptokurtic effect. Both Conway and the Mohrman, Cooke, Mohrman team used a rating response scale on this instrument but the equilibrium level was an absolute number in both their studies. In the Conway study, the equilibrium score was +7, with three levels of deprivation assigned at +5, +3, and +1; and three levels of saturation at +6, +4, and +2.[77] In the Mohrman, Cooke, Mohrman study, the equilibrium score was zero, negative numbers were the deprivation level, and positive numbers were the saturation level.[78] In this study, the scoring of this instrument was based on the contention that there should be an equal appearing interval scale for the levels of decision-making satisfaction. Seldom can one make an absolute statement of satisfaction without qualifying it to some degree. An absolute state of satisfaction would rarely be achieved. Therefore, in this study, the equilibrium scores ranged from -1 to +1, the deprivation level

---

[77] James A. Conway, "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Schools as Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (March 1976), 134-136.

[78] Alan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman, "Participation in Decision Making: A Multi-dimensional Prospective," Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (Winter 1978), 24.

ranged from -2 to -4, and the saturation level ranged from +2 to +4. The fact that the data from this study was scored differently than in prior studies, may have resulted in a greater percentage of participants scoring in the equilibrium level in this study. The conclusion that most of the teachers in this survey were satisfied with the degree of participation in decision making is, like any conclusion, only as valid as the assumption on which it was based.

The results reported in the analysis of the data indicated that those teachers who were not as involved in making decisions as they wanted to be were more dissatisfied with their lack of participation in managerial type decision issues than in decisions concerning the instructional program. This supported the findings of Mohrman, Cooke and Mohrman in their study of public school teachers.[79] Greater satisfaction in the decision-making process concerning technical (or programmatic) issues may be the result of the belief by the teachers that, by their presence in the classroom, they are in control of the decisions about daily programmatic activities and thus, they perceive a greater degree of input regardless of who makes programmatic policy decisions.

---

[79] Ibid., 20.

In determining the relationship between decision-making satisfaction and the four variables of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and role ambiguity and overload, Mohrman grouped the managerial decisions and the programmatic decisions in separate categories. In this study, each decision issue was tested separately. The results of both studies were the same on three of the four variables. This study supported Mohrman's conclusion that satisfaction in decision-making participation was associated with high intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and low role ambiguity. However, contrary to the Mohrman research, this study indicated that the teachers who were satisfied with their participation in decision making also experienced low role overload.[80]

In view of the majority of the teachers' perceived satisfaction in the decision-making process of their organizations, the results of the decision mode survey were unexpected. The data indicated that most of the managerial type decisions were made by the administrator without input from the teachers, and that all the decisions concerning the daily program for the children were made most often by the administrator after consulting with the teachers. Evidently, a majority of the

---

[80] Ibid., 24-25.

teachers in this study were more acceptive of the administrator making the decisions about hiring, budgeting, facilities, community problems, and salaries, as long as they had some input on decisions which directly related to classroom activities and on decisions concerning professional assignments and grievances. The data in this study supported Bridges' findings on teacher participation in decision making.[81] He concluded that ". . . soliciting behavior is an appropriate way in which to involve teachers when the decisions are of central concern to the teacher," and he theorized that administrators can arbitrarily make decisions which do not directly concern teachers without alienating them.[82] However, it was expected by the researcher that teachers in the 1980's would want more input than that available through the consultation mode, particularly on programmatic decisions. Perhaps the teachers in this study were more equally matched with the type of leadership which conformed to their expectations and were, therefore, more satisfied with a lesser degree of involvement in the decision-making process of their organizations.

---

[81] Edwin M. Bridges, "Teacher Participation in Decision Making," Administrator's Notebook, XII (May 1964), 1-4.

[82] Ibid., 4.

Implications and Recommendations

Whatever approach to decision-making is utilized by administrators, there must be an awareness on the part of the administrator that the degree of participation extended to the staff will be perceived differently by each person. The decision-making process of an organization must therefore allow flexibility in the amount of participation required from the staff in making decisions. Perhaps the two decision issues that all staff should be able to personally determine are: (1) the type of decisions they wish to be involved in making, and (2) the degree to which they desire to be involved.

It is therefore recommended that practicing administrators develop a decision-making process which allows a choice about type and degree of involvement. Because of staff turnover and because of changes in teachers' perceptions, this flexible type of decision-making process should be monitored annually. The decisional participation scale used in this study would be an excellent instrument to use in initiating this process, and in monitoring staff preferences concerning type and degree of decision-making involvement.

Participatory decision making is not the panacea that much of the literature on administration would lead one to believe. It fosters satisfaction and prevents stress only to the degree that teachers want to be

involved in the decision-making process. Perhaps future research should focus on determining a priority list of the decision issues that are most important to teachers.

The investigation of the methods of decision making used by organizations also needs to be extended to larger samples and to other types of organizations to determine if the form of participation (that is, the decision-making mode) is more important to the employee than the frequency of involvement in making decisions, and to explore further the relationship between the level of decision-making satisfaction and decision-making modes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, R. Douglas, Michael A. Hitt, and Charles R. Greer. "Occupational Stress and Perceived Organizational Effectiveness in Formal Groups: An Examination of Stress Level and Stress Type." Personnel Psychology, 35 (Summer 1972), 359-70.

Alutto, Joseph A. Letter to author. 11 March 1985.

Alutto, Joseph A. and James A. Belasco. "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (Winter 1972), 44-58.

Barnard, Chester. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Baron, Robert A. Behavior in Organizations. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1983.

Bridges, Edwin M. "A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship." Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (1967), 49-61.

Bridges, Edwin M. and David M. Schneiger. "Participation in Decision Making: One More Look." Research in Organizational Behavior, 1 (1979), 265-339.

Burke, R. J. "Occupational Stresses and Job Satisfaction." The Journal of Social Psychology, 100 (1976), 235-244.

Chase, Francis S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan, XXIII (November 1951), 127-32.

Chase, Francis S. "The Teacher and Policy Making." Administrator's Notebook, 1 (May 1952), 1-4.

Coch, Lester and John French, Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations I (1948), 512-32.

Conway, James A. "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Schools as Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (March 1976), 130-139.

Devlin, Barbara Seeley. "Democratic Leadership: Guidelines for School Administrators." Administrator's Notebook, XXIX (1980-81), 1-4.

Duke, Daniel L., Beverly K. Showers, and Michael Imber. "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement." Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (Winter 1980), 93-106.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Feldman, Robert Howard. Involvement in and Satisfaction with Decision Making Related to Staff and Student Behavior in IGE Schools. ERIC ED 139 788, 1977.

Fletcher, Ben C. and Roy L. Payne. "Levels of Reported Stressors and Strains Amongst Schoolteachers: Some U K Data." Educational Review, 34 (November 1982), 267-78.

Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Liphan and Roald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Hage, Jerald. "An Axiomatic Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, X (December 1965), 289-320.

Harap, Henry. "Morale." The Nation's Schools, 63 (June 1959), 55-57, 75.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Hewitson, Hal. "Participative Decision Making for Teachers - Placebo or Panacea?" The Australian Journal of Education, 22 (June 1978), 189-205.

Johns, Gary. Organizational Behavior. Glenville, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1983.

Lischeron, Joe A. and Toby D. Wall. "Employee Participation: An Experimental Field Study." Human Relations, 28 (December 1975), 863-84.

Locke, Edwin A. "Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. Marvin D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Locke, Edwin A. and David M. Schweiger. "Participation in Decision-Making: One More Look." In Research in Organizational Behavior. Ed. B. M. Straw. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1979.

Locke, Edwin A. "What Is Job Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (1969), 309-36.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

McGrath, Joseph E. "Stress and Behavior in Organizations." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. Marvin D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Medved, James A. "The Applicability of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory." Educational Leadership, 39 (April 1982), 555.

Mohrman, Alan M. Letter to author. 14 March 1985.

Mohrman, Alan M., Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman. "Participation in Decision Making: A Multidimensional Prospective." Educational Administrative Quarterly, 14 (Winter 1978), 13-29.

Morse, Nancy C. and Everett Reimer. "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (1956), 120-29.

National Directory of Children's Services. Washington, D. C.: CPR Directory Services Company, 1983.

Patchen, Martin. Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the Job. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Pitkoff, Evan. Teacher Participation in School Decision Making. ERIC ED 204 302, 1981.

SAS User's Guide. Cary, North Carolina: SAS Institute, Inc., 1982.

Stewart, David A. and Cecil Miskel. "Changing the Organizational Structure to Affect Perceived Bureaucracy, Organizational Processes, Loyalty, Job Satisfaction, and Effectiveness." American Educational Research Association, New York, N. Y., 4-8 April 1977.

Swanson, Guy. "The Effectiveness of Decision-Making Groups." Adult Leadership, 8 (1959), 48-52.

Wheeless, Virginia Eman, and Others. "An Analysis of the Contribution of Participative Decision Making and Communication with Supervisor as Predictors of Job Satisfaction." Association for Institutional Research Forum, Denver, Colorado, 16 May 1982.

Wood, Carolyn J. "Participatory Decision-Making: Why Doesn't It Seem to Work?" The Educational Forum, 49 (Fall, 1984), 55-64.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale

Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale*

Circle the number on the five-point scale which best represents your response to Actual Participation and Ideal Participation under each of the twelve decisional areas listed below. The scale ranges from (1) Never to (5) Always.

a. Actual Participation means "How frequently do you actually participate in the decision?"

b. Ideal Participation means "How frequently do you think you should participate in the decision?"

	Actual Participation					Ideal Participation				
	Never				Always	Never				Always
1. Hiring new staff.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Planning program or center budget.										
3. Resolving learning problems of individual children.										
4. Determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.										
5. Establishing general instructional policies.										
6. Establishing classroom disciplinary policies.										
7. Resolving employee grievances.										
8. Planning new buildings and facilities.										
9. Resolving problems with community groups.										
10. Determining staff salaries.										
11. Selecting specific instructional materials and equipment.										
12. Determining specific professional assignments.										

* Developed by Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco. Modified by Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman. Revised by Norma Seay Gray.

APPENDIX B

Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes

Survey of Organizational Decision-Making Modes

Listed below are twelve decision issues. Circle the answer which best represents the method by which each of these decisions is made in your organization. The choices of decision-making modes are:

Aut (Decision made by administrator without input from teachers).

Cnsl (Decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers).

MA (Decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll).

Csus (Decision made by total agreement in group meeting).

Del (Decision-making delegated by administrator to teachers).

Decision Issues	Decision-Making Modes				
1. Hiring new staff.	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
2. Preparation of program or center budget					
3. Resolving learning problems of individual children.					
4. Determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.					
5. Establishing general instructional policies.					
6. Establishing classroom disciplinary policies.					
7. Resolving employee grievances.					
8. Planning new buildings and facilities.					
9. Resolving problems with community groups.					
10. Determining staff salaries.					
11. Selecting specific instructional materials and equipment.					
12. Determining specific professional assignments.					

Developed by Norma S. Gray. Decision issues were based on the twelve decision areas in the Decisional Participation Scale developed by Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco.

APPENDIX C

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Satisfaction Scales

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Satisfaction Scales*

Indicate your level of satisfaction with various facets of your job by circling a number on the six-point scale after each of the statements.

Intrinsic Satisfaction	Low					High
1. The feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The opportunity for personal growth and development in your job.	1	2	3	4.	5	6
3. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Extrinsic Satisfaction						
5. The amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your superiors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The feeling of being informed in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The amount of supervision you receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The opportunity for participation in the determination of methods, procedures and goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6

* Developed by Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman.

APPENDIX D

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Role Stress Scales

Mohrman-Cooke-Mohrman Role Stress Scales*

Indicate how often you are bothered by the following feelings by circling a number on the five-point scale after each of the statements.

Role Ambiguity/Role Overload	Never				Always
1. Feeling you have too little authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to you.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The fact that you cannot get information needed to carry out your job.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling unable to influence your immediate supervisor's decisions and actions that affect you.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Feeling that you do not have time to do everything that others ask of you.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Feeling that you do not seem to have enough time to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5

* Developed by Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Robert A. Cooke, and Susan Albers Mohrman.

APPENDIX E

Correspondence to and from Dr. Joseph A. Alutto

Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, WV 25701

Dr. Joseph A. Alutto, Management
Room 103 Crosby Hall
SUNY Health Science Center
3435 Main Street
Buffalo, NY 14214

Dear Dr. Alutto:

I am a doctoral student in educational administration at West Virginia University and am in the process of completing my dissertation research on participative decision-making. I will be using the Decisional Participation Scale designed by you and Dr. Belasco, as modified by Allan M. Mohrman.

I am requesting any normative data that you might have on your original instrument in your 1972 study of teachers in two school districts in Western New York. I would like to include this information in my dissertation, if it is available.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the instrument as it will appear in my dissertation. Some minor changes in terminology were made in the Mohrman modification to make it more appropriate for the child development programs which will be participating in the survey.

A copy of the questionnaire is also enclosed. I have added another dimension to your study of decisional participation. Using the same twelve decisional situations as a basis of the survey, participants will be asked to provide information about what decision-making mode is used by their organizations in each of these decision situations. The purpose of this is to determine the relationship between the level of satisfaction derived from participating in the decision-making process and the methods, or modes, by which decisions are made in these organizations.

I would appreciate your mailing me any information or suggestions which you think would be helpful.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray

Norma Gray,
Executive Director

Enclosures

MAR 1 9 1985

UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

School of Management
Office of the Dean
160 Jacobs Management Center
Buffalo, New York 14260
(716) 636-3222

March 11, 1985

Ms. Norma Gray
Executive Director
Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, WV 25701

Dear Ms. Gray:

The changes you have made in our original scale are logical extensions and I would be very much interested in your results. The only additional normative information I can give you on our scale is that over some sixteen studies the stability of responses to items (with one month between administrations) has ranged from .75-.92.

Good luck with your study.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Alutto
Dean

JAA:iaf

APPENDIX F

Correspondence to and from Dr. A. M. Mohrman

Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, WV 25701

Dr. Allan M. Mohrman
Center for Effective Organizations
G5BA-HOH 501-L University Park
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421

Dear Dr. Mohrman:

I am a doctoral student in educational administration at West Virginia University and am in the process of completing my dissertation research on participative decision-making. I will be using the Decisional Participation Scale designed by Alutto and Belasco with the response format you and your colleagues developed for your study of organization development in school systems, as reported in the Educational Administration Quarterly (Winter, 1978). In my survey of child development programs, I will also be using your Satisfaction Scales and Role Stress Scales.

I am requesting any normative data that you might have on these three instruments. I would like to include this information in my dissertation, if it is available.

For your information, I am enclosing copies of the instruments as they will appear in my dissertation. Some minor changes in terminology were made in the Decisional Participation Scale to make it more appropriate for child development programs. No changes were made in the Satisfaction Scales or the Role Stress Scales.

A copy of the questionnaire is also enclosed. I have added another dimension to your multiddimensional approach in studying decisional participation. Using the twelve decision issues from the Decisional Participation Scale as a basis of the survey, participants will be asked to provide information about what decision-making mode is used by their organizations on each of these decision issues. The purpose of this is to determine the relationship between the level of satisfaction derived from participating in the decision-making process and the methods, or modes, by which decisions are made in these organizations.

I would appreciate your mailing me any information or suggestions which you think would be helpful.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray

Norma Gray,
Executive Director

Enclosures

Norma,

Thanks for your recent letter. We've not done any data collection with the Alutto-Belasco instrument since the research we reported. The complete results of that research are not readily available to me now but I'm sending along the cover pages and a pertinent chart from our technical report. It may prove useful to you. I like your additional dimension. Let me know how things come out.

Monty Brennan

CENTER FOR EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONS
Graduate School of Business Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089-1421
(213) 743-8765

Final Report

Grant No. 6-003-0172

AN ASSESSMENT OF A STRUCTURAL TASK APPROACH TO ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM

by

Robert B. Duncan
Graduate School of Management and Business
Northwestern University

Susan Albers Mohrman
Graduate School of Management
Northwestern University

Allan M. Mohrman, Jr.
College of Administrative Science
Ohio State University

Robert A. Cooke
Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

Gerald Zaltman
Graduate School of Business
University of Pittsburgh

July 1977

The research reported herein was performed under a grant from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Points of view and opinions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of NIE or DHEW.

Note: Handwritten notations on final report are those of Dr. Mohrman.

Table 6.1

Changes over Time on Evaluation Questionnaire Scales:
Significant Changes for Participating and Non-participating Samples (t-tests)
and
Significant Interaction Effects between Change and Program Participation (two-way ANOVA's)
Individual and Organization Level Analyses

	Participating Samples						Non-participating Samples				
	$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=120) [1]	t_{org} (N=8) [2]	Individual Level Interaction Effect (time x participation) [3]	$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=100) [1]	t_{org} (N=8) [2]
Environment											
Environmental influence on policy and programs											
Students	2.38	3.08	+	-4.40***	-6.40***		2.56	2.79	+		
Teachers	3.26	3.57	+	-2.92**	-2.83*		3.54	3.54	-		
Principals	4.04	4.09	+				4.12	4.05	-		
Central office	4.34	4.43	+				4.19	4.28	+		
Board of education	4.44	4.26	-				4.23	4.31	+		
Parents	3.08	3.17	+				2.94	3.02	+		
The AFT and affiliates	3.14	3.09	-				2.91	3.03	+		
State government	3.15	3.92	+	-5.81***	-3.96**		3.06	3.69	+	-4.25***	-5.26***
Federal government	3.06	3.73	+	-5.02***	-3.42**		3.08	3.61	+	-3.57***	-4.70**
Community agencies (police, fire, etc.)	2.32	2.56	+	-2.22*			2.13	2.28	+		
Organization Structure											
Standardization	4.17	4.37	+	-2.17*			4.17	4.23	+		
Autonomy	4.16	4.25	+				4.20	4.28	+		
Variety	4.02	4.31	+	-2.47*	-2.58*		4.26	4.18	-		
Hierarchy of authority	3.45	3.38	-				3.07	3.15	+		
Organizational Process											
Problem-solving process											
Evaluation	3.10	3.81	+	-5.28***	-5.58***	*	3.60	3.82	+		
Solution generation	3.19	3.78	+	-4.86***	-5.30***	*	3.69	3.80	+		
Internal diffusion	2.51	2.94	+	-3.72***	-2.64*		2.80	2.88	+		
Legitimation	2.50	2.90	+	-3.13**	-3.16*		2.72	2.96	+		
Adoption	2.79	3.19	+	-3.41***	-3.92**		3.27	3.33	+		
Implementation	3.20	3.71	+	-4.18***	-3.70**	*	3.59	3.68	+		
Routinization	3.22	3.65	+	-4.18***	-2.90*	*	3.69	3.75	+		
Participation in decision making											
Actual participation in policy decisions	1.52	1.59	+			*a	1.65	1.48	-	2.03*	
Should participate in policy decisions	3.04	3.02	-				3.03	2.98	-		
Actual participation in operational decisions	3.39	3.54	+			*	3.49	3.46	-		
Should participate in operational decisions	4.29	4.30	+				4.28	4.29	+		

adm. + teach.

-230-

166

Table 6.1 (continued)

	Participating Samples					Individual Level Interaction Effect (time x participation)	Non-participating Samples				
Resource Allocation Process	$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=170)	t_{org} (N=8)		$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=100)	t_{org} (N=8)
Amount of attention and resources											
1. Develop highly qualified staff	3.36	3.67	+	-2.76**			3.61	3.66	+		
2. Implement comprehensive and integrated instructional program	3.33	3.73	+	-3.97***	-4.22**		3.47	3.74	+	-2.17*	-3.61**
3. To provide positive and supportive school environment	3.42	3.75	+	-3.17**	-4.44**		3.69	3.81	+		
4. To provide ongoing evaluation of school programs for modification and development	2.88	3.39	+	-4.72***	-6.22***		3.11	3.37	+	-1.84	
5. To experiment with educational innovations	3.09	3.08	-				3.31	3.28	-		
6. To be responsive to community	3.04	3.43	+	-3.81***	-4.66**	*	3.43	3.44	+		
7. To communicate to public objectives and results of school programs	2.72	3.07	+	-3.15**	-5.04**	*	3.18	3.16	-		
8. To promote educational achievement of minority students	3.27	3.55	+	-2.08*	-4.84**		3.51	3.72	+		
9. To coordinate school activities with relevant community groups	2.73	2.84	+				2.90	2.89	-		
10. To lessen disciplinary problems	3.37	3.49	+				3.42	3.54	+		
Organizational Effectiveness											
Goal effectiveness											
1. Develop highly qualified staff	3.29	3.50	+				3.56	3.51	-		
2. Implement comprehensive and integrated instructional program	3.16	3.37	+	-2.04*			3.37	3.42	+		
3. To provide positive and supportive school environment	3.28	3.47	+				3.51	3.65	+		
4. To provide ongoing evaluation of school programs for modification and development	2.76	3.10	+	-3.15**	-5.76***		3.04	3.05	+		
5. To experiment with educational innovations	2.96	2.89	-				3.13	3.07	-		
6. To be responsive to community	2.87	3.20	+	-3.22***	-2.64*	*	3.20	3.22	+		
7. To communicate to public objectives and results of school programs	2.69	2.99	+	-2.99**	-5.27***	*	3.04	2.98	-		
8. To promote educational achievement of minority students	2.90	3.11	+				3.25	3.32	+		
9. To coordinate school activities with relevant community groups	2.81	2.81	+				2.86	2.90	+		
10. To lessen disciplinary problems	3.05	3.09	+				2.98	2.94	-		

Table 6.1 (continued)

	Participating Samples					Individual Level Interaction Effect (time x participation)	Non-participating Samples				
	$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=120)	t_{org} (N=8)		$\bar{X}$ Pre-test	$\bar{X}$ Post-test	Change	t_{ind} (N=100)	t_{org} (N=8)
Integration											
Role behavior											
Role overload	3.07	3.10	+				3.16	3.30	+		
Role ambiguity	2.45	2.29	-	2.15*			2.28	2.21	-		
Job satisfaction											
Intrinsic satisfaction	4.50	4.82	+	-2.95**	-3.19*	*	4.26	4.66	-		
Contextual satisfaction	4.10	4.50	+	-3.44***	-3.92**		4.41	4.54	+		
Cohesiveness	4.56	4.75	+				4.85	4.69	-		

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .01$.

***Significant at $p < .001$.

[a]Significant interaction effect at organizational level.

[1]Two-tailed t-test, between pre-test and post-test groups.

[2]Two-tailed t-test, using paired groupings.

[3]F statistic used to determine the probability that measured interactions occur by chance.

Now this was a quasi-experimental design

1 school district

8 elementary schools that participated in an OD intervention (partic)

8 " " as "controls" (non-partic)

Partic.	O_1	X	O_2
Non Partic	O_1		O_2

APPENDIX G

Pilot Study Questionnaire

TO: Teachers at Early Learning Child Care Center and Children's Place

FROM: Norma Gray

DATE: January 2, 1985

In order to complete my dissertation, a nation-wide survey will be made of teachers in child development agencies to examine the relationship between participation in decision-making and job satisfaction and/or stress. I'm asking you to participate in a pilot study which is being conducted prior to the field study in order to determine the average length of time it takes to answer the survey questions and whether changes need to be made in the questionaire. I would appreciate your returning the completed survey within a week from this date.

First, note the time you begin the questionaire. When you have completed it, please answer the questions below.

1. How many minutes did it take to complete the questionaire? _____

2. Were there any questions that you did not understand? _____ If so, please list below which questions and any suggestions you might have for clarifying these questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. If you have any other suggestions about the questionaire, please note them below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Survey of Child Development Programs

Section I.

Listed below you will find twelve decision situations. In the first two columns, circle the number on the five-point scale which best represents your response to the question in each column. The scale ranges from (1) Never to (5) Always.

In the third column circle the answer which best represents the method by which each of these twelve decisions is made in your organization. The choices are: Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers); Consultative (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers); Majority Agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll); Consensus (decision made by total agreement in group meeting); Delegated (delegated by administrator to teachers).

	How frequently do you actually participate in the decision?						How frequently do you think you should participate in the decision?						How is the decision made in your organization?				
	Never					Always	Never					Always					
1.	Hiring new staff.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
2.	Planning program or center budget.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
3.	Resolving learning problems of individual children.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
4.	Determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
5.	Establishing general instructional policies.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
6.	Establishing classroom disciplinary policies.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
7.	Resolving employee grievances.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
8.	Planning new buildings and facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
9.	Resolving problems with community groups.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
10.	Determining staff salaries.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
11.	Selecting specific instructional materials and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del
12.	Determining specific professional assignments.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Csus	Del

Section II.

Indicate your level of satisfaction with various facets of your job by circling a number on the six-point scale after each of the statements.

	Low					High
1. The feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The opportunity for personal growth and development in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your superiors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The feeling of being informed in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The amount of supervision you receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The opportunity for participation in the determination of methods, procedures and goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section III.

Indicate how often you are bothered by the following feelings by circling a number on the five-point scale after each of the statements.

	Never				Always
1. Feeling you have too little authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to you.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The fact that you cannot get information needed to carry out your job.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling unable to influence your immediate supervisor's decisions and actions that affect you.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.	1	2	3	4	5

Section III. continued

6. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Feeling that you do not have time to do everything that others ask of you.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Feeling that you do not seem to have enough time to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV.

1. What type organization are you employed by?

_____ Non-profit day care center

_____ For profit day care center

_____ Head Start

_____ Private school

_____ Public school

2. How many years experience do you have in teaching children and/or supervising others who teach children?

_____1-3 _____4-7 _____8-12 _____13-20 _____21 or more

3. In what state is your organization located? _____

APPENDIX H

Letter Sent to Child Care Licensing Agencies in Fifty States

Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

In the near future, I will be conducting a survey of child care/child development programs in the United States as part of my doctoral dissertation, and I need your help in locating the sample population.

In the survey I will be asking the director and three lead teachers from each program to complete questionaires concerning participation in decision-making, job satisfaction, and job stress. Therefore, the programs selected as the sample population should be large enough to have a director and three teachers.

Since there are so many child care/child development programs, I have narrowed the population to those in the capital city in each of the states. You could assist me in further limiting the population by sending me the names and addresses of the four largest programs in the capital city of your state. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I would appreciate receiving this information within the next two weeks.

Very little has been done in researching child development organizations and I believe this study can benefit childrens' programs, as well as those who administer them. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray

Norma Gray, Executive Director
Region III Child Development Services

Enclosure

APPENDIX I

Letters and Survey Questionnaire Mailed to Administrators of Child Development Programs

Marshall University
HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25701
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
SUPERVISION, AND FIELD SERVICE

Women's League Day Care Center
1695 Main Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06120

Attention: James Dean, Executive Director

Dear Mr. Dean:

As part of the research for my doctoral dissertation, I am conducting a survey of child development programs in the United States. By a random sampling process, your program is one of the one hundred programs selected to participate in this survey. I'm asking you and three teachers on your staff to agree to participate. Your participation is voluntary, and if you agree to participate, not every question has to be answered.

The purpose of the survey is to determine which decision issues teachers in child development programs want to participate in making and whether stress or satifaction is brought about by under-participation or over-participation in the decision-making process. The questionnaire contains three scales designed to collect this information. It takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.

The information will be confidential. The questionnaire asks only for the name of the state where the program is located. A number has been assigned to each center (written in the right-hand corner of each questionnaire) to make it easier for me to follow-up on those programs that do not return the completed questionnaire. The information from your program will be combined with that of all the other programs. There will be no separate program evaluation or analysis.

I'm asking you, as director, to select three staff persons to participate in this survey. They should be selected by the following criteria: 1)each staff person must have the primary responsibility for a classroom of children (not an assistant teacher or aide); 2)they must be staff who have been employed by your organization for the longest length of time and for at least a year. If you have only one or two staff who meet this criteria, that will be acceptable.

Give each of the three selected teachers a questionnaire to complete and a white envelope. Ask them to seal the completed questionnaire in the envelope and return it to you. When you have all the completed questionnaires, return them in the brown envelope in which you received them, using the enclosed mailing label and stamps.

I would appreciate your returning the questionnaires within ten days. I know I'm asking you and your staff to add another responsibility to an overcrowded schedule, but I believe this study can be a beneficial one for all administrators and particularly for those of us in child development. I would be grateful for your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray

A STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST VIRGINIA
Norma Gray, Executive Director
Region III Child Development Services

Enclosures

Survey of Child Development Programs

Section I.

Listed below you will find twelve decision situations. In the first two columns, circle the number on the five-point scale which best represents your response to the question in each column. The scale ranges from (1) Never to (5) Always.

In the third column circle the answer which best represents the method by which each of these twelve decisions is made in your organization. The choices are: Autocratic (decision made by administrator without input from teachers); Consultative (decision made by administrator after consultation with teachers); Majority Agreement (decision made by majority agreement, either in meetings or by poll); Consensus (decision made by total agreement in group meeting); Delegated (delegated by administrator to teachers).

	How frequently do you actually participate in the decision?					How frequently do you think you should participate in the decision?					How is the decision made in your organization?				
	Never				Always	Never				Always					
1. Hiring new staff.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
2. Planning program or center budget.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
3. Resolving learning problems of individual children.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
4. Determining appropriate instructional methods and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
5. Establishing general instructional policies.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
6. Establishing classroom disciplinary policies.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
7. Resolving employee grievances.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
8. Planning new buildings and facilities.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
9. Resolving problems with community groups.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
10. Determining staff salaries.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
11. Selecting specific instructional materials and equipment.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del
12. Determining specific professional assignments.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	Aut	Cnsl	MA	Caus	Del

Section II.

Indicate your level of satisfaction with various facets of your job by circling a number on the six-point scale after each of the statements.

	Low					High
1. The feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. The opportunity for personal growth and development in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your superiors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The feeling of being informed in your job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The amount of supervision you receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The opportunity for participation in the determination of methods, procedures and goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section III.

Indicate how often you are bothered by the following feelings by circling a number on the five-point scale after each of the statements.

	Never				Always
1. Feeling you have too little authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to you.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of your job are.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The fact that you cannot get information needed to carry out your job.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Feeling unable to influence your immediate supervisor's decisions and actions that affect you.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Not knowing just what the people you work with expect of you.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Thinking that the amount of work you have to do may interfere with how well it gets done.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Feeling that you do not have time to do everthing that others ask of you.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Feeling that you do not seem to have enough time to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV.

1. What type organization are you employed by?

_____ Non-profit day care center

_____ For profit day care center

_____ Head Start

_____ Private school

_____ Public school

2. How many years experience do you have in teaching children and/or supervising others who teach children?

_____1-3 _____4-7 _____8-12 _____13-20 _____21 or more

3. In what state is your organization located? _____

Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

In the near future, I will be conducting a survey of child care/child development programs in the United States as part of my doctoral dissertation, and I need your help in locating the sample population.

In the survey I will be asking the director and three lead teachers from each program to complete questionnaires concerning participation in decision-making, job satisfaction, and job stress. Therefore, the programs selected as the sample population should be large enough to have a director and three teachers.

Since there are so many child care/child development programs, I have narrowed the population to those in the capital city in each of the states. You could assist me in further limiting the population by sending me the names and addresses of the four largest programs in the capital city of your state. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I would appreciate receiving this information within the next two weeks.

Very little has been done in researching child development organizations and I believe this study can benefit childrens' programs, as well as those who administer them. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray, Executive Director
Region III Child Development Services

Enclosure

Region III Child Development Services
1418 Tenth Avenue
Huntington, West Virginia

Dear Director:

Several weeks ago I sent you a packet of materials and requested that you and three teachers on your staff participate in a nation-wide survey of child care/child development programs. To date, I have not received any information from you and I would greatly appreciate your staff completing the survey questionnaires and returning them to me as soon as possible.

It may be that you have already mailed the questionnaires but I have not yet received them. If so, please accept my appreciation for your assistance.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Norma Gray,
Executive Director

JUST A REMINDER!

TO: Child Development/Child Care Director

FROM: Norma Gray, Executive Director
Region III Child Development Services
Huntington, WV 25701

RE: Survey

DATE: May 5, 1985

Several weeks ago questionnaires were sent to you regarding decision-making, job satisfaction, and stress. Perhaps you have been away or your teachers have been too busy to complete them.

I would appreciate your asking your teachers to complete these questionnaires and return them. A large number of returns is essential, if this national survey is to be meaningful.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX J

Computer Analysis of Data

INTERCORRELATIONS OF ADM WITH IDM

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER H0:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	ADM01	ADM02	ADM03	ADM04	ADM05	ADM06	ADM07	ADM08	ADM09	ADM10	ADM11	ADM12
IDM01	0.79525	0.39507	0.13857	0.20201	0.37393	0.18810	0.49736	0.38767	0.39331	0.53188	0.26429	0.47625
	0.0001	0.0001	0.0454	0.0037	0.0001	0.0069	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
	208	208	209	205	206	205	208	208	204	210	204	205
IDM02	0.47443	0.74053	-0.04631	0.05408	0.22802	0.11793	0.40004	0.39038	0.35246	0.44941	0.06881	0.33125
	0.0001	0.0001	0.5086	0.4447	0.0011	0.0916	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.3317	0.0001
	205	206	206	202	203	202	205	206	201	207	201	202
IDM03	0.06413	-0.08970	0.77856	0.41539	0.29911	0.26339	0.03524	-0.03037	0.00005	-0.06461	0.34385	0.14726
	0.3551	0.1954	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.6116	0.6617	0.9994	0.3492	0.0001	0.0342
	210	210	211	207	208	207	210	210	206	212	206	207
IDM04	0.19583	0.06697	0.41665	0.76388	0.45801	0.38742	0.12860	0.06744	0.12265	0.05345	0.38747	0.29499
	0.0044	0.3342	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0629	0.3308	0.0790	0.4388	0.0001	0.0001
	210	210	211	207	208	207	210	210	206	212	206	207
IDM05	0.34710	0.13642	0.28950	0.46856	0.77169	0.27293	0.29346	0.23067	0.30969	0.22317	0.25633	0.37791
	0.0001	0.0500	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0008	0.0001	0.0012	0.0002	0.0001
	207	207	208	204	206	204	207	207	203	209	203	204
IDM06	0.18575	0.08141	0.32227	0.34348	0.30530	0.81787	0.13180	0.11939	0.18885	0.12950	0.37830	0.20767
	0.0075	0.2447	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0590	0.0874	0.0071	0.0623	0.0001	0.0029
	206	206	207	203	204	204	206	206	202	208	202	204
IDM07	0.50027	0.43176	0.11913	0.14374	0.38448	0.07983	0.73201	0.32907	0.40702	0.38511	0.16492	0.39717
	0.0001	0.0001	0.0850	0.0393	0.0001	0.2540	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0181	0.0001
	209	209	210	206	207	206	210	209	205	211	205	207
IDM08	0.45480	0.34013	-0.00857	0.18337	0.31278	0.16816	0.41511	0.66034	0.43690	0.45879	0.24685	0.39477
	0.0001	0.0001	0.9027	0.0090	0.0001	0.0167	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0004	0.0001
	205	206	206	202	203	202	205	206	201	207	201	202
IDM09	0.48129	0.43025	-0.03088	0.08572	0.36164	0.19953	0.44952	0.48638	0.78682	0.58149	0.21013	0.48973
	0.0001	0.0001	0.6619	0.2287	0.0001	0.0046	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0030	0.0001
	202	202	203	199	200	200	202	202	204	204	198	200
IDM10	0.36056	0.27813	0.01046	0.06367	0.26387	0.12605	0.27388	0.36443	0.40540	0.54875	0.13797	0.35595
	0.0001	0.0001	0.8808	0.3656	0.0001	0.0717	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0496	0.0001
	207	207	208	204	205	205	207	207	204	209	203	204
IDM11	0.18110	0.00394	0.27446	0.33414	0.25717	0.25868	0.12234	0.10512	0.16736	0.06239	0.59964	0.20658
	0.0089	0.9549	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0783	0.1308	0.0165	0.3683	0.0001	0.0029
	208	208	209	205	206	206	208	208	205	210	205	206
IDM12	0.45112	0.31163	0.05184	0.20562	0.31433	0.09049	0.37998	0.33277	0.43093	0.40391	0.20222	0.72870
	0.0001	0.0001	0.4615	0.0035	0.0001	0.2014	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0042	0.0001
	203	203	204	200	201	201	203	203	200	205	199	204

MEANS OF SDN01 IJS EJS RA RO

VARIABLE	LABEL	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
SDN01		208	-0.48076923	0.94772312
IJS	INTRINSIC SATISFACTION	210	19.50476190	4.28332431
EJS	EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION	202	18.18316832	4.61892213
RA	ROLE AMBIGUITY	210	9.36190476	4.21576855
RO	ROLE OVERLOAD	209	7.84688995	3.27071834

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SDM WITH IJS EJS RA RO

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	SDM01	SDM02	SDM03	SDM04	SDM05	SDM06	SDM07	SDM08	SDM09	SDM10	SDM11	SDM12
IJS	0.25684	0.31699	0.30428	0.07362	0.22051	0.23919	0.15631	0.25859	0.17921	0.29435	0.23261	0.33120
INTRINSIC SATISFACTION	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.2941	0.0016	0.0006	0.0245	0.0002	0.0109	0.0001	0.0009	0.0001
	206	204	208	205	203	201	207	204	201	206	202	201
EJS	0.29733	0.32934	0.28246	0.04944	0.24194	0.28069	0.24144	0.36647	0.26090	0.35102	0.32111	0.44451
EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.4880	0.0006	0.0001	0.0006	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
	197	196	200	199	198	196	199	195	193	198	198	193
RA	-0.29441	-0.23490	-0.28354	-0.14839	-0.10207	-0.19601	-0.23632	-0.28626	-0.25775	-0.34406	-0.25839	-0.36997
ROLE AMBIGUITY	0.0001	0.0007	0.0001	0.0342	0.1473	0.0053	0.0006	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001
	205	205	208	204	203	201	207	203	201	206	202	201
RO	-0.17975	-0.15524	-0.21034	-0.14877	-0.12537	-0.07886	-0.16945	-0.20873	-0.22052	-0.22738	-0.16909	-0.28207
ROLE OVERLOAD	0.0101	0.0270	0.0024	0.0341	0.0754	0.2670	0.0149	0.0029	0.0017	0.0010	0.0164	0.0001
	204	203	207	203	202	200	206	202	200	205	201	200

TABLE OF GP01 BY DMN01

GP01 HIRING GROUPS DMN01

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	0 . . .	2 . . .	3 . . .	0 . . .	0 . . .	0 . . .	. .
5	0 . . .	28 13.59 75.68 25.45	7 3.40 18.92 8.75	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.97 5.41 66.67	37 17.96
6	2 . . .	81 39.32 48.21 73.64	73 35.44 43.45 91.25	8 3.88 4.76 100.00	5 2.43 2.98 100.00	1 0.49 0.60 33.33	168 81.55
7	0 . . .	1 0.49 100.00 0.91	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.49
TOTAL	. .	110 53.40	80 38.83	8 3.88	5 2.43	3 1.46	206 100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	17.553	DF= 8	PROB=0.0248
PHI	0.292		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.280		
CRAMER'S V	0.206		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	19.330	DF= 8	PROB=0.0132

TABLE OF GP02 BY DMM02

GP02 BUDGET GROUPS DMM02

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	2 . . .	2 . . .	2 . . .	1 . . .	0 . . .	0 . . .	. .
5	0 . . .	31 15.42 67.39 25.83	8 3.98 17.39 14.81	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	6 2.99 13.04 54.55	1 0.50 2.17 14.29	46 22.89
6	5 . . .	89 44.28 57.79 74.17	46 22.89 29.87 85.19	9 4.48 5.84 100.00	5 2.49 3.25 45.45	5 2.49 3.25 71.43	154 76.62
7	0 . . .	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.50 100.00 14.29	1 0.50
TOTAL	. .	120 59.70	54 26.87	9 4.48	11 5.47	7 3.48	201 100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	39.483	DF= 8	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.443		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.405		
CRAMER'S V	0.313		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	19.588	DF= 8	PROB=0.0120

TABLE OF GP03 BY DMM03

GP03 LEARNING PROBLEMS GROUPS DMM03

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	0	0	1	0	0	1	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	0	1	7	0	1	2	11
	.	0.48	3.33	0.00	0.48	0.95	5.24
	.	9.09	63.64	0.00	9.09	18.18	
	.	25.00	6.42	0.00	3.85	4.65	
6	1	3	102	28	25	41	199
	.	1.43	48.57	13.33	11.90	19.52	94.76
	.	1.51	51.26	14.07	12.56	20.60	
	.	75.00	93.58	100.00	96.15	95.35	
TOTAL	.	4	109	28	26	43	210
	.	1.90	51.90	13.33	12.38	20.48	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	5.134	DF= 4	PROB=0.2738
PHI	0.156		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.154		
CRAMER'S V	0.156		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	5.166	DF= 4	PROB=0.2707

TABLE OF GP04 BY DMM04

GP04 INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS GROUPS DMM04

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	1	3	1	0	0	1	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	0	3	4	3	2	0	12
	.	1.48	1.97	1.48	0.99	0.00	5.91
	.	25.00	33.33	25.00	16.67	0.00	
	.	23.08	4.88	10.00	8.00	0.00	
6	4	9	76	26	23	50	184
	.	4.43	37.44	12.81	11.33	24.63	90.64
	.	4.89	41.30	14.13	12.50	27.17	
	.	69.23	92.68	86.67	92.00	94.34	
7	0	1	2	1	0	3	7
	.	0.49	0.99	0.49	0.00	1.48	3.45
	.	14.29	28.57	14.29	0.00	42.86	
	.	7.69	2.44	3.33	0.00	5.66	
TOTAL	.	13	82	30	25	53	203
	.	6.40	40.39	14.78	12.32	26.11	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	14.163	DF= 8	PROB=0.0776
PHI	0.264		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.255		
CRAMER'S V	0.187		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	15.016	DF= 8	PROB=0.0588

TABLE OF GP05 BY DMM05

GP05 INSTRUCTIONAL POLICIES GROUPS DMM05

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	1	4	1	1	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
5	2	11	3	2	4	3	23
	.	5.47	1.49	1.00	1.99	1.49	11.44
	.	47.83	13.04	8.70	17.39	13.04	
	.	27.50	3.75	10.53	16.00	8.11	
6	3	29	76	17	20	33	175
	.	14.43	37.81	8.46	9.95	16.42	87.06
	.	16.57	43.43	9.71	11.43	18.86	
	.	72.50	95.00	89.47	80.00	89.19	
7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
	.	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.50	1.49
	.	0.00	33.33	0.00	33.33	33.33	
	.	0.00	1.25	0.00	4.00	2.70	
TOTAL	.	40	80	19	25	37	201
	.	19.90	39.80	9.45	12.44	18.41	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	18.034	DF= 8	PROB=0.0210
PHI	0.300		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.287		
CRAMER'S V	0.212		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	17.457	DF= 8	PROB=0.0257

TABLE OF GF06 BY DHM06

GF06 CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE GROUPS DHM06

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	2	5	1	1	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	2	5	2	0	1	3	11
	.	2.55	1.02	0.00	0.51	1.53	5.61
	.	45.45	18.18	0.00	9.09	27.27	
	.	22.73	2.60	0.00	4.17	6.25	
6	6	17	75	25	23	44	184
	.	8.67	38.27	12.76	11.73	22.45	93.88
	.	9.24	40.76	13.59	12.50	23.91	
	.	77.27	97.40	100.00	95.83	91.67	
7	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.51
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.08	
TOTAL	.	22	77	25	24	48	196
	.	11.22	39.29	12.76	12.24	24.49	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	18.223	DF= 8	PROB=0.0196
PHI	0.305		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.292		
CRAMER'S V	0.216		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	14.690	DF= 8	PROB=0.0655

TABLE OF GP07 BY DMM07

GP07 EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCES GROUPS DMM07

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	1	0	2	0	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	0	26	10	0	0	0	36
	.	12.87	4.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.82
	.	72.22	27.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	32.91	11.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	7	51	76	10	21	4	162
	.	25.25	37.62	4.95	10.40	1.98	80.20
	.	31.48	46.91	6.17	12.96	2.47	
	.	64.56	88.37	100.00	100.00	66.67	
7	1	2	0	0	0	2	4
	.	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.99	1.98
	.	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	
	.	2.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	
TOTAL	.	79	86	10	21	6	202
	.	39.11	42.57	4.95	10.40	2.97	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	55.541	DF= 8	PROB=0.0001
PHI	0.524		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.464		
CRAMER'S V	0.371		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	40.460	DF= 8	PROB=0.0001

TABLE OF GP08 BY DMM08

GP08 FACILITY PLANNING GROUPS DMM08

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	1	4	2	0	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	1	41	12	3	2	0	58
	.	20.40	5.97	1.49	1.00	0.00	28.86
	.	70.69	20.69	5.17	3.45	0.00	
	.	33.88	23.53	20.00	25.00	0.00	
6	4	80	39	12	6	6	143
	.	39.80	19.40	5.97	2.99	2.99	71.14
	.	55.94	27.27	8.39	4.20	4.20	
	.	66.12	76.47	80.00	75.00	100.00	
TOTAL	.	121	51	15	8	6	201
	.	60.20	25.37	7.46	3.98	2.99	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
. TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	5.260	DF=	4	PROB=0.2617
PHI	0.162			
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.160			
CRAMER'S V	0.162			
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	6.939	DF=	4	PROB=0.1391

TABLE OF GP09 BY DMM09

GP09 COMMUNITY PROBLEMS GROUPS DMM09

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	7	1	0	1	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	2	23	9	2	1	1	36
	.	11.73	4.59	1.02	0.51	0.51	18.37
	.	63.89	25.00	5.56	2.78	2.78	
	.	20.00	17.65	11.11	12.50	25.00	
6	6	92	42	16	7	3	160
	.	46.94	21.43	8.16	3.57	1.53	81.63
	.	57.50	26.25	10.00	4.38	1.88	
	.	80.00	82.35	88.89	87.50	75.00	
TOTAL	.	115	51	18	8	4	196
	.	58.67	26.02	9.18	4.08	2.04	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	1.155	DF= 4	PROB=0.8854
PHI	0.077		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.077		
CRAMER'S V	0.077		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	1.243	DF= 4	PROB=0.8710

TABLE OF GP10 BY DMM10

GP10 SALARIES GROUPS DMM10

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	1	1	0	2	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	4	58	11	0	6	3	78
	.	29.00	5.50	0.00	3.00	1.50	39.00
	.	74.36	14.10	0.00	7.69	3.85	
	.	37.42	47.83	0.00	85.71	23.08	
6	5	97	12	2	1	10	122
	.	48.50	6.00	1.00	0.50	5.00	61.00
	.	79.51	9.84	1.64	0.82	8.20	
	.	62.58	52.17	100.00	14.29	76.92	
TOTAL	.	155	23	2	7	13	200
	.	77.50	11.50	1.00	3.50	6.50	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	10.001	DF= 4	PROB=0.0404
PHI	0.224		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.218		
CRAMER'S V	0.224		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	10.915	DF= 4	PROB=0.0275

TABLE OF GP11 BY DMM11

GP11 INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS GROUPS DMM11

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	3	4	0	1	0	0	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	0	7	9	0	3	3	22
	.	3.55	4.57	0.00	1.52	1.52	11.17
	.	31.82	40.91	0.00	13.64	13.64	
	.	38.89	9.68	0.00	11.54	8.11	
6	8	11	84	22	23	34	174
	.	5.58	42.64	11.17	11.68	17.26	88.32
	.	6.32	48.28	12.64	13.22	19.54	
	.	61.11	90.32	95.65	88.46	91.89	
7	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	.	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.51
	.	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL	.	18	93	23	26	37	197
	.	9.14	47.21	11.68	13.20	18.78	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	24.763	DF= 8	PROB=0.0017
PHI	0.355		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.334		
CRAMER'S V	0.251		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	19.385	DF= 8	PROB=0.0129

TABLE OF GF12 BY DMM12

GF12 PROFESSIONAL ASSIGNMENTS GROUPS DMM12

FREQUENCY / PERCENT / ROW PCT / COL PCT	.	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
.	6	1	2	0	0	0	9
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	.	.	.	.	.	.	
5	0	22	10	1	2	2	37
	.	10.89	4.95	0.50	0.99	0.99	18.32
	.	59.46	27.03	2.70	5.41	5.41	
	.	29.73	12.20	10.00	18.18	8.00	
6	2	50	72	9	9	23	163
	.	24.75	35.64	4.46	4.46	11.39	80.69
	.	30.67	44.17	5.52	5.52	14.11	
	.	67.57	87.80	90.00	81.82	92.00	
7	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	.	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.99
	.	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL	.	74	82	10	11	25	202
	.	36.63	40.59	4.95	5.45	12.38	100.00

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	14.829	DF= 8	PROB=0.0626
PHI	0.271		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.262		
CRAMER'S V	0.192		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	15.295	DF= 8	PROB=0.0537

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	180.59401982	90.29700991	5.12	0.0068	0.048037	21.5162
ERROR	203	3578.86229086	17.62986350		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	205	3759.45631068			4.19879310		19.51456311

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP01	2	180.59401982	5.12	0.0068	2	180.59401982	5.12	0.0068

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	290.07497171	145.03748585	7.21	0.0010	0.069195	24.6791
ERROR	194	3902.05700799	20.11369592		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	196	4192.13197970			4.48482953		18.17258883

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP01	2	290.07497171	7.21	0.0010	2	290.07497171	7.21	0.0010

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	291.90490708	145.95245354	8.73	0.0002	0.079543	43.4351
ERROR	202	3377.85119048	16.72203560		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	204	3669.75609756			4.08925856		9.41463415

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP01	2	291.90490708	8.73	0.0002	2	291.90490708	8.73	0.0002

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	69.14718602	34.57359301	3.31	0.0384	0.031925	41.0009
ERROR	201	2096.78908849	10.43178651		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	203	2165.93627451			3.22982763		7.87745098

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP01	2	69.14718602	3.31	0.0384	2	69.14718602	3.31	0.0384

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	171.07067533	85.53533766	4.95	0.0080	0.046692	44.3746
ERROR	202	3492.75371491	17.29085997		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	204	3663.82439024			4.15822798		9.37073171

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP02	2	171.07067533	4.95	0.0080	2	171.07067533	4.95	0.0080

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	80.21247481	40.10623740	3.84	0.0230	0.037005	41.2984
ERROR	200	2087.40328874	10.43701644		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	2167.61576355			3.23063716		7.82266010

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP02	2	80.21247481	3.84	0.0230	2	80.21247481	3.84	0.0230

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	371.74945971	185.87472986	11.10	0.0001	0.099478	20.9887
ERROR	201	3365.24563833	16.74251561		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	203	3736.99509804			4.09176192		19.49509804

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP02	2	371.74945971	11.10	0.0001	2	371.74945971	11.10	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	305.63652487	152.81826243	7.86	0.0005	0.075333	24.1242
ERROR	193	3751.48592411	19.43775090		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	195	4057.12244898			4.40882648		18.27551020

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP02	2	305.63652487	7.86	0.0005	2	305.63652487	7.86	0.0005

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	315.53944056	315.55944056	18.58	0.0001	0.082739	21.1540
ERROR	206	3498.36363636	16.98234775		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	207	3813.92307692			4.12096442		19.48076923

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP03	1	315.55944056	18.58	0.0001	1	315.55944056	18.58	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	333.39845118	333.39845118	16.71	0.0001	0.077820	24.5842
ERROR	198	3950.82154882	19.95364419		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	199	4284.22000000			4.46695021		18.17000000

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP03	1	333.39845118	16.71	0.0001	1	333.39845118	16.71	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	246.37358454	246.37358454	14.74	0.0002	0.066774	43.5204
ERROR	206	3443.29949239	16.71504608		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	207	3689.67307692			4.08840385		9.39423077

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP03	1	246.37358454	14.74	0.0002	1	246.37358454	14.74	0.0002

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	79.67288009	79.67288009	7.74	0.0059	0.036373	40.9506
ERROR	205	2110.74257885	10.29630526		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	206	2190.41545894			3.20878564		7.83574879

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP03	1	79.67288009	7.74	0.0059	1	79.67288009	7.74	0.0059

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	107.60858342	53.80429171	2.96	0.0541	0.028475	21.8330
ERROR	202	3671.49385561	18.17571216		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	204	3779.10243902			4.26329827		19.52682927

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	107.60858342	2.96	0.0541	2	107.60858342	2.96	0.0541

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	134.20767899	67.10383950	3.19	0.0433	0.031533	25.2792
ERROR	196	4121.85262252	21.02986032		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	198	4256.06030151			4.58583257		18.14070352

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	134.20767899	3.19	0.0433	2	134.20767899	3.19	0.0433

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA		ROLE AMBIGUITY					
SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	37.73605875	18.86802937	1.04	0.3569	0.010201	45.5630
ERROR	201	3661.69041184	18.21736523		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	203	3699.42647059			4.26818055		9.36764706

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	37.73605875	1.04	0.3569	2	37.73605875	1.04	0.3569

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO		ROLE OVERLOAD					
SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	21.73834511	10.86917256	1.01	0.3654	0.010017	41.6875
ERROR	200	2148.39958592	10.74199793		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	2170.13793103			3.27749873		7.86206897

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	21.73834511	1.01	0.3654	2	21.73834511	1.01	0.3654

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	37.73605875	18.86802937	1.04	0.3569	0.010201	45.5630
ERROR	201	3661.69041184	18.21736523		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	203	3699.42647059			4.26818055		9.36764706

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	37.73605875	1.04	0.3569	2	37.73605875	1.04	0.3569

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	21.73834511	10.86917256	1.01	0.3654	0.010017	41.6875
ERROR	200	2148.39958592	10.74199793		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	2170.13793103			3.27749873		7.86206897

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP04	2	21.73834511	1.01	0.3654	2	21.73834511	1.01	0.3654

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	126.45964883	63.22982441	3.53	0.0310	0.034137	21.5734
ERROR	200	3578.01325758	17.89006629		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	3704.47290640			4.22966503		19.60591133

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GPOS	2	126.45964883	3.53	0.0310	2	126.45964883	3.53	0.0310

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	140.35295306	70.17647653	3.39	0.0357	0.033614	24.9220
ERROR	195	4035.02078431	20.69241428		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	197	4175.37373737			4.54889154		18.25252525

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GPOS	2	140.35295306	3.39	0.0357	2	140.35295306	3.39	0.0357

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	67.35470779	33.67735390	1.90	0.1520	0.018661	45.3209
ERROR	200	3542.07386364	17.71036932		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	3609.42857143			4.20836896		9.28571429

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP05	2	67.35470779	1.90	0.1520	2	67.35470779	1.90	0.1520

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	33.74547754	16.87273877	1.59	0.2073	0.015689	41.5162
ERROR	199	2117.09115613	10.63864903		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	201	2150.83663366			3.26169420		7.85643564

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP05	2	33.74547754	1.59	0.2073	2	33.74547754	1.59	0.2073

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	232.85297904	116.42648952	6.58	0.0017	0.062290	21.5966
ERROR	198	3505.33607569	17.70371755		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3738.18905473			4.20757859		19.48258706

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP06	2	232.85297904	6.58	0.0017	2	232.85297904	6.58	0.0017

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	371.85714286	185.92857143	9.30	0.0001	0.087930	24.5438
ERROR	193	3857.14285714	19.98519615		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	195	4229.00000000			4.47048053		18.21428571

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP06	2	371.85714286	9.30	0.0001	2	371.85714286	9.30	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	108.24719488	54.12359744	3.07	0.0486	0.030077	44.7964
ERROR	198	3490.76773050	17.63014005		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3599.01492537			4.19882603		9.37313433

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP06	2	108.24719488	3.07	0.0486	2	108.24719488	3.07	0.0486

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	16.36957219	8.18478610	0.77	0.4662	0.007719	41.8486
ERROR	197	2104.41042781	10.68228644		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	199	2120.78000000			3.26837673		7.81000000

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP06	2	16.36957219	0.77	0.4662	2	16.36957219	0.77	0.4662

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	115.21038952	57.60519476	3.20	0.0430	0.030386	21.8051
ERROR	204	3676.33550420	18.02125247		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	206	3791.54589372			4.24514458		19.46859903

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP07	2	115.21038952	3.20	0.0430	2	115.21038952	3.20	0.0430

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	181.72499334	90.86249667	4.34	0.0143	0.042425	25.1618
ERROR	196	4101.76244385	20.92735941		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	198	4283.48743719			4.57464309		18.18090452

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP07	2	181.72499334	4.34	0.0143	2	181.72499334	4.34	0.0143

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	260.09240319	130.04620159	8.13	0.0004	0.073799	42.8365
ERROR	204	3264.23609923	16.00115735		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	206	3524.32850242			4.00014467		9.33816425

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP07	2	260.09240319	8.13	0.0004	2	260.09240319	8.13	0.0004

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	54.73335060	27.36667530	2.63	0.0744	0.025273	41.2093
ERROR	203	2110.97538726	10.39889353		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	205	2165.70873786			3.22473154		7.82524272

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP07	2	54.73335060	2.63	0.0744	2	54.73335060	2.63	0.0744

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	197.69373975	197.69373975	11.15	0.0010	0.052296	21.6621
ERROR	202	3582.60037789	17.73564544		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	203	3780.29411765			4.21137097		19.44117647

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP08	1	197.69373975	11.15	0.0010	1	197.69373975	11.15	0.0010

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	379.99459493	379.99459493	19.33	0.0001	0.091043	24.4570
ERROR	193	3793.80027687	19.65699625		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	194	4173.79487179			4.43362112		18.12820513

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP08	1	379.99459493	19.33	0.0001	1	379.99459493	19.33	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	229.79753695	229.79753695	13.77	0.0003	0.064095	43.6080
ERROR	201	3355.49310345	16.69399554		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	202	3585.29064039			4.08582862		9.36945813

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP08	1	229.79753695	13.77	0.0003	1	229.79753695	13.77	0.0003

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	46.66937941	46.66937941	4.49	0.0354	0.021942	41.4690
ERROR	200	2080.30586812	10.40152934		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	201	2126.97524752			3.22514020		7.77722772

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP08	1	46.66937941	4.49	0.0354	1	46.66937941	4.49	0.0354

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	65.48500822	65.48500822	3.54	0.0613	0.017486	22.1442
ERROR	199	3679.41051417	18.48950007		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3744.89552239			4.29994187		19.41791045

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP09	1	65.48500822	3.54	0.0613	1	65.48500822	3.54	0.0613

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	191.91882281	191.91882281	9.30	0.0026	0.046439	25.0046
ERROR	191	3940.77547771	20.63233234		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	192	4132.69430052			4.54228272		18.16580311

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP09	1	191.91882281	9.30	0.0026	1	191.91882281	9.30	0.0026

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA		ROLE AMBIGUITY					
SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	155.14484728	155.14484728	9.09	0.0029	0.043691	44.2364
ERROR	199	3395.85017759	17.06457376		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3550.99502488			4.13092892		9.33830846

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP09	1	155.14484728	9.09	0.0029	1	155.14484728	9.09	0.0029

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO		ROLE OVERLOAD					
SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	71.85881280	71.85881280	6.81	0.0098	0.033245	41.3841
ERROR	198	2089.64118720	10.55374337		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	199	2161.50000000			3.24886255		7.85000000

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP09	1	71.85881280	6.81	0.0098	1	71.85881280	6.81	0.0098

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	436.95816189	436.95816189	26.89	0.0001	0.116476	20.6813
ERROR	204	3314.52242063	16.24765892		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	205	3751.48058252			4.03083849		19.49029126

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP10	1	436.95816189	26.89	0.0001	1	436.95816189	26.89	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	446.53746148	446.53746148	23.14	0.0001	0.105581	24.2230
ERROR	196	3782.78072034	19.29990163		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	197	4229.31818182			4.39316533		18.13636364

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP10	1	446.53746148	23.14	0.0001	1	446.53746148	23.14	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	368.71479619	368.71479619	22.70	0.0001	0.100121	42.9532
ERROR	204	3313.98908730	16.24504455		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	205	3682.70388350			4.03051418		9.38349515

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP10	1	368.71479619	22.70	0.0001	1	368.71479619	22.70	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	133.41860363	133.41860363	13.10	0.0004	0.060617	40.7629
ERROR	203	2067.60578662	10.18525018		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	204	2201.02439024			3.19143388		7.82926829

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP10	1	133.41860363	13.10	0.0004	1	133.41860363	13.10	0.0004

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	176.89263032	88.44631516	4.96	0.0079	0.047446	21.6971
ERROR	199	3551.42915185	17.84637765		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	201	3728.32178218			4.22449732		19.47029703

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP11	2	176.89263032	4.96	0.0079	2	176.89263032	4.96	0.0079

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	380.35425685	190.17712843	9.53	0.0001	0.089031	24.6050
ERROR	195	3891.79220779	19.95790876		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	197	4272.14646465			4.46742753		18.15656566

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP11	2	380.35425685	9.53	0.0001	2	380.35425685	9.53	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	242.21631577	121.10815788	7.18	0.0010	0.067326	43.7713
ERROR	199	3355.43219909	16.86146834		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	201	3597.64851485			4.10627183		9.38118812

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP11	2	242.21631577	7.18	0.0010	2	242.21631577	7.18	0.0010

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	78.96434825	39.48217413	3.79	0.0242	0.036877	40.6451
ERROR	198	2062.31923384	10.41575371		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	2141.28358209			3.22734468		7.94029851

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP11	2	78.96434825	3.79	0.0242	2	78.96434825	3.79	0.0242

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: IJS INTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	529.52830442	264.76415221	16.60	0.0001	0.143612	20.5554
ERROR	198	3157.67567568	15.94785695		ROOT MSE		IJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3687.20398010			3.99347680		19.42786070

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP12	2	529.52830442	16.60	0.0001	2	529.52830442	16.60	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: EJS EXTRINSIC SATISFACTION

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	1	561.41712320	561.41712320	29.21	0.0001	0.132662	24.1595
ERROR	191	3670.52070064	19.21738587		ROOT MSE		EJS MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	192	4231.93782383			4.38376389		18.14507772

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP12	1	561.41712320	29.21	0.0001	1	561.41712320	29.21	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RA ROLE AMBIGUITY

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	425.11579490	212.55789745	13.21	0.0001	0.117696	42.3969
ERROR	198	3186.85435435	16.09522401		ROOT MSE		RA MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	200	3611.97014925			4.01188534		9.46268657

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP12	2	425.11579490	13.21	0.0001	2	425.11579490	13.21	0.0001

GENERAL LINEAR MODELS PROCEDURE

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: RO ROLE OVERLOAD

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARE	F VALUE	PR > F	R-SQUARE	C.V.
MODEL	2	95.40282209	47.70141104	4.63	0.0109	0.044859	40.5444
ERROR	197	2031.31717791	10.31125471		ROOT MSE		RO MEAN
CORRECTED TOTAL	199	2126.72000000			3.21111425		7.92000000

SOURCE	DF	TYPE I SS	F VALUE	PR > F	DF	TYPE III SS	F VALUE	PR > F
GP12	2	95.40282209	4.63	0.0109	2	95.40282209	4.63	0.0109

Abstract

PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING AND ITS EFFECT ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ROLE STRESS OF STAFF IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Norma Seay Gray

This study examined the relationship of staff participation and desire to participate in the decision-making process of an organization to perceived job satisfaction and role ambiguity and overload of teachers in child development agencies. The study also included an investigation of the methods of decision making most often used by child development agencies to determine if there was a significant relationship between the teachers' level of satisfaction in participating in decision making and the mode of decision making used in their organizations.

Two hundred thirteen teachers from seventy-six child development programs completed questionnaires indicating how frequently they participated in each of the twelve itemized decision issues, how frequently they thought they should participate, and by what method these decisions were made in their organizations. They were also requested to rate their perceptions of job satisfaction and role stress. These data were analyzed using SAS computer programs to obtain the Pearson correlations, one-way analysis of variance, and chi square tests of significance.

The probability level of all tests of the hypotheses was predetermined at .05.

From the statistical analysis of the data, it was concluded that a majority of teachers in child development programs were satisfied with the degree of participation they experienced in the decision-making process of their organizations. Of the few teachers who were not as involved in making decisions as they wanted to be, more were dissatisfied with their lack of participation in managerial type decisions than in decisions concerning program or instruction.

Teachers who were satisfied with their participation in decision making also perceived greater intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and less role ambiguity and overload than teachers who were not as involved as they wanted to be in making decisions.

It was also found that a majority of the teachers in these child development programs were not involved in the decision-making process to any greater degree of participation than providing input to the administrator, who then made the decision. Decisions concerning programs were most often made after consultation with teachers, and most managerial decisions were made autocratically.

APPROVAL OF EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Neil Gibbins, Ph.D.

Margaret Campbell, Ed.D.

Bill Gordon, Ed.D.

Richard Meckley, Ph.D.

Ermel Stepp, Ed.D.

John O. Andes, Ed.D.

12-31-65
Date