71-23,819

MALECHE, Albert Joseph, 1930-
SOME CORRELATES OF TEACHER ROLE AND TEACHER SATISFACTION IN SEVEN WEST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1970
Social Psychology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

# SOME CORRELATES OF TEACHER ROLE AND TEACHER SATISFACTION IN SEVEN WEST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

by
Albert Joseph Maleche

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Social Psychology)
in The University of Michigan
1970

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Daniel Katz, Chairman
Associate Professor Raphael S. Ezekiel
Associate Professor Howard D. Schuman
Professor Joseph K. Veroff

## ABSTRACT

SOME CORRELATES OF TEACHER ROLE AND TEACHER SATISFACTION IN SEVEN WEST EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

by
Albert Joseph Maleche

Chairman: Daniel Katz

The purpose of the study was to examine five dimensions of teacher satisfaction in relation to ten background factors among primary and secondary school teachers in Belgium, England, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. Specifically, the study tried to relate teacher classification, sex, age, type of school institution, marital status, education, length of service, size of class, and salary to the degree of satisfaction expressed by the teacher with self-expression, extrinsic aspects of his job, pupil behavior, and social appreciation; to ascertain the relationship between authority, as measured by the F-scale and the five types of teacher satisfaction; and to generalize about these relationships within and across cultures.

The study is a subset of a larger comparative study of teachers' attitudes to international problems and policies undertaken by the Organization for Comparative Social Research in 1953. Thirty-nine questions and 18 additional items were administered to equivalent national samples of 300 primary and 100 secondary teachers in each

country.

Major findings were: (1) Women reported greater general satisfaction than men. (2) Teachers in private schools were more satisfied with teaching than teachers in public schools. (3) General satisfaction was found to increase with length of service. (4) Satisfaction was also found to decrease with an increase in authoritarianism. (5) Partial support was found for the prediction that secondary teachers are more content in their role than primary teachers. (6) There was partial support for an increase in satisfaction with age. (7) It was also partially true that teachers of small classes are more satisfied than teachers of medium size classes but only slightly more so than teachers of large classes. (8) There was no support for the prediction that married teachers are happier in their job than single teachers. The reverse was the case. (9) Satisfaction was not found to increase with more education as predicted. (10) The effects of salary on teacher satisfaction were found to be equivocal. Beyond these cross-national generalizations lie a complex set of more specific findings peculiar to each nation.

Two major conclusions were made: (1) There is a need to replicate the study in order to further develop a more adequate conceptual framework and better operational procedures. (2) Future research should attempt to be more precise about what personality attributes do in fact have an effect on teacher role and with what behavioral results.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to the four members of my committe who made my final stay at this great university both happy and successful. I often thought of them as "the four elders" overseeing my final rites of passage into the African equivalent of a "young elder grade." For this privilege I am grateful to them.

In particular, I wish to thank Dr. Daniel Katz for providing unknown to him the initial inspiration for this work and for his sustained patience, understanding, and guidance. Dr. Rafe Ezekiel has been a friend and a teacher whose close contacts provided numerous insights contained in this work. To Dr. Joseph Veroff I extend similar gratitude and for the same reasons. He also helped me to appreciate the power of motivation when interest in my work was lagging. He was always there when I needed him. Dr. Howard Schuman not only provided important social-psychological insights to my education but he generously gave of his time when I was desperate for his help. I thank him for both.

I also want to thank John Petrocick, Karen Sidney, and Mary Starkweather of the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research and Lou McClelland of the Survey Research Center for their part in educating me into the mysteries of the computer. They made life a whole lot easier. I also thank Bill Schmalgemeier for similar help and for his constant encouragement in all phases of my work.

More than anybody else my wife, Agnetta Winifred Maleche deserves

special recognition and thanks for her stoic perseverance and unfailing encouragement and understanding throughout my graduate career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgements | ii |
| List of Tables | v |
| Chapter | |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Hypotheses | 12 |
| 3. Method | 19 |
| 4. Results | 27 |
| 5. Discussion and Conclusions | 82 |
| Appendix A - Correlations of 10 Satisfaction Variables used in the OCSR Study in seven countries of Western Europe. | 89 |
| Appendix B - Factor Analysis Matrix of Teacher Satisfaction items by country | 96 |
| Appendix C - Correlations of 9 Demographic Variables and one personality factor with each other by country | 104 |
| Appendix D - The 15 "F-Scale" Items used in the OCSR survey in seven countries of Western Europe. | 111 |
| Reference | 112 |

## LIST OF TABLES


Page

Table 1 - National Teacher Sample: Primary and Secondary Teachers . . . . . 22

Table 2 - A summary of all statistically significant relationships between 10 predictor variables and 5 dimensions of satisfaction . . . . . 28

Table 3A- Relationships of Teacher Classification to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 30

Table 3B- Relationships of Sex to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 35

Table 3C- Relationships of Kind of School Institution to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction. . . . . 40

Table 3D- Relationships of Marital Status to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 45

Table 3E- Relationships of Age to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 50

Table 3F- Relationships of Education of Respondent to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction. . . . . 55

Table 3G- Relationships of Length of Service to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction. . . . . 60

Table 3H- Relationships of Size of Class to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 65

Table 3I- Relationships of Salary to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 70

Table 3J- Relationships of the F-Scale to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction . . . . . 78

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

The dissertation is an analysis of a subset of findings from a cross-national study by the Organization for Comparative Social Research (OCSR) in seven countries of Western Europe in 1953. The study sought to explore the opinions and attitudes of primary and secondary school teachers in Belgium, England, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden on a number of social, educational, and political issues. While the central objective of the investigation was to study the effect upon group processes of perceived enemy and war threat (the Cold War following World War II) the questions also provided information about the teacher role. Questions on the teacher role dealt with the respondents' satisfaction with their job, estimates of the prestige of teaching, comparisons of secondary and grammar school and public and private school teachers on a number of issues, suggested educational reforms, teaching experience, and the influence of teachers as professionals on political and international affairs. Data collected on personality characteristics include attitude responses to a modified Sanford "Authoritarianism-Equalitarianism" scale (Appendix D); and responses bearing on teaching and child-rearing philosophies and practices.

The objective of this analysis is to examine five dimensions of teacher satisfaction, such as self-expression vs extrinsic satisfaction

in relation to the background or demographic factors of teacher classification, sex, age, type of school institution, marital status, education of respondent, salary, length of service in teaching, and size of class. A second objective is to ascertain the relationship between authority, as measured by the F scale and types of teacher satisfaction. Finally, the equivalent samples from seven nations permit analyses of general and specific relationships across cultures.

A major reason for the choice of the OCSR study for analysis is its potential for comparative research in former colonial Africa where Belgium, England, France and Germany have had extensive colonial influence. The European heritage is most evident in education where European traditions were superimposed upon African traditions and both traditions are now undergoing drastic change as a result of modernization and national political independence. At the center of these changes is the African primary and secondary school teacher who acts as catalyst, interpreter, and living model of both traditions. Like his European counterpart of the early fifties in England and France the contemporary African teacher is a product of a highly selective and academic oriented education designed for a white collar professional middle class. His training emphasized religious and moral instruction, an academic curriculum with a dichotomous and narrow specialization into arts and science, teaching as a vocation, promotion by seniority, frequent transfers, low pay and poor working conditions but a respected social status. To the extent that these elements play an important part in determining occupational attitudes we would expect European and African teachers to hold similar job aspirations and to express similar likes and dislikes or satisfactions and dissatisfactions in their jobs, other

things being equal. However, the African teacher differs from his European counterpart in at least three respects.

First, he is living through a period of rapidly expanding job opportunities in government, industry and politics and these create inflated expectations for quick economic and political power obtainable outside of teaching. And since teaching is the largest single category of white collar employees it is the one most adversely affected by persons changing occupations. It has become the stepping stone to other jobs and this must surely influence career expectations for those joining, staying in or leaving teaching. The important point is that frequent career changes and rapidly rising expectations are not conducive to job satisfaction. Second, for those teachers who remain in teaching a political dimension has been added to their role. The school is an effective instrument in forging new nation states out of diverse racial, ethnic and kinship groups with diverse cultures. The teacher's role is to facilitate this process even at the expense of his professional concerns and conflicting loyalties to his primary membership groups. In this role he is a highly respected opinion leader in the community and derives much satisfaction from this status but at the same time he experiences a considerable degree of conflict and anxiety as he struggles to integrate professional, national and primary group identities with which his European counterpart has by and large come to terms. This could be a major source of dissatisfaction in his job particularly if it makes him feel inadequate for the job. Finally, the African teacher is faced with an urgent problem of re-education and re-training. Educated and trained in a school system modelled in content and method on that of the metropolitan power he is now required to perform competently

under a modified education system with an emphasis on educating the masses, secular values, science and technology, African heritage and nationhood. For some this adjustment could be very painful and difficult resulting in frustrated expectations, low commitment, and apathy.

This short description of potential similarities and differences in teacher roles between Europe in the early fifties and contemporary Africa are relevant areas for research. One wants to know not only what motivates Africans to join, stay in or leave teaching in the fluid situation that now prevails but also what is it about the job that they find satisfying or dissatisfying? An adequate answer would require research that combines situational and personality determinants of satisfaction in an interactive model where we specify clearly the conditions under which certain job aspects interact with given personality factors to produce predicted effects. While the OCSR study does not offer such a comprehensive approach its limited data on ten aspects of the teaching role and the F scale (authority dimension) is suggestive and in the remainder of this chapter we shall examine existing theory and research on job attitudes, their determinants and consequences in order to integrate the findings and as a basis for the analysis of the study.

The aspect of job attitudes which has received much attention in research has been variously labeled as job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1935); morale (Morse, 1953); or job valence (Vroom, 1964). Related concepts include motivation (Gurin-Veroff-Feld, 1960); alienation (Blauner, 1960; Wilensky, 1964); and the meaning of work (Weiss and Kahn, 1960). While the choice of concept reflects the author's theoretical orientation researchers tend to use these terms loosely and interchangeably as gross measures of cognitive and affective orientations by individuals toward

their jobs as a whole or toward some aspects of the job. In this sense job satisfaction is the dependent criterion measure of what individuals like or dislike about their work. Satisfaction is usually inferred from the content analysis of fantasy (Veroff and Feld, 1970) or from verbal responses to questionnaire and this includes a majority of the studies to be reviewed. The measures typically assume a relationship between some motive (Gurin et al. 1960), desire or need or aspiration (Morse, 1953; Lewin, Dembo, Festinger, and Sears, 1944) and a valued outcome with a given probability of fulfillment. The amount and direction of satisfaction is generally hypothesized to depend on the value the person attaches to the outcome, the expectation of its being met and the degree to which it is actually met. For example, an individual who highly values autonomy might seek a job with a large measure of independence and will be satisfied if in fact he has opportunities to participate in decisions affecting his work and if expectation and fulfillment remain congruent. In this instance a personality variable (independence or autonomy) interacts with a situational determinant (opportunity to participate in supervisory roles) to explain the magnitude of satisfaction. Outcomes which are highly valued are then said to acquire positive attitudes (satisfaction) while those with low value acquire negative attitudes (dissatisfaction).

In much of the literature the stress has been on specifying the universe of situational determinants and types of satisfactions and to take personality determinants for granted. Attempts have also been made to relate some background factors (e.g., education, age, sex) to the types of satisfaction. We now review the findings of this research and discuss the theoretical controversies underlying the work. While there is no universally

agreed universe of the work role determinants of satisfaction Vroom (1964, p. 173) has summarized the major ones to be "....high pay, substantial promotional opportunities, considerate and participative supervision, an opportunity to interact with one's peers, varied duties, and a high degree of control over work methods and work pace." Controversy centers on how differences in the type and amount of satisfaction within and between individuals are to be explained, and how to characterize the "types" of satisfaction. Let us first consider the latter controversy.

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) and Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) have advanced a two-factor theory of satisfaction according to which intrinsic (content, motivator) factors are primarily satisfiers and a deficit of these factors can reduce satisfaction. Examples include achievement, responsibility and recognition. Extrinsic (context, hygiene) factors are primarily dissatisfiers and a surplus of these factors will not reduce satisfaction. Pay, job security and working conditions are examples of hygiene factors. The two factors were assumed to be independent and unidimensional. Even though the study was confined to 200 accountants and engineers in nine plants in Pittsburg its far reaching conclusions have resulted in extensive if generally inconclusive research work which was recently reviewed by Burke (1966). Gordon (1965) and Halpern (1965) report findings moderately in favor of the two-factor hypotheses. They found the mean level of the two factors to be the same with instrinsic factors accounting for significantly more variance in overall satisfaction measures than did extrinsic factors. Supporting data for the Herzberg et al. theory was provided by the Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) study into the mental health of 2,460

American adults. But they also found a strong occupational status differential in which white-collar workers were more concerned with intrinsic or ego-involvement factors while blue-collar workers named extrinsic factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction more often. This status-satisfaction relation was found to hold well within each job level but to be indeterminate at the boundary levels of lower white-collar and upper blue-collar workers. Blauner's (1960) extensive review of the determinants of differential job satisfaction across occupations in America and Europe supports the Gurin et al. status-satisfaction finding. Also in support is the Weiss and Kahn's (1960) study of the meaning of work; Wilensky's Detroit study (1960) of self-image and its differential effects on job alienation, attachment, and indifference for individuals at different occupational levels; Korhauser's (1965) study of the mental health of factory workers; and Johnson's (1967) study of elementary and high school teachers in the Georgia school system. The outcome of this literature is to strongly support the view of a two-factor theory without resolving the issue of whether they are independent and unidimensional. The presence of a status relation in differentiating the two types of satisfaction may also mean that types of satisfaction can be characterized in purely class-phenomena terms. At any rate the evidence for an increase in intrinsic concerns and a decrease in extrinsic outcomes as one goes up the socioeconomic ladder is very strong and a useful basis for categorizing the various types of job satisfaction. A more complete list of the factors includes: achievement, recognition, interpersonal relations, responsibility, advancement, salary, job security, personal life, status, working conditions, policy and administration, supervision, and the work itself (Johnson, 1967).

How are we to account for individual differences on satisfaction? In one approach Morse (1953) and Ross and Zander (1957) employ a subtractive-additive model according to which the amount of satisfaction depends on the tension-level as perceived by the individual within him. This level results from the amount of the environmental return or job outcomes provided by the work role(s) and the strength of a related desire or motive within the person. Satisfaction is increased directly by the amount the individual's tensions are reduced and by the amount of remaining tension. To predict satisfaction we need to know the strength of the need or aspiration level, the probability of job outcomes and the actual fulfillment of these needs. When these three are congruent the individual can be said to be satisfied but when they are discrepant he will experience dissatisfaction. The actual amount of satisfaction or dissatisfaction will depend on the degree of congruence or discrepancy. The needs, their strength and salience for the person are hypothesized to result from learning rather than from simple instincts. It is for this reason that the authors find a high correlation between education, occupational status (i.e., type of work) and type of satisfaction. Individuals with a high education tend to hold high status jobs, to be more aware of and to expect and seek self-fulfillment in these jobs because they have learned to value highly intrinsic satisfactions. They are less concerned with extrinsic factors since these are a built-in feature of their job. The reverse is the case for people with a low education. Support for this approach is found in Kuhlen's (1963) study of teachers' reports of need-strength and the potential of the teaching profession for satisfying these needs; the Gurin et al. study and a host of studies relating demographic factors to satisfaction

reviewed below.

Variations on the above approach are found in studies which emphasize an inputs-outputs exchange matrix of satisfaction (Homans, 1961; Adams, 1963). Inputs usually include demographic factors (e.g., sex, education, seniority, skill) while outcomes include job benefits, pay, and status symbols. In this view equity and inequity are relative terms. That is, inequity results "...from discrepancies in the relative magnitudes of rewards and investments of a person and those of other persons with whom he compares himself." (Vroom, 1964, p. 170). If so differences in satisfaction across occupations could be accounted for by reference group theory to which equity lends itself. This in fact would be a simplistic view since the interactive effects of input-output factors are rarely reliably identified. The complexity of these relationships has been well demonstrated in Festinger's (1957) work on the tension generated by over-reward or under-reward relative to the person's expectations. Even when the relationships predicted by equity theory have been shown to hold we do not as yet know how stable they are. We run into a similar problem in theories which seek to explain differences in satisfaction in terms of relative levels of aspiration (Lewin et al., 1944, p. 375).

In all the literature there are persistent attempts to relate background factors like age, sex, education, and status to the different types of satisfaction. The effects of education on status and the effect of both on satisfaction is a consistent finding exemplified in the work by Gurin et al. and in all the research with findings on status-satisfaction relation. In general women (Kilpatrick, et al., 1960; Centers and Bugental, 1966) report higher satisfactions in their jobs than men,

and report greater concern with interpersonal relations. Men are particularly unhappy in jobs mainly filled by women (Morse, 1953; Converse and Robinson, 1969). Age is more complex in its varied effects on sex, education, marital status, service, and even social status. But in general Gurin et al. (p. 169) aptly summarize the consistent findings that there is a steady increase in job satisfaction with age apparently because "age brings a growing adaptation to a role, a minimization of aspirations and self-demand, an increasing ability to reconcile aspiration and accomplishment." For the younger person satisfaction reflects the uncertainty of a "testing-out" period which brings with it "a certain amount of tension, dissatisfaction, and ambivalence." Outside of the job married people report greater happiness with life in general than single people, with the widowed and divorced the least satisfied of the unmarried people, and single men more unhappy than single women. Research evidence on the effects of all other background factors on satisfaction in the job are ambiguous and will not be discussed here.

In summary: theorists attempting to understand job attitudes, their determinants and consequences for job satisfaction have in large measure specified an important set of job variables and identified the general nature of their effects on job satisfaction. Using imprecise conceptual and operational definitions and lacking an overall theoretical framework they have nevertheless found important relationships and raised important questions. One set of questions relates to the effects of personality and demographic factors on satisfaction in the job. This is the area of focus in the present analysis of teacher satisfaction in seven west European countries. In the next chapter we state the major hypotheses guiding the analysis and then review the method of study

and analysis in Chapter 3. The fourth chapter presents and discusses the results and in the fifth and final chapter we draw some conclusions and suggest implications based on the results.

## CHAPTER II

## HYPOTHESES

The first objective is to examine the relationships of nine demographic variables to five dimensions of teacher satisfaction. By teacher satisfaction we mean affective orientations by teachers toward the ten aspects of their job for which written responses were obtained in the study. The responses have been factor analyzed to yield five clusters of satisfaction: self-expression, extrinsic satisfaction, pupil behavior, interpersonal relations, and social appreciation. (Appendix B).

Satisfaction with self-expression is the degree of satisfaction obtained by the teacher from performing those tasks which constitute the content of his work. It is inferred from the teacher's responses to two items:

1. Scope for the full use of your abilities (Q. 38, V 35).
2. Opportunity to study or practice your favorite subject (Q. 38, V 36).

Code: Five-point scale of Very Satisfied (1) to Very Dissatisfied (5) for all ten items.

Extrinsic Satisfaction is the extent to which teachers reported to be content with opportunities available for advancement and with their salary. The extent of this satisfaction was obtained from two items:

1. Opportunity for promotion or advancement (Q. 38, V 35).
2. Salary (Q. 38, V 41).

Pupil Behavior is defined as the degree of satisfaction the teacher derives from how much interest pupils show in their work and their response to discipline at school. This measure was obtained from two items:

1. Pupils' interest in their work (Q. 38, V 37).
2. Pupils' response to discipline in the school (Q. 38, V 40).

Interpersonal Relations is the amount of satisfaction the teacher derives from his dealings with superiors and staff colleagues at work. This was measured from two items:

1. Relations with superiors (Q. 38, V 38).
2. Degree of cooperation among members of the staff (Q. 38, V 42).

Social Appreciation is the degree of satisfaction expressed by the teacher in the extent to which parents of the pupils appreciate the teacher's work and in the recognition by society of the social standing of the teaching occupation. The measure of this satisfaction was derived from responses to two items:

1. Appreciation of your work by parents of the pupils (Q. 38, V 34).
2. Social standing of the occupation (attitude of people met outside of the school) (Q. 38, V 39).

Against these factors were run the nine predictors of age, sex, teacher classification, kind of institution, marital status, education of the respondent, length of service in teaching, size of class, and salary. Appendix B summarizes the distribution of the factor loadings by country following a normalized varimax rotation. Each factor contains the two highest loadings on each of the ten satisfaction items and can be presumed to represent the most variance for that factor.

The second objective is to ascertain the relationship between the personality variable of authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale (Appendix D) and the five dimensions of satisfaction. Finally, the equivalent samples from the seven nations should permit analyses of general and specific relationships across cultures. These three objectives yield the following specific hypotheses:

H- 1. Secondary school teachers are in general more satisfied with teaching than primary teachers. In particular they should express greater satisfaction with self-expression, extrinsic factors, and social appreciation than primary teachers.

H- 2. Women should report greater general satisfaction with teaching than men. They should also express more discontent than men over social appreciation while the men will be more discontented with extrinsic factors than women.

H- 3. In general teachers in private schools are more satisfied with teaching than those in public schools. This difference should be more marked in extrinsic and social appreciation factors.

H- 4. Married teachers are more satisfied with teaching in general than single teachers. In particular they are happy with social appreciation and extrinsic satisfaction.

H- 5. Satisfaction with teaching should increase with age. However, young teachers will be markedly dissatisfied with self-expression while middle age and old teachers will be more appreciably dissatisfied with extrinsic factors and social appreciation than the young.

H- 6. General satisfaction with teaching should increase with higher education so that teachers with a primary education are the least satisfied, with a secondary education moderately satisfied, and with above secondary education the most happy.

H- 7. General satisfaction with teaching should increase with length of service. Short term teachers should show great concern over self-expression while medium and long service teachers will be dissatisfied with social appreciation above all.

H- 8. In general, the larger the class the less satisfied the teacher will find teaching to be and especially with pupil behavior and extrinsic satisfaction.

H- 9. Satisfaction with the job is predicted to increase as we move up the salary scale.

H-10. General dissatisfaction with teaching should increase with an increase in authoritarianism. The differences should be evident with pupil behavior, social appreciation, and extrinsic factors of satisfaction.

These predictions make some important assumptions about the predictor factors. For example, teachers classification and amount of education could be assumed to be highly interrelated. (See Appendix C for intercorrelations among the ten predictors). Thus teachers with high education will in general be expected to teach at secondary school level and to receive the higher occupational status accorded to this level of employment. Accordingly we expect the Gurin et al. (1960) status-satisfaction relation to be an important factor. If so secondary school teachers should express significantly greater satisfaction with self-expression, extrinsic satisfaction, and social appreciation than primary teachers. These predictions are made in H-1 and H-6.

It is also assumed that age, salary, and length of service are strongly intercorrelated. Teachers with the longest service are expected to be older and to be earning more money than everybody else. Extrinsic and social appreciation concerns are salient to them as a reflection of their greater "investments" (Adams, 1963). We expect them to show a lot more discontent with these factors than young teachers who may regard their pay and status as adequate relative to their inputs. In any case young teachers can be expected to be "testing-out" their competence, involvement, and expectations about opportunities for self-fulfillment and to show greater dissatisfaction in these areas. Middle age teachers

with a medium length of service can be expected to act like the older long service teachers but express more moderate dissatisfaction. These predictions are contained in hypotheses five, seven and nine dealing with the factors of age, salary and length of service respectively.

A more complex set of relationships is assumed in our predictions for salary which we assume to be highly intercorrelated with teacher classification, sex, age, marital status and education. Because of the greater amount of education and their higher occupational status secondary school teachers earn more and should feel more satisfied on this factor than the less well paid teachers.

Men doing the same jobs as women tend traditionally to be paid more than the women and we can expect them to be more sensitive to salary changes relative to the women. Concern with pay is also predicted for married teachers who probably have dependents to support and will experience a greater amount of discontent when pay is considered by them as inadequate than would be the case for unmarried teachers. This would be especially true if the socioeconomic status of the father or family is defined in terms of pay. The assumptions underlying the relationships of salary to teacher classification, sex, marital status, and education are appropriate for hypotheses one, two, four, and six respectively.

Hypothesis three relates kind of institution to differences in extrinsic and social appreciation satisfactions among teachers in these settings. It is assumed that in general European private schools tend to cater to an economic and social elite who can afford to pay higher salaries than public schools in order to maintain the high prestige and status of these private institutions. Religious autonomy is often an important ingredient in founding private schools and it acts to cement

the economic and social ideology of these institutions. It seems reasonable to assume that their teachers will report being more satisfied than their colleagues in public schools with regard to salary and social occupational prestige.

Hypothesis eight deals with class size and predicts that teachers of small size classes will experience more satisfaction with pupil behavior and extrinsic factors than teachers of large classes. This assumes that the potential for greater and more intimate interaction between student and teacher in small classes can make discipline easier and permit the teacher to more directly appreciate the interest pupils show in their work than is the case in large classes. It also assumes that the same pay for teachers with varying sizes of classes should create dissatisfaction with pay among teachers with large classes when the differences in salary are perceived in terms of inequity (Adams, 1963).

The tenth hypothesis starts with the Adorno et al, (1950) assumptions about authoritarian personality and predicts that teachers high on F will seek and report more satisfaction in extrinsic, pupil behavior, and social appreciation aspects of their job than low Fs. Medium Fs should report average satisfaction relative to the other two but perhaps closer to the high Fs.

In summary: the ten hypotheses attempt to predict job satisfaction from nine demographic and one personality factors using data from primary and secondary school teachers in seven nations of Western Europe. The question items used were limited to eliciting responses regarding the respondent's perceptions at the time of the study and without provision for future expectations. This limits the scope of interpretation to present perceptions as reported by the teachers. No attempts were made

to gather data on the behavioral consequences of these perceptions. The analysis looks first at some cross-national relationships among predictors and types of satisfaction and then shifts to analyses of relationships specific to each nation.

# CHAPTER III

## METHOD

The OCSR study faced many methodological problems of which three are particularly relevant to our present analysis. The design called for a set of equivalent research operations in each of the seven nations. This meant that samples had to be both representative and comparable if accurate generalizations were to be made. The second problem had to do with controlled translation, that is, all interview questionnaires had to be translated from English into French, Dutch, German, Norwegian and Swedish so as to reproduce the English meaning or intent and its psychological equivalent in the other languages. The third problem was one of standardizing interview behavior across a variety of field conditions and in what was almost clinical-type interviewing. What follows is a brief description of how and to what extent these problems were met through extensive pre-tests, conferences and correspondence.

### Sampling

The decision to concentrate on teachers as a single occupational group for study was prompted by a variety of methodological considerations. Reliable rosters of all teachers or classes in all countries were easily available and this simplified sampling procedures. Teachers were also considered to occupy a strategic position in the communication processes related to social, educational and political issues with which

the study was concerned. They were thus expected to be relatively more knowledgeable and articulate about these processes than the population average. Finally concentrating on teachers instead of cutting across all occupational sections reduced one central source of variance and allowed the testing of relationships that could not possibly be explored in nation-wide samples of the same size.

Having decided on the occupational category the seven national teams agreed to interview 300 primary and 100 secondary school full time teachers in state and religious systems in each country; a total of 400 for each country and 2,800 for all the countries together. In fact geographical restrictions and sample loss resulted in a total population of 2,758 with Germany (N=365) and France (N=350) having the heaviest losses and Sweden (N=443) with the highest figure. To ensure that the samples were comparable the selections were randomly made from lists of teachers or classrooms whose population was defined in the same way. This procedure was used for the original sample and for replacement. In replacement, selection was made from strata representing the loss. Major obstacles to sample representativeness and comparability included differences in school structures, divisions within these systems, refusals, sample loss and geographical restrictions. Where divisions in the national education system were important the solution was to include in the sample teachers from all divisions: public vs private, state vs religious. The exception was England where for practical reasons only state system teachers were used. In Belgium, the Netherlands and England there were no arbitrary exclusions of geographical areas. But in Norway, Sweden and France, and to a lesser extent Germany, samples were limited to major population centers in and

around the larger cities. The decision to use a quasi-urban sample in the larger countries does not so much limit the comparability of samples among countries as it does their representativeness within each of these countries. For smaller countries like Belgium and the Netherlands this yields samples that are fully representative of the total teacher population, but in other countries rural teachers are underrepresented. These considerations caution us against generalzations which ignore the limitations of geography, divisions within educational systems, refusals and sample loss. Table 1 presents the distribution of all samples relative to the total population of teachers in each of the seven countries.

**Table 1: National Teacher Sample: Primary and Secondary Teachers**

| | Primary school | Secondary school |
|---|---|---|
| **Belgium** | | |
| State system | 148 ( 17,377) | 55 ( 8,627) |
| Catholic | 152 ( 18,424) | 45 ( 7,128) |
| **England** | | |
| State system only: (Junior, all-age, secondary modern schools) | 300 (155,291) | 100 (27,375) (Grammar) |
| **France** | | |
| State system | 299 (160,000) | 47 (24,000) |
| Catholic (Around major cities in 8 regions) | 43 ( 35,000) | 31 (24,000) |
| **Netherlands** | | |
| Public | 80 ( 9,801) | 53 ( 2,297) |
| Catholic | 130 ( 14,967) | 31 ( 1,378) |
| Protestant | 85 ( 9,874) | 16 ( 827) |
| Private secular | 5 ( 747) | ..... |
| **Norway** | | |
| State system only: (North Norway excluded) | 300 ( 9,725) | 100 ( 1,376) |
| **Sweden** | | |
| State system only: (Around 4 major cities only) | 324 ( 6,345) | 119 ( 1,950) |

**Table 1:** (continued)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **West Germany** | | |
| Gemeinschaftsschulen | 150 ( ) | 95 ( ) |
| Kath. Bekennthnissch | 77 (130,000) | 5 (29,000) |
| Evang. Bekennthnissch | 38 ( ) | (.....) |

Numbers in brackets indicate totals from which samples drawn.

## Data Collection and Analysis

The final draft of the questionnaire used for all interviews included a sequence of 39 questions designed to produce extensive answers and 18 additional items about the respondent's teaching experience and personal background. To insure some degree of language equivalence in this instrument the following procedure was adopted. The originals of the instrument were formulated in English and then translated by each group member into his native tongue. In each country, these translated instruments were then retranslated into English by two bilingual persons, who had no knowledge of the study. The retranslations and the original were then compared and any differences eliminated. When the team leaders and central staff agreed that there were several equally appropriate translations into the language of use, the team leader chose the form that he judged best in establishing rapport or in terms of simplicity or style. In instances where the translation difficulty occurred because the concept was not commonly found in the culture or the language was not equipped to handle the concept unambiguously, the question was eliminated in all countries and substituted by a more suitable alternative. In all cases of doubt the final decision lay with the central office which was independent of the national teams. If these techniques produced translations that seemed to preserve the intent and meaning of the original English form it still had to be shown that these translations would produce equivalent data among the countries. This problem was met partly by extensive pre-testing and partly during the analysis of the data. That is, to the extent that sets of questions among the countries are capable of providing data

that allow parallel relationships to be examined these data can be said to be equivalent, as are the questions.

With a standard interview and controlled translation, there remained the question of providing equivalent interviewing situations in all countries. Interviewer behavior was standardized through the selection and training of interviewers. They were either graduate students in the social sciences or trained professional interviewers on the staff of continuing field organizations. Training was continuous during the pre-tests and depended heavily on reports of field experiences. Manuals were prepared which contained detailed step-by-step descriptions of the procedure to be followed. Many of the interviewers were later used as coders.

In all countries coders were selected and trained by the team leader and the principal staff assistants. In most countries training included a discussion of the study, instruction in the use of the code, and a set of practice sessions in which all of the coders worked with a common set of interviews, comparing coding assignments until there was agreement on the use of the code. Standard practices were adapted from the coding guide used by the Michigan Survey Research Center. Two procedures were used to check on coding reliability. In one procedure the team leader and his principal assistants in each country had a sample of the interviews coded independently by more than one person followed by a discussion with the coders in order to resolve any discrepancies. In some countries records of the discrepancies were kept from which estimates of coding reliability could be made. In an alternative approach each team was asked to code five Norwegian interviews. All five were coded by each of four or five regular coders, and

the data were sent to the central office for analysis. The analysis disclosed varying degrees of agreement among countries and among items though there were no gross discrepancies.

When the coding and interviewing had been completed in all countries, each team sent its punched cards and final code to the central office where a master code and a master set of cards were prepared and stored. In summary, it can be said that the use of a methodology involving equivalent samples, common research design, common procedures and functionally equivalent measures is necessary for the kind of comparative analysis undertaken in this thesis. We are interested in the patterns of teacher gratification in the teacher role and how they vary in size, direction and significance across nations and cultures.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

The findings generally support the hypotheses. Hypothesis one dealt with teacher classification and predicted that secondary school teachers should report greater satisfaction than primary teachers with respect to all the five dimensions of satisfaction; and that they would be particularly satisfied with self-expression, extrinsic factors and social appreciation. It was assumed that the Gurin et al. status-satisfaction effects might underline these predictions. Tables 2 and 3A summarize the results. Table 2 is an overview statement of how countries cluster around statistically significant differences between the ten predictors and the five satisfaction variables. A more detailed picture of these relationships is then given in Tables 3A-J.

As can be seen from Tables 2 and 3A the results for Hypothesis 1 are mixed almost evenly for and against the predictions. In Belgium, Germany and Norway secondary school teachers are more satisfied than primary teachers with self-expression but dissatisfied with social appreciation and extrinsic aspects of the job. All other factors show no clear or consistent pattern of relationships for both types of teachers.

Table 2: A summary of all statistically significant* relationships between 10 predictor variables and 5 dimensions of satisfaction across Seven Countries of Western Europe.

| Predictor Variable | Type of Satisfaction | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Self-Expression | Extrinsic | Pupil Behavior | Interpersonal | Social Appreciation |
| Teacher Classification | Sweden | Norway<br>Sweden | England<br>Netherlands | England | Sweden |
| Sex | France<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Belgium<br>England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | France<br>Norway | England<br>France | Belgium<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden |
| Kind of Institution | Belgium | Belgium<br>England | Germany | Germany | Belgium<br>Germany |
| Marital Status | | England<br>Norway | France<br>Norway | England | Belgium<br>England<br>Germany |
| Age | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Norway | Sweden | Belgium | France<br>Netherlands<br>Sweden | Belgium<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden |
| Education of Respondent | | Norway | Netherlands | | |

Table 2: (continued)

| Predictor Variable | Type of Satisfaction: Self-Expression | Extrinsic | Pupil Behavior | Interpersonal | Social Appreciation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Length of Service | France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway | Germany | Belgium<br>Netherlands | France | Belgium<br>Germany<br>Norway |
| Size of Class | | Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Sweden | | Sweden |
| Salary | Sweden | Norway<br>Sweden | France<br>Norway | Germany | Germany<br>Sweden |
| F-Scale | England | England<br>Germany<br>Sweden | France | France<br>Germany | England<br>Germany |

* See Tables 3A-J for levels of significance for each country.

Table 3A: 1 to 7. Relationships of Teacher Classification to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

I. Belgium (N=400)

| | Teacher Level | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Primary | | | Secondary | | | Total |
| Type of Satisfaction | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | N |
| Self-Expr. | 3.14 | 1.69 | 107 | 2.98 | 1.77 | 48 | 155 |
| Extr. | 4.32 | 1.76 | 116 | 4.29 | 1.77 | 34 | 150 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.51 | 1.43 | 138 | 2.82 | 1.49 | 55 | 193 |
| Interpers. | 1.41 | 1.30 | 125 | 1.32 | 1.12 | 50 | 175 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.43 | 1.53 | 131 | 3.45 | 1.68 | 47 | 178 |

2. England (N=400)

| | Teacher Level | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Primary | | | Secondary | | | Total | | | |
| Type of Satisfaction | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | N | F | d.f. | p. |
| Self-Expr. | 2.92 | 2.08 | 150 | 3.51 | 2.03 | 43 | 193 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.06 | 2.05 | 118 | 4.20 | 1.58 | 25 | 143 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.81 | 1.73 | 155 | 3.55 | 1.72 | 44 | 199 | 6.16 | 1 | <.05 |
| Interpers. | 1.48 | 1.53 | 156 | 2.05 | 1.60 | 43 | 199 | 4.53 | 1 | <.05 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.07 | 1.82 | 155 | 2.79 | 1.42 | 42 | 197 | | | |

Table 3A: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Teacher Level: Primary M | Primary SD | Primary N | Middle M | Middle SD | Middle N | Secondary M | Secondary SD | Secondary N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.58 | 1.60 | 210 | 2.91 | 1.52 | 93 | 3.29 | 1.72 | 76 | 379 | 5.81 | 2 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 3.30 | 1.38 | 202 | 2.75 | 1.49 | 88 | 2.96 | 1.57 | 78 | 368 | 6.97 | 2 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.63 | 1.51 | 212 | 4.12 | 1.56 | 97 | 4.35 | 1.41 | 81 | 390 | 8.00 | 2 | <.01 |
| Interpers. | 3.05 | 1.70 | 206 | 3.59 | 1.60 | 96 | 3.96 | 1.72 | 79 | 381 | 9.43 | 2 | <.01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.34 | 1.55 | 199 | 2.42 | 1.40 | 95 | 2.05 | 1.41 | 81 | 375 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Teacher Level: Primary M | Primary SD | Primary N | Secondary M | Secondary SD | Secondary N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.34 | 1.72 | 201 | 2.86 | 2.06 | 63 | 264 |
| Extr. | 4.30 | 1.64 | 228 | 4.28 | 1.78 | 61 | 289 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.76 | 1.33 | 260 | 3.07 | 1.40 | 76 | 336 |
| Interpers. | 1.74 | 1.36 | 247 | 2.03 | 1.50 | 73 | 320 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.00 | 1.41 | 244 | 3.03 | 1.33 | 69 | 313 |

Table 3A: 1 to 7.

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Teacher Level: Primary Mean | SD | N | Secondary Mean | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.47 | 1.97 | 259 | 3.63 | 2.08 | 96 | 355 | | | |
| Extr. | 5.77 | 1.94 | 247 | 5.34 | 1.92 | 94 | 341 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.88 | 1.58 | 259 | 2.38 | 1.42 | 96 | 355 | 7.57 | 1 | <.01 |
| Interpers. | 1.83 | 1.30 | 258 | 1.54 | 1.02 | 96 | 354 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.18 | 1.52 | 260 | 2.99 | 1.51 | 96 | 356 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Teacher Level: Primary M | SD | N | Secondary M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.71 | 1.94 | 277 | 3.50 | 1.99 | 90 | 360 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.59 | 1.57 | 250 | 4.88 | 1.91 | 59 | 309 | 29.72 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.02 | 1.71 | 297 | 4.05 | 1.60 | 97 | 394 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.04 | 1.39 | 294 | 1.97 | 1.56 | 98 | 392 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.10 | 1.52 | 297 | 3.19 | 1.51 | 96 | 393 | | | |

Table 3A: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

Teacher Level

| Type of Satisfaction | Primary Mean | Primary SD | Primary N | Secondary Mean | Secondary SD | Secondary N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.00 | 1.66 | 278 | 3.84 | 1.93 | 95 | 373 | 16.62 | 1 | <.001 |
| Extr. | 3.05 | 1.56 | 264 | 4.41 | 1.60 | 81 | 345 | 46.56 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.55 | 1.53 | 292 | 2.46 | 1.47 | 98 | 390 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.62 | 1.29 | 290 | 1.45 | 1.44 | 95 | 385 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.40 | 1.38 | 287 | 3.17 | 1.52 | 96 | 383 | 21.29 | 1 | <.001 |

Hypothesis 2 predicts that in general women should report greater satisfaction than men on all five dimensions of satisfaction. A look at Tables 3B: 1 to 7 shows that almost without exception the prediction is confirmed in all seven countries. Among all predictors (Table 2) sex yields the largest number of statistically significant differences especially in France, Norway and Sweden. Also confirmed was the second prediction that men would show greater discontent with extrinsic satisfaction than women. The F ratios on this dimension are unusually large suggesting perhaps the lack of opportunities for advancement in the teaching profession together with poor salaries associated with teaching in European countries. The final prediction that women should express more discontent than men over social appreciation is not supported. It could be that the professional status accorded women doing similar jobs with men outweighs their generally low social status outside of the job area. A more detailed discussion of this fact is presented later under discussion.

Table 3B: 1 to 7. Relationships of Sex to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

Sex of Teacher

| Type of Satisfaction | Male Mean | Male SD | Male N | Female Mean | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.33 | 1.81 | 78 | 2.84 | 1.57 | 77 | 155 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.97 | 1.75 | 73 | 3.69 | 1.53 | 77 | 150 | 22.96 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.41 | 1.42 | 91 | 2.78 | 1.46 | 102 | 193 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.45 | 1.37 | 85 | 1.32 | 1.13 | 90 | 175 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.67 | 1.62 | 88 | 3.20 | 1.49 | 90 | 178 | 4.07 | 1 | <.05 |

2. England (N=400)

Sex of Teacher

| Type of Satisfaction | Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.32 | 2.05 | 101 | 2.76 | 2.07 | 92 | 193 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.63 | 2.00 | 79 | 3.41 | 1.72 | 64 | 143 | 15.07 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.21 | 1.67 | 101 | 2.74 | 1.81 | 98 | 199 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.98 | 1.56 | 101 | 1.21 | 1.46 | 98 | 199 | 12.76 | 1 | <.001 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.24 | 1.66 | 100 | 2.77 | 1.80 | 97 | 197 | | | |

Table 3B: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Sex of Teacher: Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.05 | 1.73 | 156 | 2.63 | 1.53 | 223 | 397 | 5.99 | 1 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 2.75 | 1.56 | 158 | 2.40 | 1.39 | 210 | 368 | 5.07 | 1 | <.05 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.54 | 1.42 | 164 | 3.44 | 1.44 | 226 | 390 | 56.64 | 1 | <.001 |
| Interpers. | 3.97 | 1.63 | 160 | 3.08 | 1.72 | 221 | 381 | 16.89 | 1 | <.001 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.40 | 1.53 | 161 | 2.22 | 1.46 | 214 | 375 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Sex of Teacher: Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.16 | 1.86 | 127 | 3.29 | 1.77 | 137 | 264 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.71 | 1.66 | 136 | 3.93 | 1.59 | 153 | 289 | 16.85 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.88 | 1.38 | 153 | 2.79 | 1.32 | 183 | 336 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.80 | 1.24 | 147 | 1.80 | 1.52 | 173 | 320 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.21 | 1.40 | 145 | 2.83 | 1.37 | 168 | 313 | 5.90 | 1 | <.05 |

Table 3B: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

Sex of Teacher

| Type of Satisfaction | Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.39 | 1.98 | 241 | 3.77 | 2.03 | 114 | 355 | | | |
| Extr. | 6.06 | 1.76 | 232 | 4.78 | 2.02 | 109 | 341 | 35.39 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.68 | 1.56 | 241 | 2.89 | 1.54 | 114 | 355 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.73 | 1.82 | 238 | 1.80 | 1.33 | 116 | 354 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.16 | 1.45 | 241 | 3.06 | 1.66 | 115 | 356 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

Sex of Teacher

| Type of Satisfaction | Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.84 | 1.99 | 226 | 3.37 | 1.86 | 141 | 367 | 5.03 | 1 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 4.29 | 1.72 | 197 | 3.04 | 1.38 | 112 | 309 | 43.48 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.19 | 1.69 | 242 | 3.79 | 1.66 | 152 | 394 | 6.20 | 1 | <.05 |
| Interpers. | 2.02 | 1.46 | 242 | 2.03 | 1.40 | 150 | 392 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.27 | 1.56 | 242 | 2.89 | 1.40 | 151 | 393 | 5.77 | 1 | <.05 |

Table 3B: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Sex of Teacher: Male M | Male SD | Male N | Female M | Female SD | Female N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.36 | 1.75 | 239 | 2.96 | 1.78 | 134 | 373 | 4.64 | 1 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 3.58 | 1.77 | 224 | 2.97 | 1.39 | 121 | 345 | 10.87 | 1 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.64 | 1.50 | 246 | 2.34 | 1.54 | 144 | 390 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.57 | 1.29 | 244 | 1.58 | 1.40 | 141 | 385 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.70 | 1.48 | 242 | 2.40 | 1.38 | 141 | 383 | 3.97 | 1 | <.05 |

Hypothesis 3 predicts that teachers in private school institutions should report more general satisfaction in teaching than teachers in public schools, and that this might be particularly true of extrinsic and social appreciation factors than any other. Both predictions are strongly supported in Belgium, England, and Germany but are contradicted in Norway (Tables 3C: 1 to 7). There are no data for teachers in private schools in France and Sweden. The coding system used in the Netherlands is unavailable and the results are therefore not used in the analysis.

Table 3C: 1 to 7. Relationships of Kind of School Institution to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private Mean | Private SD | Private N | Public Mean | Public SD | Public N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.47 | 1.60 | 55 | 3.43 | 1.68 | 100 | 155 | 11.90 | 1 | <.001 |
| Extr. | 3.60 | 1.69 | 47 | 4.64 | 1.70 | 103 | 150 | 12.27 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.61 | 1.51 | 71 | 2.60 | 1.42 | 122 | 197 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.27 | 1.35 | 63 | 1.45 | 1.19 | 112 | 175 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.78 | 1.32 | 60 | 3.76 | 1.59 | 118 | 178 | 16.89 | 1 | <.001 |

2. England (N=400)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private M | Private SD | Private N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.94 | 2.10 | 117 | 3.22 | 2.04 | 76 | 193 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.68 | 1.77 | 79 | 4.58 | 2.10 | 64 | 143 | 7.63 | 1 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.91 | 1.83 | 122 | 3.08 | 1.62 | 77 | 199 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.44 | 1.61 | 121 | 1.86 | 1.44 | 78 | 199 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.94 | 1.77 | 120 | 3.12 | 1.69 | 77 | 197 | | | |

Table 3C: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private M | Private SD | Private N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | (No cases sampled) | | | 2.80 | 1.63 | 378 | 378 |
| Extr. | | | | 2.55 | 1.47 | 367 | 367 |
| Pup. Beh. | | | | 3.90 | 1.53 | 389 | 389 |
| Interpers. | | | | 3.38 | 1.72 | 380 | 380 |
| Soc. Appre. | | | | 2.30 | 1.49 | 374 | 374 |

4. Germany (N=365)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private M | Private SD | Private N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.98 | 2.12 | 62 | 3.30 | 1.71 | 202 | 264 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.83 | 1.84 | 41 | 4.38 | 1.63 | 248 | 289 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.11 | 1.56 | 74 | 2.75 | 1.28 | 262 | 336 | 4.06 | 1 | <.05 |
| Interpers. | 1.33 | 1.36 | 72 | 1.94 | 1.38 | 248 | 320 | 18.87 | 1 | <.01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.61 | 1.38 | 67 | 3.12 | 1.38 | 246 | 313 | 7.09 | 1 | <.01 |

Table 3C: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands* (N=400)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private M | Private SD | Private N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.50 | 2.01 | 236 | 3.73 | 2.03 | 79 | 3.28 | 1.89 | 36 | 351 |
| Extr. | 5.68 | 1.87 | 222 | 5.53 | 2.15 | 78 | 5.68 | 1.90 | 37 | 337 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.68 | 1.50 | 236 | 3.01 | 1.73 | 78 | 2.68 | 1.49 | 37 | 351 |
| Interpers. | 1.74 | 1.18 | 234 | 1.68 | 1.37 | 80 | 1.97 | 1.11 | 36 | 350 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.17 | 1.47 | 235 | 2.98 | 1.72 | 80 | 3.19 | 1.39 | 37 | 352 |

* These data are not used bacause changes in re-coding are unavailable.

6. Norway (N=400)

Kind of Institution

| Type of Satisfaction | Private M | Private SD | Private N | Public M | Public SD | Public N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.73 | 2.04 | 245 | 3.51 | 1.78 | 122 | 367 |
| Extr. | 3.86 | 1.74 | 207 | 3.79 | 1.67 | 102 | 309 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.04 | 1.71 | 264 | 4.01 | 1.64 | 130 | 394 |
| Interpers. | 1.97 | 1.49 | 260 | 2.14 | 1.32 | 132 | 392 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.22 | 1.55 | 264 | 2.94 | 1.41 | 129 | 393 |

Table 3C: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Kind of Institution: Private Mean | Private SD | Private N | Public Mean | Public SD | Public N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | (No cases sampled) | | | 3.22 | 1.77 | 372 | 372 |
| Extr. | | | | 3.37 | 1.68 | 344 | 344 |
| Pup. Beh. | | | | 2.53 | 1.52 | 389 | 389 |
| Interpers. | | | | 1.58 | 1.33 | 384 | 384 |
| Soc. Appre. | | | | 2.59 | 1.45 | 382 | 382 |

Hypothesis 4 predicts that in general married teachers are more satisfied with teaching than single teachers. This prediction is not only not supported but from Tables 3D: 1 to 7 the contrary would seem to be the case particularly in England. It was further predicted that married teachers would show greater discontent with social appreciation and extrinsic aspects of the job than unmarried teachers. The former prediction is not confirmed but the latter receives strong support in all countries. This finding seems to indicate that happiness in marriage does not automatically carry into the job situation and that the need for promotion and a good salary are important concerns for teachers with families responsibilities. It could be that the enhanced social status that comes with marriage makes social appreciation less of a salient factor than was anticipated in the hypothesis.

Table 3D: 1 to 7. Relationships of Marital Status to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Married: Mean | Married: SD | Married: N | Single: Mean | Single: SD | Single: N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.32 | 1.71 | 105 | 2.59 | 1.66 | 44 | 149 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.41 | 1.80 | 112 | 3.91 | 1.53 | 32 | 144 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.54 | 1.40 | 129 | 2.74 | 1.62 | 57 | 186 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.43 | 1.32 | 122 | 1.23 | 1.09 | 47 | 169 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.71 | 1.61 | 127 | 2.68 | 1.16 | 44 | 171 | 7.75 | 1 | <.01 |

2. England (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Married: M | Married: SD | Married: N | Single: M | Single: SD | Single: N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.27 | 2.00 | 92 | 2.82 | 2.13 | 99 | 191 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.61 | 2.00 | 79 | 3.36 | 1.69 | 62 | 141 | 15.56 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.14 | 1.60 | 93 | 2.81 | 1.88 | 104 | 197 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.84 | 1.50 | 94 | 1.31 | 1.49 | 103 | 197 | 6.19 | 1 | <.05 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.33 | 1.77 | 93 | 2.69 | 1.69 | 102 | 195 | | | |

Table 3D: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Marital Status: Married M | Married SD | Married N | Single M | Single SD | Single N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.93 | 1.76 | 190 | 2.67 | 1.47 | 163 | 353 | | | |
| Extr. | 2.68 | 1.52 | 186 | 2.45 | 1.45 | 158 | 344 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.28 | 1.44 | 199 | 3.48 | 1.53 | 166 | 365 | 16.52 | 1 | <.001 |
| Interpers. | 3.54 | 1.77 | 194 | 3.23 | 1.66 | 164 | 358 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.38 | 1.52 | 191 | 2.23 | 1.49 | 160 | 351 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Marital Status: Married M | Married SD | Married N | Single M | Single SD | Single N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.37 | 1.76 | 164 | 3.01 | 1.87 | 93 | 257 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.46 | 1.58 | 200 | 3.93 | 1.87 | 82 | 282 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.82 | 1.20 | 217 | 2.92 | 1.60 | 112 | 329 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.88 | 1.35 | 203 | 1.70 | 1.47 | 109 | 312 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.21 | 1.40 | 205 | 2.58 | 1.28 | 100 | 305 | 7.34 | 1 | <.01 |

Table 3D: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Married M | Married SD | Married N | Single M | Single SD | Single N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.36 | 1.95 | 229 | 3.73 | 2.08 | 110 | 339 | | | |
| Extr. | 6.02 | 1.78 | 220 | 4.82 | 2.06 | 106 | 326 | 15.18 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.65 | 1.55 | 230 | 2.93 | 1.49 | 109 | 339 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.77 | 1.26 | 225 | 1.70 | 1.18 | 114 | 339 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.19 | 1.45 | 229 | 2.97 | 1.61 | 112 | 341 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Married M | Married SD | Married N | Single M | Single SD | Single N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.76 | 2.01 | 178 | 3.59 | 1.90 | 179 | 357 | 14.53 | 1 | <.001 |
| Extr. | 4.35 | 1.72 | 150 | 3.32 | 1.56 | 149 | 299 | 5.19 | 1 | <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.30 | 1.60 | 187 | 3.81 | 1.71 | 195 | 382 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.03 | 1.51 | 186 | 1.99 | 1.37 | 194 | | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.25 | 1.54 | 188 | 3.06 | 1.47 | 193 | | | | |

Table 3D: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Marital Status: Married M | Married SD | Married N | Single M | Single SD | Single N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.31 | 1.73 | 266 | 3.00 | 1.81 | 88 | 354 |
| Extr. | 3.41 | 1.75 | 254 | 3.15 | 1.37 | 72 | 326 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.53 | 1.55 | 280 | 2.52 | 1.37 | 89 | 369 |
| Interpers. | 1.55 | 1.31 | 275 | 1.54 | 1.25 | 89 | 364 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.63 | 1.47 | 276 | 2.44 | 1.36 | 90 | 366 |

Hypothesis 5 predicts that general satisfaction with teaching should increase with age. The prediction is partially supported (Tables 3E: 1 to 7) old teachers are the most satisfied while young and middle age teachers are about evenly divided with perhaps the middle age tending to be slightly more dissatisfied than the young. This latter fact could be due to the fact that the young probably consider their present status as realistic relative to their limited investment whereas the middle aged may be going through a transitional period of staying or leaving the job before it is too late. We discuss this issue in some detail later in the last chapter.

Table 3E: 1 to 7. Relationships of Age to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Age: Young (up to 30) Mean | SD | N | Middle (31-50) Mean | SD | N | Old (over 50) Mean | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.36 | 1.73 | 25 | 3.35 | 1.67 | 89 | 2.97 | 1.76 | 37 | 151 | 3.43 | 2 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 4.04 | 1.51 | 25 | 4.51 | 1.85 | 89 | 4.03 | 1.73 | 30 | 144 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.29 | 1.22 | 34 | 2.88 | 1.47 | 115 | 2.00 | 1.43 | 38 | 187 | 6.38 | 2 | <.01 |
| Interpers. | 1.23 | 1.04 | 30 | 1.45 | 1.35 | 102 | 1.24 | 1.19 | 37 | 169 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.24 | 1.46 | 29 | 3.74 | 1.59 | 105 | 2.76 | 1.36 | 38 | 172 | 6.07 | 2 | <.01 |

2. England (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Age: Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.24 | 2.24 | 55 | 2.92 | 1.98 | 106 | 2.93 | 1.98 | 29 | 190 |
| Extr. | 3.93 | 1.97 | 43 | 4.14 | 1.97 | 73 | 3.96 | 2.03 | 24 | 140 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.20 | 1.99 | 56 | 2.97 | 1.62 | 111 | 2.45 | 1.79 | 29 | 196 |
| Interpers. | 1.64 | 1.30 | 56 | 1.55 | 1.55 | 111 | 1.45 | 1.80 | 29 | 196 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.02 | 1.70 | 56 | 2.91 | 1.73 | 109 | 3.14 | 1.79 | 29 | 194 |

Table 3E: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Age: Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.39 | 1.60 | 140 | 2.60 | 1.64 | 179 | 2.51 | 1.49 | 73 | 356 | 9.59 | 2 | <.01 |
| Extr. | 2.65 | 1.38 | 103 | 2.48 | 1.42 | 175 | 2.46 | 1.59 | 66 | 344 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.73 | 1.52 | 107 | 4.07 | 1.55 | 186 | 3.63 | 1.51 | 73 | 366 | | | |
| Interpers. | 3.81 | 1.72 | 108 | 3.27 | 1.74 | 179 | 2.96 | 1.59 | 71 | 358 | 5.94 | 2 | <.01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.47 | 1.62 | 106 | 2.17 | 1.44 | 175 | 2.26 | 1.49 | 72 | 353 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Age: Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.29 | 2.04 | 59 | 3.47 | 1.71 | 154 | 2.39 | 1.63 | 51 | 264 | 7.19 | 2 | <.01 |
| Extr. | 4.54 | 1.81 | 54 | 4.37 | 1.61 | 179 | 3.84 | 1.66 | 56 | 289 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.77 | 1.39 | 65 | 2.84 | 1.31 | 205 | 2.86 | 1.46 | 66 | 336 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.94 | 1.44 | 62 | 1.86 | 1.39 | 195 | 1.49 | 1.35 | 63 | 320 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.35 | 1.52 | 57 | 3.16 | 1.36 | 191 | 2.28 | 1.11 | 65 | 313 | 12.66 | 2 | <.01 |

Table 3E: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.47 | 1.83 | 55 | 3.70 | 2.07 | 163 | 3.29 | 1.98 | 134 | 352 | | | |
| Extr. | 5.64 | 1.97 | 50 | 5.73 | 1.96 | 157 | 5.57 | 1.90 | 131 | 338 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.73 | 1.51 | 56 | 2.56 | 1.46 | 159 | 2.96 | 1.67 | 137 | 352 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.11 | 1.42 | 55 | 1.73 | 1.28 | 157 | 1.60 | 1.06 | 139 | 351 | 3.37 | 2 | <.05 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.06 | 1.58 | 55 | 3.19 | 1.50 | 159 | 3.06 | 1.52 | 139 | 353 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 4.07 | 1.94 | 106 | 3.64 | 1.93 | 181 | 3.18 | 1.95 | 78 | 365 | 4.74 | 2 | <.01 |
| Extr. | 3.57 | 1.72 | 99 | 4.04 | 1.63 | 142 | 3.85 | 1.85 | 66 | 307 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.89 | 1.65 | 113 | 4.18 | 1.69 | 192 | 3.92 | 1.71 | 87 | 392 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.15 | 1.47 | 114 | 2.02 | 1.47 | 192 | 1.87 | 1.28 | 84 | 390 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.23 | 1.44 | 115 | 3.24 | 1.53 | 192 | 2.74 | 1.51 | 82 | 391 | 3.46 | 2 | <.05 |

Table 3E: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Age: Young (up to 30) M | SD | N | Middle (31-50) M | SD | N | Old (over 50) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.20 | 1.84 | 49 | 3.32 | 1.79 | 188 | 3.08 | 1.68 | 134 | 371 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.07 | 1.53 | 44 | 3.59 | 1.70 | 174 | 3.14 | 1.66 | 125 | 343 | 3.34 | 2 | < .05 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.64 | 1.52 | 52 | 2.57 | 1.43 | 189 | 2.40 | 1.60 | 147 | 388 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.79 | 1.42 | 52 | 1.72 | 1.32 | 191 | 1.30 | 1.27 | 140 | 383 | 4.92 | 2 | < .01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.71 | 1.22 | 51 | 2.80 | 1.49 | 186 | 2.28 | 1.44 | 145 | 382 | 5.56 | 2 | < .01 |

Hypothesis 6 predicts that the potential for satisfaction or dissatisfaction in teaching will vary with the amount of education the teacher has received and that it will increase with more education. The evidence on Tables 3F: 1 to 7 suggests the reverse of this prediction, that is, satisfaction decreases as one goes up the education ladder. This finding makes sense if we remember that many of the primary teachers have a high education and probably joined teaching because better alternative employment for people with their education and training was not available. Theirs could be a case of "status incongruence." In any case the evidence confirms the familiar finding that job dissatisfaction occurs most commonly with higher education. (Veroff and Feld 1970). It is what one would predict from expectation theory.

Table 3F: 1 to 7. Relationship of Education of Respondent to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

| | Education of Respondent | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Primary | | | Secondary | | | Above Secondary | | | Total |
| Type of Satisfaction | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | N |
| Self-Expr. | 3.13 | 1.73 | 94 | 3.18 | 1.53 | 22 | 3.00 | 1.93 | 32 | 148 |
| Extr. | 4.29 | 1.76 | 106 | 4.50 | 1.59 | 16 | 4.30 | 2.06 | 23 | 145 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.52 | 1.43 | 124 | 2.63 | 1.58 | 24 | 2.76 | 1.44 | 37 | 185 |
| Interpers. | 1.41 | 1.30 | 111 | 1.09 | 1.28 | 23 | 1.44 | 1.11 | 34 | 168 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.38 | 1.57 | 117 | 3.62 | 1.50 | 23 | 3.53 | 1.72 | 32 | 172 |

2. England (N=400)

| | Education of Respondent | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Primary | | | Secondary | | | Above Secondary | | | Total |
| Type of Satisfaction | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | N |
| Self-Expr. | 2.99 | 2.11 | 139 | 2.60 | 2.03 | 15 | 3.59 | 2.06 | 29 | 183 |
| Extr. | 4.06 | 2.00 | 110 | 4.20 | 2.39 | 10 | 3.87 | 1.41 | 15 | 135 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.78 | 1.69 | 143 | 3.38 | 2.00 | 16 | 3.53 | 1.72 | 30 | 189 |
| Interpers. | 1.45 | 1.51 | 144 | 2.00 | 1.55 | 16 | 2.00 | 1.46 | 29 | 189 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.04 | 1.77 | 143 | 2.50 | 1.97 | 16 | 3.11 | 1.47 | 28 | 187 |

Table 3F: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Education of Respondent: Primary M | SD | N | Secondary M | SD | N | Above Secondary M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.43 | 1.27 | 7 | 2.70 | 1.63 | 244 | 3.11 | 1.65 | 114 | 365 |
| Extr. | 1.86 | 0.38 | 7 | 2.41 | 1.40 | 236 | 2.80 | 1.58 | 111 | 354 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.86 | 1.77 | 7 | 3.74 | 1.51 | 246 | 4.13 | 1.54 | 122 | 375 |
| Interpers. | 3.51 | 0.98 | 7 | 3.27 | 1.74 | 241 | 3.59 | 1.67 | 120 | 368 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.00 | 1.16 | 7 | 2.16 | 1.46 | 234 | 2.57 | 1.48 | 120 | 361 |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Education of Respondent: Primary M | SD | N | Secondary M | SD | N | Above Secondary M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.30 | 1.70 | 134 | 3.08 | 1.70 | 65 | 3.18 | 2.14 | 63 | 262 |
| Extr. | 4.11 | 1.61 | 161 | 4.64 | 1.76 | 67 | 4.44 | 1.68 | 59 | 287 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.70 | 1.30 | 184 | 2.81 | 1.32 | 75 | 3.12 | 1.42 | 74 | 333 |
| Interpers. | 1.65 | 1.34 | 173 | 1.89 | 1.39 | 73 | 2.09 | 1.53 | 70 | 316 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.95 | 1.34 | 176 | 3.00 | 1.53 | 67 | 3.20 | 1.41 | 66 | 309 |

Table 3F: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Education of Respondent: Primary M | SD | N | Secondary M | SD | N | Above Secondary M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.26 | 1.88 | 109 | 3.66 | 2.01 | 117 | 3.60 | 2.08 | 124 | 350 | | | |
| Extr. | 5.91 | 1.73 | 105 | 5.39 | 2.07 | 111 | 5.63 | 1.98 | 120 | 336 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.05 | 1.63 | 111 | 2.78 | 1.58 | 117 | 2.42 | 1.37 | 122 | 350 | 5.11 | 2 | <.01 |
| Interpers. | 1.70 | 1.27 | 112 | 1.96 | 1.35 | 114 | 1.63 | 1.07 | 123 | 349 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.25 | 1.44 | 112 | 3.07 | 1.45 | 116 | 3.07 | 1.63 | 123 | 351 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Education of Respondent: Primary M | SD | N | Secondary M | SD | N | Above Secondary M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.62 | 1.94 | 237 | 3.79 | 1.97 | 58 | 3.67 | 2.01 | 72 | 367 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.65 | 1.56 | 214 | 3.73 | 1.81 | 48 | 4.81 | 1.96 | 47 | 309 | 9.49 | 2 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.05 | 1.73 | 256 | 3.92 | 1.54 | 59 | 4.04 | 1.66 | 79 | 394 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.05 | 1.41 | 253 | 1.83 | 1.25 | 59 | 2.09 | 1.66 | 80 | 392 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.15 | 1.55 | 256 | 2.80 | 1.30 | 59 | 3.30 | 1.53 | 78 | 393 | | | |

Table 3F: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Education of Respondent: Primary M | Primary SD | Primary N | Secondary | Above Secondary | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.24 | 1.76 | 364 | (No data available) | | 364 |
| Extr. | 3.38 | 1.68 | 339 | | | 339 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.54 | 1.51 | 381 | | | 381 |
| Interpers. | 1.58 | 1.34 | 377 | | | 377 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.60 | 1.45 | 375 | | | 375 |

Hypothesis 7 predicts that general satisfaction with teaching should increase with length of service. This prediction receives support in all countries except Belgium (Table 3G: 1) where we find a curvilinear effect with medium service teachers the least satisfied. The second prediction was that teachers with short service would be more discontent with self-expression than other types of teachers. This receives partial support in that relative to teachers with long service they are more dissatisfied but medium service teachers are the least satisfied of all. The final prediction was that dissatisfaction with social appreciation would show an increase with length of service. Instead long service teachers show the most satisfaction while the other two are about evenly divided.

Table 3G: 1 to 7. Relationship of Length of Service to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Length of Service: Short (up to 10yrs.) Mean | SD | N | Medium (11 to 30yrs.) Mean | SD | N | Long (over 31 yrs) Mean | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.85 | 1.78 | 47 | 3.34 | 1.66 | 79 | 2.78 | 1.72 | 27 | 153 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.10 | 1.63 | 41 | 4.55 | 1.84 | 84 | 3.87 | 1.69 | 23 | 148 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.59 | 1.29 | 58 | 2.78 | 1.51 | 104 | 2.03 | 1.48 | 29 | 191 | 3.05 | 2 | <.05 |
| Interpers. | 1.33 | 1.03 | 51 | 1.52 | 1.38 | 95 | 0.93 | 1.04 | 27 | 173 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.28 | 1.57 | 53 | 3.81 | 1.56 | 94 | 2.52 | 1.18 | 29 | 176 | 8.50 | 2 | <.01 |

2. England (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Length of Service: Short (up to 10yrs) M | SD | N | Medium (11 to 30yrs) M | SD | N | Long (over 31 yrs) M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.26 | 2.07 | 74 | 2.93 | 2.11 | 93 | 2.92 | 2.00 | 26 | 193 |
| Extr. | 4.17 | 2.04 | 53 | 3.96 | 1.88 | 69 | 4.29 | 2.15 | 21 | 143 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.32 | 1.99 | 76 | 2.78 | 1.48 | 97 | 2.69 | 1.83 | 26 | 199 |
| Interpers. | 1.71 | 1.47 | 75 | 1.53 | 1.56 | 98 | 1.58 | 1.82 | 26 | 199 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.09 | 1.64 | 75 | 2.89 | 1.79 | 96 | 3.23 | 1.88 | 26 | 197 |

Table 3G: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Length of Service: Short (up to 10yrs) M | SD | N | Medium (11 to 30yrs) M | SD | N | Long (over 31 yrs) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.24 | 1.63 | 178 | 2.50 | 1.55 | 154 | 2.14 | 1.47 | 43 | 375 | 13.32 | 2 | <.01 |
| Extr. | 2.58 | 1.43 | 175 | 2.60 | 1.45 | 148 | 2.32 | 1.74 | 41 | 364 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.97 | 1.51 | 185 | 3.85 | 1.54 | 158 | 3.70 | 1.61 | 43 | 386 | | | |
| Interpers. | 3.71 | 1.69 | 182 | 3.19 | 1.70 | 153 | 2.69 | 1.68 | 42 | 377 | 7.91 | 2 | <.01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.45 | 1.55 | 179 | 2.19 | 1.36 | 151 | 2.10 | 1.64 | 41 | 371 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Length of Service: Short (up to 10yrs) M | SD | N | Medium (11 to 30yrs) M | SD | N | Long (over 31 yrs) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.13 | 1.93 | 79 | 3.45 | 1.78 | 143 | 2.63 | 1.61 | 41 | 263 | 3.42 | 2 | <.05 |
| Extr. | 4.36 | 1.81 | 76 | 4.42 | 1.54 | 165 | 3.75 | 1.78 | 47 | 288 | 3.11 | 2 | <.05 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.81 | 1.41 | 90 | 2.91 | 1.35 | 194 | 2.58 | 1.23 | 52 | 336 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.93 | 1.41 | 87 | 1.81 | 1.40 | 183 | 1.53 | 1.36 | 49 | 319 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.19 | 1.56 | 81 | 3.10 | 1.34 | 178 | 2.42 | 1.18 | 52 | 311 | 5.74 | 2 | <.01 |

Table 3G: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| | Length of Service | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Short(up to 10yrs) | | | Medium(11 to 30yrs) | | | Long(over 31 yrs) | | | Total | | |
| Type of Satisfaction | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | N | F | d.f. p. |
| Self-Expr. | 3.49 | 1.94 | 102 | 3.76 | 2.06 | 158 | 3.13 | 1.91 | 95 | 355 | 3.02 | 2 <.05 |
| Extr. | 5.84 | 1.96 | 96 | 5.63 | 1.94 | 155 | 5.48 | 1.92 | 90 | 341 | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.83 | 1.53 | 101 | 2.52 | 1.46 | 158 | 3.02 | 1.64 | 96 | 355 | 3.40 | 2 <.05 |
| Interpers. | 1.84 | 1.37 | 102 | 1.72 | 1.22 | 155 | 1.71 | 1.11 | 97 | 354 | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.13 | 1.57 | 102 | 3.21 | 1.48 | 157 | 2.99 | 1.52 | 97 | 356 | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| | Length of Service | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Short (up to 10yrs) | | | Medium(11 to 30yrs) | | | Long(over 31yrs) | | | Total | | |
| Type of Satisfaction | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | N | F | d.f. p. |
| Self-Expr. | 3.97 | 1.90 | 151 | 3.53 | 1.98 | 153 | 3.22 | 1.91 | 63 | 367 | 3.85 | 2 <.05 |
| Extr. | 3.70 | 1.76 | 134 | 4.01 | 1.62 | 118 | 3.79 | 1.81 | 57 | 309 | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.87 | 1.59 | 165 | 4.25 | 1.73 | 158 | 3.89 | 1.76 | 71 | 394 | | |
| Interpers. | 2.13 | 1.49 | 167 | 1.96 | 1.45 | 158 | 1.90 | 1.26 | 67 | 392 | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.17 | 1.41 | 168 | 3.27 | 1.58 | 158 | 2.69 | 1.54 | 67 | 393 | 3.61 | 2 <.05 |

Table 3G: 1 to 7. (continued)

Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | Length of Service: Short (up to 10yrs) M | SD | N | Medium (11 to 30yrs) M | SD | N | Long (over 31 yrs) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.11 | 1.71 | 109 | 3.39 | 1.84 | 177 | 3.01 | 1.67 | 86 | 372 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.47 | 1.69 | 100 | 3.38 | 1.66 | 164 | 3.20 | 1.70 | 80 | 344 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.75 | 1.53 | 111 | 2.42 | 1.53 | 184 | 2.47 | 1.47 | 94 | 389 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.70 | 1.29 | 112 | 1.62 | 1.39 | 183 | 1.36 | 1.23 | 89 | 384 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.62 | 1.42 | 111 | 2.74 | 1.48 | 179 | 2.27 | 1.39 | 92 | 382 | 3.27 | 2 | $< .05$ |

Hypothesis 8 predicts that in general the smaller the class the happier the teacher and that teachers of small classes will be particularly satisfied with pupil behavior and with extrinsic features of their work role. Belgium, England and Sweden do not have enough cases in the "large class" category for us to draw definitive conclusions across nations. Our statements will instead be confined to the remaining four countries for which there are enough cases (Tables 3H: 1 to 7).

The general hypothesis is partially supported in Germany and the Netherlands, reversed in France and inconclusive in Norway. The prediction on pupil behavior is supported in Germany and the Netherlands but not confirmed elsewhere. The prediction on extrinsic satisfaction is not supported anywhere. Despite the lack of clear-cut support for the predictions it should be noted that where the differences are statistically significant they are in the dimensions specified in the hypothesis.

Table 3H: 1 to 7. Relationships of Size of Class to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium* (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Size of Class: Small (up to 20) Mean | SD | N | Medium (21 to 40) Mean | SD | N | Large (over 40) Mean | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.02 | 1.79 | 53 | 3.16 | 1.67 | 100 | - | - | - | 153 |
| Extr. | 4.09 | 1.58 | 54 | 4.41 | 1.86 | 93 | 6.00 | 1.41 | 2 | 149 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.53 | 1.38 | 70 | 2.67 | 1.47 | 118 | 2.33 | 2.52 | 3 | 191 |
| Interpers. | 1.59 | 1.11 | 58 | 1.30 | 1.32 | 112 | 0.67 | 0.58 | 3 | 173 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.57 | 1.70 | 62 | 3.38 | 1.50 | 112 | 2.50 | 2.12 | 2 | 176 |

* Data not used because too few cases in "large class" sample.

2. England* (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Size of Class: Small (up to 20) M | SD | N | Medium (21 to 40) M | SD | N | Large (over 40) M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.24 | 1.90 | 45 | 3.04 | 2.15 | 138 | 2.50 | 1.73 | 4 | 187 |
| Extr. | 4.31 | 1.88 | 36 | 4.13 | 1.98 | 99 | 2.00 | 1.41 | 2 | 137 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.72 | 1.66 | 47 | 3.02 | 1.78 | 141 | 3.40 | 1.95 | 5 | 193 |
| Interpers. | 1.64 | 1.61 | 47 | 1.56 | 1.54 | 141 | 2.20 | 0.84 | 5 | 193 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.98 | 1.71 | 46 | 3.03 | 1.77 | 140 | 3.00 | 1.58 | 5 | 191 |

* Data not used because too few cases in "large class" sample.

Table 3H: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

| Type of Satisfaction | Size of Class: Small(up to 20) M | SD | N | Medium(21 to 40) M | SD | N | Large(over 40) M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.84 | 1.87 | 32 | 2.86 | 1.59 | 272 | 2.59 | 1.61 | 69 | 373 |
| Extr. | 2.70 | 1.56 | 30 | 2.62 | 1.43 | 266 | 2.20 | 1.46 | 66 | 362 |
| Pup. Beh. | 4.00 | 1.48 | 34 | 3.95 | 1.52 | 282 | 3.57 | 1.57 | 68 | 384 |
| Interpers. | 3.47 | 2.05 | 32 | 3.38 | 1.68 | 276 | 3.32 | 1.69 | 68 | 376 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.15 | 1.37 | 33 | 2.33 | 1.48 | 276 | 2.18 | 1.55 | 62 | 371 |

4. Germany (N=365)

| Type of Satisfaction | Size of Class: Small(up to 20) M | SD | N | Medium(21 to 40) M | SD | N | Large(over 40) M | SD | N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.30 | 1.70 | 134 | 3.08 | 1.70 | 65 | 3.18 | 2.14 | 63 | 262 |
| Extr. | 4.11 | 1.61 | 161 | 4.64 | 1.76 | 67 | 4.44 | 1.68 | 59 | 287 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.70 | 1.30 | 184 | 2.81 | 1.32 | 75 | 3.12 | 1.42 | 74 | 333 |
| Interpers. | 1.65 | 1.34 | 173 | 1.89 | 1.39 | 73 | 2.09 | 1.53 | 70 | 316 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.95 | 1.34 | 176 | 3.00 | 1.53 | 67 | 3.20 | 1.41 | 66 | 309 |

Table 3H: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Small(up to 20) M | SD | N | Medium(21 to 40) M | SD | N | Large(over 40) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.64 | 1.80 | 11 | 3.62 | 2.03 | 181 | 3.45 | 1.97 | 163 | 355 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.30 | 3.09 | 10 | 5.44 | 2.00 | 171 | 5.96 | 1.72 | 158 | 341 | 5.64 | 2 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 1.82 | 0.98 | 11 | 2.62 | 1.44 | 180 | 2.94 | 1.67 | 164 | 355 | 3.87 | 2 | <.05 |
| Interpers. | 1.10 | 0.88 | 10 | 1.69 | 1.08 | 180 | 1.85 | 1.39 | 164 | 354 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.18 | 1.47 | 11 | 3.09 | 1.51 | 181 | 3.23 | 1.51 | 164 | 356 | | | |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | Small(up to 20) M | SD | N | Medium(21 to 40) M | SD | N | Large(over 40) M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.62 | 2.21 | 60 | 3.59 | 1.86 | 217 | 3.89 | 1.98 | 89 | 366 | | | |
| Extr. | 4.50 | 1.87 | 44 | 3.91 | 1.67 | 182 | 3.34 | 1.58 | 82 | 308 | 7.21 | 2 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.64 | 1.51 | 64 | 4.16 | 1.73 | 232 | 4.01 | 1.65 | 97 | 393 | | | |
| Interpers. | 2.03 | 1.63 | 65 | 1.97 | 1.32 | 230 | 2.16 | 1.57 | 96 | 391 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.09 | 1.58 | 64 | 3.10 | 1.50 | 231 | 3.23 | 1.49 | 97 | 392 | | | |

Table 3H: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| | Size of Class | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Small(up to 20) | | | Medium(21 to 40) | | | Large(over 40) | | | | | |
| Type of Satisfaction | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | Total N | F | d.f. p. |
| Self-Expr. | 3.12 | 1.64 | 131 | 3.27 | 1.83 | 242 | | | | 373 | | |
| Extr. | 2.76 | 1.45 | 127 | 3.72 | 1.69 | 218 | | | | 345 | 28.84 | 1 <.001 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.23 | 1.41 | 140 | 2.70 | 1.55 | 250 | (This category not | | | 390 | 8.69 | 1 <.01 |
| Interpers. | 1.53 | 1.18 | 136 | 1.60 | 1.41 | 249 | applicable to Sweden) | | | 385 | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.33 | 1.41 | 138 | 2.74 | 1.46 | 245 | | | | 383 | 7.25 | 1 <.01 |

Hypothesis 9 predicts that satisfaction with the job should increase as we move up the salary scale. As (Tables 3I: 1 to 7) indicate the scales are not comparable across nations. The results can only be analyzed by country. Also in five of the countries the last one to three steps have less than 10 persons thus making meaningful analysis difficult. A closer look at the results reveals no simple or clear patterns of satisfaction for or against the hypothesis.

Table 3I: 1 to 7. Relationship of Salary* to Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (8)

| Type of Satisfaction | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 2.27 | 2.81 | 3.38 | 3.00 | 3.18 | 3.75 | 4.17 | 3.50 | |
| | SD | 1.44 | 1.75 | 1.74 | 1.70 | 1.65 | 2.55 | 1.17 | 0.71 | |
| | N | 15 | 21 | 32 | 40 | 22 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 146 |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 3.00 | 4.00 | 4.66 | 4.04 | 4.91 | 5.14 | 4.67 | 5.00 | |
| | SD | 1.58 | 1.62 | 1.88 | 1.74 | 1.51 | 2.41 | 1.97 | 1.00 | |
| | N | 5 | 20 | 32 | 46 | 21 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 140 |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 2.55 | 2.68 | 2.35 | 2.77 | 2.50 | 1.90 | 3.83 | 2.00 | |
| | SD | 1.77 | 1.11 | 1.46 | 1.58 | 1.59 | 0.99 | 1.17 | 0.00 | |
| | N | 22 | 25 | 37 | 51 | 24 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 178 |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 1.05 | 1.27 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.38 | 0.63 | 2.17 | 0.67 | |
| | SD | 1.15 | 1.08 | 1.50 | 1.05 | 1.58 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 1.16 | |
| | N | 20 | 22 | 35 | 43 | 24 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 161 |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 2.40 | 3.30 | 3.32 | 3.43 | 3.40 | 4.44 | 4.50 | 3.67 | |
| | SD | 1.35 | 1.74 | 1.54 | 1.56 | 1.32 | 1.24 | 1.98 | 2.08 | |
| | N | 15 | 23 | 38 | 49 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 168 |

* 1

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

2. England (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | | Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (8) 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 2.38 | 3.04 | 2.96 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 6.00 | 3.00 | |
| | SD | 2.13 | 2.01 | 2.13 | 1.99 | 2.06 | 1.41 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | N | 29 | 26 | 56 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 185 |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 3.60 | 3.72 | 3.87 | 4.61 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.50 | 3.00 | |
| | SD | 1.60 | 1.57 | 2.14 | 1.97 | 2.12 | 2.36 | 0.71 | 0.0 | |
| | N | 15 | 18 | 39 | 33 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 135 |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 3.03 | 2.64 | 3.36 | 2.88 | 2.88 | 3.20 | 4.50 | 1.00 | |
| | SD | 1.99 | 1.73 | 1.89 | 1.52 | 1.62 | 0.84 | 0.71 | 1.41 | |
| | N | 31 | 28 | 56 | 40 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 189 |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 1.27 | 1.25 | 1.64 | 1.83 | 1.72 | 2.40 | 3.00 | 1.00 | |
| | SD | 1.44 | 1.48 | 1.54 | 1.58 | 1.51 | 0.89 | 2.83 | 1.41 | |
| | N | 30 | 28 | 56 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 189 |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 2.83 | 2.64 | 3.05 | 3.50 | 2.88 | 3.20 | 4.00 | 2.00 | |
| | SD | 1.62 | 1.55 | 1.81 | 1.81 | 1.75 | 0.84 | 2.83 | 0.0 | |
| | N | 30 | 28 | 56 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 187 |

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (8)

| Type of Satisfaction | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 3.28 | 3.10 | 2.45 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.78 | 2.20 | 1.80 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.53 | 1.67 | 1.56 | 1.63 | 1.68 | 1.70 | 1.30 | 1.92 | | | | |
| | N | 47 | 79 | 83 | 71 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 5 | 357 | | | |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 2.57 | 2.42 | 2.41 | 2.58 | 2.67 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 1.25 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.28 | 1.26 | 1.53 | 1.48 | 1.36 | 1.98 | 2.05 | 0.50 | | | | |
| | N | 46 | 77 | 76 | 71 | 43 | 25 | 5 | 4 | 347 | | | |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 3.59 | 3.47 | 3.82 | 4.35 | 4.13 | 4.46 | 3.60 | 4.20 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.47 | 1.49 | 1.55 | 1.23 | 1.74 | 1.60 | 0.55 | 1.92 | | 2.98 | 7 | < .01 |
| | N | 49 | 79 | 84 | 71 | 45 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 366 | | | |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 3.55 | 3.29 | 3.40 | 3.41 | 3.42 | 3.71 | 2.60 | 2.00 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.76 | 1.79 | 1.78 | 1.45 | 1.79 | 1.65 | 1.52 | 1.58 | | | | |
| | N | 49 | 77 | 83 | 68 | 45 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 360 | | | |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 2.78 | 2.03 | 2.19 | 2.16 | 2.29 | 2.57 | 2.00 | 2.20 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.61 | 1.46 | 1.39 | 1.39 | 1.52 | 1.55 | 0.71 | 1.92 | | | | |
| | N | 45 | 76 | 80 | 73 | 42 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 354 | | | |

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

4. Germany (N=365)

Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (7)

| Type of Satisfaction | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 3.00 | 3.41 | 3.30 | 3.50 | 2.20 | 1.67 | 2.77 | | | | |
| | SD | 2.18 | 1.66 | 1.58 | 2.07 | 2.28 | 2.08 | 1.88 | | | | |
| | N | 53 | 90 | 78 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 260 | | | |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 4.15 | 4.47 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.20 | 3.60 | 2.75 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.87 | 1.44 | 1.75 | 2.01 | 1.48 | 1.14 | 2.06 | | | | |
| | N | 47 | 110 | 93 | 23 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 287 | | | |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 3.16 | 2.69 | 2.77 | 2.96 | 3.20 | 2.20 | 2.79 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.66 | 1.14 | 1.30 | 1.55 | 1.30 | 0.45 | 1.62 | | | | |
| | N | 63 | 118 | 97 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 331 | | | |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 1.49 | 1.94 | 1.69 | 2.46 | 3.40 | 2.60 | 1.17 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.32 | 1.45 | 1.22 | 1.64 | 0.89 | 1.52 | 1.34 | | 3.86 | 6 | < .01 |
| | N | 63 | 105 | 96 | 24 | 5 | 5 | 18 | 316 | | | |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 2.73 | 3.32 | 2.97 | 2.91 | 3.40 | 3.33 | 2.13 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.27 | 1.46 | 1.40 | 1.38 | 1.34 | 0.58 | 1.19 | | 2.45 | 6 | < .05 |
| | N | 60 | 109 | 93 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 307 | | | |

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | | Salary Scale Range: Lowest (2) to Highest (8) 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 2.88 | 3.61 | 3.52 | 3.56 | |
| | SD | 2.03 | 1.92 | 1.97 | 2.12 | |
| | N | 8 | 77 | 166 | 100 | 351 |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 5.11 | 5.70 | 5.76 | 5.50 | |
| | SD | 2.76 | 1.97 | 1.85 | 1.96 | |
| | N | 9 | 70 | 162 | 97 | 338 |
| Pupil | Mean | 3.11 | 2.58 | 2.93 | 2.55 | |
| | SD | 1.45 | 1.68 | 1.55 | 1.49 | |
| | N | 9 | 76 | 166 | 100 | 351 |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 1.89 | 2.07 | 1.71 | 1.62 | |
| | SD | 1.17 | 1.51 | 1.21 | 1.00 | |
| | N | 9 | 75 | 165 | 101 | 350 |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 3.00 | 2.95 | 3.26 | 3.10 | |
| | SD | 1.58 | 1.63 | 1.51 | 1.42 | |
| | N | 2 | 75 | 167 | 101 | 352 |

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

6. Norway (N=400)

Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (9)

| Type of Satisfaction | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 4.16 | 4.14 | 3.42 | 3.88 | 3.67 | 3.05 | 3.67 | 3.56 | 2.00 | | | | |
| | SD | 2.08 | 2.00 | 1.87 | 1.80 | 1.96 | 1.73 | 1.81 | 2.56 | 1.41 | | | | |
| | N | 31 | 37 | 77 | 68 | 70 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 2 | 358 | | | |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 3.11 | 3.61 | 3.44 | 4.18 | 3.92 | 3.18 | 4.77 | 5.52 | 2.00 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.65 | 1.73 | 1.46 | 1.64 | 1.56 | 1.67 | 1.64 | 1.99 | 0.00 | | 5.88 | 8 | <.01 |
| | N | 27 | 33 | 69 | 57 | 64 | 17 | 13 | 21 | 3 | 304 | | | |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 3.84 | 3.13 | 4.28 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 3.96 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 2.33 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.76 | 1.60 | 1.63 | 1.79 | 1.46 | 1.68 | 1.61 | 1.83 | 0.58 | | 2.54 | 8 | <.01 |
| | N | 32 | 40 | 83 | 72 | 73 | 24 | 25 | 31 | 3 | 383 | | | |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 2.71 | 1.83 | 1.86 | 2.13 | 1.95 | 2.12 | 1.72 | 2.45 | 1.33 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.55 | 1.63 | 1.11 | 1.49 | 1.33 | 1.67 | 1.14 | 1.82 | 1.56 | | | | |
| | N | 31 | 40 | 83 | 72 | 73 | 25 | 25 | 29 | 3 | 381 | | | |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 3.28 | 2.98 | 3.27 | 3.07 | 3.00 | 3.16 | 3.35 | 3.38 | 3.00 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.59 | 1.54 | 1.43 | 1.59 | 1.47 | 1.34 | 1.27 | 1.74 | 0.00 | | | | |
| | N | 32 | 40 | 82 | 72 | 76 | 25 | 23 | 29 | 2 | 381 | | | |

Table 3I: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

| Type of Satisfaction | | Salary Scale Range: Lowest (1) to Highest (8) 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 | | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expression | Mean | 2.55 | 3.09 | 3.19 | 3.96 | 3.16 | | 3.81 | 4 | <.01 |
| | SD | 1.72 | 1.69 | 1.67 | 1.96 | 1.72 | | | | |
| | N | 29 | 131 | 114 | 55 | 37 | 366 | | | |
| Extrinsic | Mean | 2.23 | 3.00 | 3.44 | 4.28 | 4.03 | | 10.52 | | |
| | SD | 0.77 | 1.56 | 1.73 | 1.71 | 1.36 | | | | |
| | N | 26 | 125 | 108 | 46 | 34 | 339 | | | |
| Pupil Behavior | Mean | 2.21 | 2.47 | 2.67 | 2.42 | 2.43 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.56 | 1.55 | 1.53 | 1.13 | 1.52 | | | | |
| | N | 33 | 139 | 116 | 55 | 40 | 383 | | | |
| Inter-personal | Mean | 1.48 | 1.73 | 1.55 | 1.56 | 1.24 | | | | |
| | SD | 1.53 | 1.37 | 1.18 | 1.34 | 1.48 | | | | |
| | N | 31 | 139 | 116 | 54 | 38 | 378 | | | |
| Social Appreciation | Mean | 2.09 | 2.45 | 2.56 | 3.24 | 2.75 | | 4.26 | 4 | <.01 |
| | SD | 1.09 | 1.54 | 1.34 | 1.33 | 1.61 | | | | |
| | N | 32 | 136 | 115 | 54 | 40 | 377 | | | |

Hypothesis 10 predicts dissatisfaction with the job should increase from Low Fs toward High Fs especially on the dimensions of extrinsic factors, social appreciation and pupil behavior. As we see on (Tables 3J: 1 to 7) this prediction is consistently supported in France, Norway and Sweden. The results in the other four countries are in the same direction but will not be used for analysis because of the very small number of cases in the category of High Fs.

Table 3J: 1 to 7. Relationship of the F Scale with Five Factors of Job Satisfaction in Seven West European Countries.

1. Belgium (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | F Scale: Low Mean | Low SD | Low N | Medium Mean | Medium SD | Medium N | High Mean | High SD | High N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.00 | 1.60 | 45 | 3.08 | 1.77 | 106 | 4.50 | 1.00 | 4 | 155 |
| Extr. | 4.05 | 1.78 | 42 | 4.38 | 1.75 | 105 | 5.67 | 1.16 | 3 | 150 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.36 | 1.37 | 53 | 2.67 | 1.43 | 135 | 3.20 | 2.39 | 5 | 193 |
| Interpers. | 1.31 | 1.16 | 49 | 1.37 | 1.29 | 121 | 2.40 | 0.89 | 5 | 175 |
| Soc. Appre. | 3.27 | 1.62 | 48 | 3.44 | 1.55 | 125 | 4.80 | 1.10 | 5 | 178 |

2. England (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | F Scale: Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 1.97 | 1.65 | 36 | 3.25 | 2.06 | 150 | 4.43 | 2.51 | 7 | 193 | 7.55 | 2 | <.01 |
| Extr. | 3.17 | 2.19 | 23 | 4.19 | 1.88 | 115 | 5.80 | 1.48 | 5 | 143 | 4.76 | 2 | <.01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.69 | 1.79 | 36 | 3.05 | 1.75 | 157 | 2.83 | 1.72 | 6 | 199 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.44 | 1.84 | 36 | 1.64 | 1.52 | 156 | 1.71 | 0.76 | 7 | 199 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.25 | 1.68 | 36 | 3.16 | 1.70 | 154 | 3.57 | 2.15 | 7 | 197 | 4.54 | 2 | <.05 |

Table 3J: 1 to 7. (continued)

3. France (N=410)

F Scale

| Type of Satisfaction | Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.29 | 1.95 | 31 | 2.82 | 1.59 | 316 | 3.07 | 1.60 | 30 | 377 | | | |
| Extr. | 2.10 | 1.30 | 31 | 2.54 | 1.46 | 302 | 2.81 | 1.36 | 32 | 365 | | | |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.97 | 1.80 | 31 | 3.98 | 1.50 | 323 | 4.06 | 1.27 | 33 | 387 | 6.50 | 2 | < .01 |
| Interpers. | 2.36 | 1.84 | 31 | 3.45 | 1.68 | 317 | 3.73 | 1.62 | 30 | 378 | 6.65 | 2 | < .01 |
| Soc. Appre. | 1.84 | 1.78 | 32 | 2.29 | 1.45 | 308 | 2.72 | 1.42 | 32 | 372 | | | |

4. Germany (N=365)

F Scale

| Type of Satisfaction | Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.17 | 1.91 | 48 | 3.23 | 1.76 | 209 | 3.80 | 3.03 | 5 | 262 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.80 | 1.39 | 44 | 4.37 | 1.68 | 233 | 5.56 | 1.81 | 9 | 286 | 4.88 | 2 | < .01 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.85 | 1.61 | 60 | 2.84 | 1.28 | 263 | 2.30 | 1.57 | 10 | 333 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.38 | 1.21 | 60 | 1.91 | 1.41 | 250 | 1.88 | 1.81 | 8 | 318 | 3.42 | 2 | < .05 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.56 | 1.10 | 57 | 3.10 | 1.43 | 243 | 3.20 | 1.75 | 10 | 310 | 3.62 | 2 | < .05 |

Table 3J: 1 to 7. (continued)

5. Netherlands (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | F Scale: Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 3.35 | 2.10 | 84 | 3.57 | 1.98 | 265 | 3.20 | 1.79 | 5 | 354 |
| Extr. | 5.49 | 1.92 | 83 | 5.59 | 1.94 | 252 | 6.20 | 2.49 | 5 | 340 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.99 | 1.71 | 83 | 2.68 | 1.51 | 265 | 2.50 | 0.84 | 6 | 354 |
| Interpers. | 1.70 | 1.90 | 86 | 1.75 | 1.21 | 261 | 2.50 | 2.59 | 6 | 353 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.92 | 1.65 | 86 | 3.20 | 1.47 | 264 | 3.00 | 1.41 | 5 | 355 |

6. Norway (N=400)

| Type of Satisfaction | F Scale: Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.50 | 2.20 | 28 | 3.67 | 1.95 | 318 | 3.68 | 1.83 | 19 | 365 |
| Extr. | 3.14 | 1.67 | 28 | 3.88 | 1.71 | 266 | 4.27 | 1.71 | 15 | 309 |
| Pup. Beh. | 3.77 | 1.96 | 31 | 4.06 | 1.67 | 341 | 3.95 | 1.54 | 20 | 392 |
| Interpers. | 1.94 | 1.32 | 31 | 1.99 | 1.44 | 339 | 2.45 | 1.28 | 20 | 390 |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.94 | 1.67 | 31 | 3.12 | 1.52 | 340 | 3.55 | 1.15 | 20 | 391 |

Table 3J: 1 to 7. (continued)

7. Sweden (N=443)

F Scale

| Type of Satisfaction | Low M | Low SD | Low N | Medium M | Medium SD | Medium N | High M | High SD | High N | Total N | F | d.f. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Expr. | 2.20 | 1.32 | 10 | 3.24 | 1.74 | 308 | 3.35 | 1.94 | 54 | 372 | | | |
| Extr. | 3.50 | 1.08 | 10 | 3.26 | 1.61 | 284 | 3.92 | 2.20 | 50 | 344 | 3.34 | 2 | <.05 |
| Pup. Beh. | 2.31 | 1.32 | 13 | 2.58 | 1.50 | 320 | 2.29 | 1.65 | 56 | 389 | | | |
| Interpers. | 1.15 | 1.07 | 13 | 1.59 | 1.33 | 318 | 1.59 | 1.41 | 54 | 385 | | | |
| Soc. Appre. | 2.17 | 1.12 | 12 | 2.58 | 1.40 | 315 | 2.75 | 1.77 | 55 | 382 | | | |

# CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In the last chapter we pointed out some patterns of satisfaction and discontent in the teacher role across the seven nations of Western Europe sampled in the OCSR study. The ten hypotheses made predictions about general job satisfaction and satisfaction with specific aspects of the job. The findings were in general support of these hypotheses. Women reported greater general satisfaction than men (H-2); teachers in private schools were more satisfied than their colleagues in public schools (H-3); satisfaction was found to increase with length of service (H-7); and general satisfaction was found to decrease with increase in authoritarianism (H-10). Partial support was found for the prediction that secondary teachers are more satisfied than primary teachers (H-1); it was found to be partially true that satisfaction with teaching increases with age (H-5); and that teachers of small classes are more content than teachers of medium size or large classes (H-8). Almost completely contradicted was the hypothesis that married teachers are generally more satisfied with teaching than single teachers (H-4); and that satisfaction should increase with higher education (H-6). The effects of salary upon general satisfaction remain equivocal (H-9).

It could be that where our hypotheses were supported our original assumptions were right and that where they were partially supported or

even completely refuted our assumptions were wrong or there could be important factors at work in each nation to explain these results better. For this reason we shall now turn to a discussion of what these factors might be by focussing upon our predictions in the five areas of job satisfaction.

In H-1 only partial support was found for the prediction that secondary teachers will show greater satisfaction with self-expression, extrinsic factors, and social appreciation. The differences assumed the effect of the Gurin et al. status-satisfaction relation to operate. This was found to be so for self-expression in Belgium, Germany and Norway but not for the other two factors, and the relationships for the three factors showed in clear patterns in all other countries. These results are consistent with the findings in H-6 which show that contrary to expectation dissatisfaction increased with higher education. Could it be that amount of education and job level are not adequate criteria for differentiating satisfaction in the teacher role? It may also be that the questionnaire items used were much too broad to get at the subtle differences in perception of discontent among the types of teachers interviewed. (Tables 2; 3A and 3F).

The predictions for H-2 for greater satisfaction among women than men was strongly supported in all nations except for social appreciation. Women are less dissatisfied with social appreciation than was expected. This could be because the professional status accorded them outweighs the generally low status accorded them outside of the job. It may also be due to the fact that in coming to the job they do not expect a high status or that teaching provides an alternative to staying home and is a source of needed income to supplement family earnings. Without

additional research evidence it is difficult to say what differential effects each or several of these factors have on how women teachers perceive or experience social appreciation in these countries. (Tables 2; 3B).

In H-3 we relate satisfaction to teaching in private and public schools and find teachers in private schools more satisfied than their colleagues in public schools. This is especially true of social appreciation and extrinsic satisfaction in Belgium, England, and Germany but not in Norway (Tables 3C: 1 to 7). The lack of data for teachers in private schools in the remaining countries excludes them from analysis. The fact that in Norway the school system is state oriented may mean that its teachers are given a social status and good pay adequate enough to make it a more attractive place to teach than private schools. This interpretation would probably have received better support if we had had comparative evidence from other state-supported school systems like Sweden.

Hypothesis 4 deals with satisfaction between married and single teachers and finds little support to assume that married teachers should be more satisfied than the unmarried. It does find married teachers more unhappy with extrinsic satisfaction but not with social appreciation as predicted. Apparently Gurin et al. are right in contending that happiness in marriage does not automatically carry over into the job situation. But our assumption that promotion and good pay are important concerns for married people with family responsibilities is confirmed in all countries (Tables 3D: 1 to 7). It may also be that the enhanced social status which comes with marriage compensates for the lack of social status in the job, and hence the lack of support

for the prediction that married people should exhibit greater discontent over social appreciation in teaching.

In H-5 there is support for old teachers being the most satisfied with teaching but it does not seem to follow as predicted that satisfaction necessarily increases with age as is evident on (Tables 3E: 1 to 7) where dissatisfaction is about evenly divided between the young and the middle age teachers. It makes sense to assume that young teachers will feel unsure of their career prospects as they "test-out" their hopes for competence and job security. To that extent they should feel dissatisfied. But relative to their investment into the role they might be expected to be happy with pay and present status and the sheer excitement of a new job and great hopes for the future. Similarly middle age teachers are at the cross-roads of life when options for leaving or staying in the job are narrowing. But they at least know what to expect if they stay and one would hope that they have come to identify with the system to an important extent, especially if they find opportunities for the use of their skills and other aspects of the job content (Vroom, 1964, p. 126). For all these reasons both groups have reason to be both happy and apprehensive but for the middle age we might have expected them to be "settling down" and be more accepting of reality than the more idealistic young. Apparently this is not the case with our present evidence but there is enough in the mixed results to suggest the need for further study.

H-7 was strongly supported in its prediction for an increase in satisfaction with length of service. But the evidence for satisfaction with self-expression and social appreciation are mixed. These findings parallel those for age and we would suspect for the same reasons if we

consider the varied effects of age on length of service, marriage, pay, and the education of the respondent (Appendix C). The differential relationships of these factors to each other and of their effects on job satisfaction remain wide open to investigation. Our present results therefore remain tentative. (Tables 3G: 1 to 7).

Disregarding Belgium, England, and Sweden for which we have inadequate evidence (Tables 3H: 1 to 7) the results are inconclusive for H-8 which predicts that satisfaction should increase the smaller the class size. This is true both of general satisfaction and of satisfaction in the five aspects of the job. The general hypothesis is partially supported in Germany and the Nertherlands, refuted in France, and inconclusive in Norway. One reason may be that in all the seven countries large classes with over forty pupils are rare. For this reason our definition of large is not discriminative enough. In addition, the physical facilities and the methods of teaching used are probably adequate to the teaching needs of most teachers so that they have no reason to prefer one size of class to another. Hence the mixed results in the specific areas of prediction.

It is very difficult and hazardous to interpret the results of H-9 which predicts that general and specific satisfactions will increase as we move up the salary scale. As we see from (Tables 3I: 1 to 7) the scales are not comparable and in five of the countries the scales toward the top end have fewer than ten cases. But we can make the general observation that interpersonal relations show the greatest area of satisfaction while the extrinsic factors indicate the area of most dissatisfaction. While the latter relationship finds support in the tables of correlations among satisfaction items and demographic variables

it is difficult to explain the former using these same tables which indicate no relationship between salary and interpersonal relations. Finally, if the original protocols were available, and they are lost, it might be useful to collapse the salary scales so as to make them more comparable and then to see what one might find.

H-10 (Tables 3J: 1 to 7) was consistently confirmed in all respects in France, Norway, and Sweden for which there were enough cases and enough data for comparison. But even where data and cases were deficient support is in the direction and magnitude predicted for both general and specific satisfactions. It might be noted, though, that the items are biased in the direction of High F and this is reflected in the one-sided findings.

## Conclusions

We have attempted to relate one personality variable and nine demographic factors to five dimensions of satisfaction in the teacher role in seven countries of Western Europe. Predictions on general satisfaction were supported in four hypotheses (H-2, 3, 7, and 10); partially supported in three hypotheses (H-1, 5, and 8); refuted in two hypotheses (H-4 and 6); and found equivocal in one hypothesis (H-9). More complex results were found for the predictions in the specific areas of satisfaction and presented in the last chapter where the underlying assumptions for the hypotheses and interpretation of the results were discussed. From these results two broad conclusions and one general implication can be made.

The OCSR study was an example of an early pioneer study in the theory and methodology of cross-national and cross-cultural comparative research. As a consequence its theoretical and operational definitions

were exploratory. This factor is reflected in this analysis which lacks a precise theoretical framework. Satisfaction has therefore been defined in general terms as affective orientations toward teaching or aspects of it. A more stringent definition would be necessary for the African study suggested earlier in the analysis. This is true of operational definitions. The major implication of these shortcomings is that a replication of this study in the developing areas of former colonial Africa would provide an ideal opportunity to test and improve upon the shortcomings found in the present study. It is my hope that this analysis is a first step in that direction. "The worth of the pudding is in the eating."

# APPENDIX A

## CORRELATIONS OF 10 SATISFACTION VARIABLES USED IN THE OCSR STUDY IN SEVEN COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE

Table 1: The 10 Satisfaction Variables used in the OCSR Survey in Seven Western European Countries

Variable No.

33 Opportunity for promotion or advancement

34 Appreciation of your work by parents of the pupils

35 Scope for the full use of your abilities

36 Opportunity to study or practice your favorite subject

37 Pupils' interest in their work

38 Relations with superiors

39 Social standing of the occupation (attitude of people met outside of school)

40 Pupils' response to discipline in the school

41 Salary

42 Degree of cooperation among members of the staff

Correlations of the 10 Satisfaction Variables with Each Other by Country

Table 11: Belgium

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .32* | .26 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .24 | .18 | .52* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .12 | .37* | .20 | .12 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .16 | .16 | .26 | .22 | .28 | | | | | |
| 39 | .26 | .36* | .29 | .27 | .20 | .28 | | | | |
| 40 | -.04 | .15 | .10 | .05 | .32* | .26 | .21 | | | |
| 41 | .41* | .18 | .24 | .19 | .14 | .11 | .37* | .05 | | |
| 42 | .20 | .10 | .22 | .11 | .18 | .35* | .21 | .23 | .08 | - |

* Denotes significance at an arbitrary coefficient of .30 in all tables

Table III: England

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .14 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .30* | .37* | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .10 | .16 | .28 | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .11 | .11 | .24 | .37* | | | | | | |
| 38 | .13 | .09 | .23 | .30* | .41* | | | | | |
| 39 | .16 | .18 | .26 | .18 | .27 | .32* | | | | |
| 40 | .26 | .11 | .15 | .13 | .05 | .03 | .03 | | | |
| 41 | .17 | .17 | .20 | .21 | .19 | .34* | .32* | .02 | | |
| 42 | .19 | .14 | .15 | .30* | .25 | .15 | .12 | .41* | .14 | - |

Table IV: France

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .18 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .30* | .27 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .24 | .29 | .46* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .01 | .22 | .15 | .11 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .23 | .25 | .23 | .22 | .16 | | | | | |
| 39 | .20 | .30* | .16 | .20 | .23 | .33* | | | | |
| 40 | .01 | .18 | .14 | .10 | .37* | .17 | .17 | | | |
| 41 | .38* | .13 | .24 | .12 | .12 | .17 | .31* | .16 | | |
| 42 | .14 | .07 | .17 | .16 | .10 | .33* | .15 | .10 | .10 | |

Table V: Germany

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .04 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .23 | .16 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .07 | .18 | .50* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | -.04 | .35* | .11 | .14 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .17 | .21 | .24 | .16 | .09 | | | | | |
| 39 | .29 | .32* | .22 | .21 | .09 | .24 | | | | |
| 40 | .06 | .37* | .08 | .12 | .39* | .08 | .14 | | | |
| 41 | .51* | .10 | .14 | .05 | -.13 | .13 | .32* | .07 | | |
| 42 | .09 | .09 | .14 | .12 | .02 | .27 | .11 | .01 | .06 | - |

Table VI: Netherlands

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .10 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .37* | .18 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .30* | .26 | .59* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .07 | .31* | .12 | .16 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .15 | .24 | .23 | .25 | .14 | | | | | |
| 39 | .17 | .36* | .22 | .28 | .20 | .14 | | | | |
| 40 | .07 | .25 | .14 | .17 | .43* | .22 | .32* | | | |
| 41 | .39* | .23 | .26 | .26 | .19 | .07 | .30* | .18 | | |
| 42 | .15 | .07 | .24 | .20 | .04 | .35* | .21 | .16 | .12 | - |

Table VII: Norway

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .35* | .28 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .25 | .14 | .39* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .12 | .32* | .14 | .11 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .24 | .23 | .21 | .07 | .24 | | | | | |
| 39 | .32* | .44* | .28 | .17 | .16 | .28 | | | | |
| 40 | .08 | .30* | .10 | .10 | .39* | .29 | .15 | | | |
| 41 | .46* | .20 | .20 | .18 | .05 | .12 | .41* | .02 | | |
| 42 | .11 | .16 | .20 | .10 | .13 | .27 | .10 | .22 | .03 | - |

Table VIII: Sweden

| Var. No./ | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .21 | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | .26 | .23 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | .22 | .16 | .45* | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .08 | .22 | .24 | .15 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .09 | .17 | .20 | .07 | .28 | | | | | |
| 39 | .37* | .43* | .29 | .22 | .22 | .16 | | | | |
| 40 | .11 | .24 | .15 | .11 | .43* | .32* | .21 | | | |
| 41 | .37* | .25 | .25 | .24 | .19 | .11 | .47* | .16 | | |
| 42 | .06 | .22 | .22 | .15 | .12 | .31* | .15 | .07 | .08 | - |

Table IX: Correlations of 10 Satisfaction Items With Each Other:

A Summary of Country Clusters.

| Variable No. | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | Belgium<br>England<br>France<br>Netherlands<br>Norway | England | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Netherlands | | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | Belgium<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway | | England | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | England | England | | | | | |

Table IX: (continued)

| Variable No. | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | Norway<br>Sweden | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | England<br>France | | | | |
| 40 | | Germany | | | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Sweden | Netherlands | | | |
| 41 | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Norway | | | | England | Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | |
| 42 | | | | England | | Belgium<br>France<br>Netherlands<br>Sweden | | England | | |

# APPENDIX B

# FACTOR ANALYSIS MATRIX

# OF

# TEACHER SATISFACTION ITEMS

# BY COUNTRY

## Factor Analysis Matrix of Teacher Satisfaction Items By Country

**Factor No.**

1 Self-expression satisfaction

2 Extrinsic satisfaction

3 Satisfaction with Pupil Behavior

4 Satisfaction with Interpersonal Relations

5 Satisfaction with Social Appreciation

Table I: Belgium

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .16 | .31* | -.21 | .56* | -.51* |
| 34-Appreciat. | .16 | -.04 | .83* | .21 | -.04 |
| 35-Scope | .78* | .21 | -.18 | .15 | -.06 |
| 36-Study | .89* | .03 | -.03 | .12 | .02 |
| 37-Interest | .04 | .22 | -.77* | .01 | .23 |
| 38-Superiors | .24 | .66* | -.14 | .07 | .25 |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | .25 | .10 | -.19 | .66* | .31* |
| 40-Discipl. | -.01 | .25 | -.20 | .11 | .79* |
| 41-Salary | .07 | .01 | -.03 | .87* | -.04 |
| 42-Cooperat. | .03 | .87* | -.03 | .07 | .01 |

* Denotes loadings above an arbitrary .30 all tables

Table II: England

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .01 | .19 | .06 | .13 | -.89* |
| 34-Appreciat. | -.01 | .11 | -.89* | .15 | .04 |
| 35-Scope | .32* | -.02 | -.63* | .08 | -.45* |
| 36-Study | .72* | .24 | -.21 | .05 | .07 |
| 37-Interest | .81* | .04 | -.02 | .14 | -.07 |
| 38-Superiors | .57* | -.04 | .08 | .50* | -.12 |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | .19 | -.04 | -.15 | .67* | -.15 |
| 40-Discip. | -.04 | .81* | -.05 | -.04 | -.26 |
| 41-Salary | .04 | .11 | -.09 | .85* | .01 |
| 42-Cooperat. | .27 | .81* | -.06 | .10 | .04 |

Table III: France

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .30* | -.15 | .72* | .12 | .10 |
| 34-Appreciat. | .37* | .13 | -.04 | -.07 | .73* |
| 35-Scope | .79* | .14 | .25 | .10 | .02 |
| 36-Study | .81* | .02 | .03 | .11 | .18 |
| 37-Interest | .07 | .77* | -.02 | .04 | .21 |
| 38-Superiors | .11 | .06 | .10 | .65* | .44* |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | -.07 | .15 | .31* | .18 | .73* |
| 40-Discipl. | .06 | .83* | .07 | .08 | .02 |
| 41-Salary | .02 | .18 | .86* | .02 | .11 |
| 42-Cooperat. | .12 | .08 | .05 | .88* | .08 |

Table IV: Germany

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .86* | -.02 | -.14 | .10 | .02 |
| 34-Appreciat. | -.06 | -.52* | -.06 | .08 | .63* |
| 35-Scope | .19 | -.06 | -.83* | .14 | .06 |
| 36-Study | -.05 | -.08 | -.86* | .03 | .13 |
| 37-Interest | -.15 | -.79* | -.12 | .04 | .06 |
| 38-Superiors | .05 | .01 | -.13 | .62* | .45* |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | .30* | -.01 | -.16 | .03 | .79* |
| 40-Discipl. | .15 | -.83* | -.01 | -.02 | .06 |
| 41-Salary | .83* | .05 | .01 | .00 | .20 |
| 42-Cooperat. | .06 | -.04 | -.06 | .89* | .08 |

Table V: Netherlands

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .76* | .02 | .11 | -.32* | -.09 |
| 34-Appreciat. | -.07 | .26 | -.01 | -.25 | .74* |
| 35-Scope | .24 | .04 | .16 | -.82* | .05 |
| 36-Study | .13 | .07 | .10 | -.83 | .21 |
| 37-Interest | .06 | .86* | .06 | -.11 | .10 |
| 38-Superiors | -.12 | .21 | .71* | -.28 | .07 |
| 39-Soc. Stand | .26 | .08 | .18 | -.03 | .80* |
| 40-Discipl. | .09 | .76* | .23 | .01 | .20 |
| 41-Salary | .78* | .14 | -.03 | -.08 | .29 |
| 42-Cooperat. | .17 | -.04 | .86* | -.03 | .08 |

Table VI: Norway

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .81* | -.03 | -.15 | .06 | -.01 |
| 34-Appreciat. | .13 | .17 | -.09 | .12 | .87* |
| 35-Scope | .18 | .14 | -.77* | .18 | .10 |
| 36-Study | .14 | .05 | -.86* | -.01 | .05 |
| 37-Interest | .02 | .78* | -.19 | .05 | .14 |
| 38-Superiors | .16 | .44* | .02 | .74* | -.13 |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | .59* | .14 | -.11 | .06 | .55* |
| 40-Discipl. | .10 | .82* | -.01 | .07 | .10 |
| 41-Salary | .75* | .13 | -.13 | -.02 | .18 |
| 42-Cooperat. | -.05 | -.11 | -.19 | .82* | .28 |

Table VII: Sweden

| Factor No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Var. No. | | | | | |
| 33-Promotion | .78* | .08 | -.26 | .14 | -.07 |
| 34-Appreciat. | .02 | .30* | -.13 | .07 | -.82* |
| 35-Scope | .14 | -.02 | -.73* | .24 | -.30 |
| 36-Study | .16 | .13 | -.86* | -.05 | .04 |
| 37-Interest | .04 | .82* | -.10 | -.00 | -.15 |
| 38-Superiors | .29 | .31* | .07 | .64 | -.13 |
| 39-Soc. Stand. | .39* | .02 | -.06 | .10 | -.75* |
| 40-Discipl. | -.01 | .77* | -.02 | .24 | -.09 |
| 41-Salary | .82* | -.04 | -.06 | -.05 | -.21 |
| 42-Cooperat. | -.08 | .03 | -.16 | .85* | -.05 |

Table VIII: The Factor Matrix: Country Clusters

| Var. No. | Factor No. 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33 | France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Belgium | France | Belgium<br>Netherlands | Belgium<br>England |
| 34 | France<br>Netherlands | Germany<br>Sweden | Belgium<br>England | | France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden |
| 35 | Belgium<br>England<br>France | | England<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Netherlands | England<br>Sweden |
| 36 | Belgium<br>England<br>France | | Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Netherlands | |
| 37 | England | France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Belgium | | |

Table VIII: (continued)

| Var. No. | Factor No. 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38 | England | Belgium<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Netherlands | England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Germany<br>France |
| 39 | Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | France | Belgium<br>England | Belgium<br>France<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden |
| 40 | England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | Belgium<br>Germany |
| 41 | Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | |

Table VIII: (continued)

| Var. No. | Factor No. 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42 | | Belgium<br>England | Netherlands | France<br>Germany<br>Norway<br>Sweden | |

Note: Each country represents a factor loading of .30 or above on Tables I to VII.

# APPENDIX C

## CORRELATIONS OF 9 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND ONE PERSONALITY FACTOR WITH EACH OTHER BY COUNTRY

Table I: The 10 variables used in the analysis of Teacher Satisfaction

| Var. No. | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Teacher classification (Primary-Secondary) |
| 5 | Sex |
| 6 | Age |
| 7 | Kind of institution (Private-Public) |
| 8 | Marital Status |
| 9 | Education of Respondent |
| 10 | Salary |
| 11 | Length of Service |
| 18 | Size of class |
| 43 | F-scale |

Correlations of the 9 Demographic variables and one personality factor with each other by country

Table II: Belgium

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.17 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | -.06 | -.06 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | .05 | -.23 | .11 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | .11 | .37* | -.14 | -.51* | | | | | | |
| 9 | .88* | -.20 | -.03 | .01 | .13 | | | | | |
| 10 | .15 | -.27 | .29* | .49* | -.51* | .18 | | | | |
| 11 | -.18 | -.26 | .86* | .10 | -.18 | -.17 | .30* | | | |
| 18 | -.08 | -.02 | -.03 | -.23 | .13 | -.00 | -.13 | -.01 | | |
| 43 | .09 | -.14 | -.20 | .12 | -.04 | .12 | .08 | -.21 | -.09 | |

* Denotes significance at an arbitary coefficient of .30 in all tables

Table III: England

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.21 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .08 | -.11 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | -.01 | .55* | -.11 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | .83* | -.18 | .12 | - | -.02 | | | | | |
| 10 | .42* | -.64* | .45 | - | -.29* | .42* | | | | |
| 11 | .05 | -.08 | .74* | - | -.05 | .07 | .48* | | | |
| 18 | -.36* | .05 | .04 | - | .10 | -.34* | -.18 | .01 | | |
| 43 | .24 | -.13 | -.07 | - | -.05 | .25 | .15 | -.09 | -.12 | |

Table IV: France

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.16 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .13 | .07 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | -.30* | .01 | .03 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | .10 | .21 | -.16 | .39* | | | | | | |
| 9 | .69* | -.17 | .01 | -.17 | .09 | | | | | |
| 10 | .39* | -.08 | .29* | -.04 | .07 | .28* | | | | |
| 11 | .06 | .07 | .85* | .14 | -.24 | -.10 | .23 | | | |
| 18 | -.27 | -.01 | -.02 | .19 | -.14 | -.10 | -.01 | .02 | | |
| 43 | .02 | -.20 | -.04 | .31* | -.21 | .06 | -.02 | -.04 | -.01 | |

Table V: Germany

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.08 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .12 | .21 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | -.33* | .08 | .01 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | .01 | .70* | -.21 | .14 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .75* | .00 | -.08 | -.24 | .06 | | | | | |
| 10 | .57* | -.30* | .56* | -.19 | -.24 | .32* | | | | |
| 11 | .01 | -.13 | .79* | .04 | -.17 | -.18 | .50* | | | |
| 18 | -.39* | .05 | -.06 | .19 | -.01 | -.32* | -.18 | .03 | | |
| 43 | .06 | -.12 | -.15 | -.03 | -.11 | .16 | .04 | -.16 | -.09 | |

Table VI: Netherlands

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .24 | -.11 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | .25 | -.06 | .10 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | -.28 | .71* | -.35* | -.12 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .80* | -.25 | .12 | .20 | -.22 | | | | | |
| 10 | .66* | -.38* | .62* | .18 | -.53* | .52* | | | | |
| 11 | .07 | -.08 | .86* | .05 | -.30* | -.06 | .54* | | | |
| 18 | -.57* | .24 | -.23 | -.18 | .28 | -.43* | -.48* | -.12 | | |
| 43 | .16 | -.17 | -.03 | .22 | -.17 | .15 | .07 | -.07 | -.10 | |

Table VII: Norway

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.31* | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .12 | -.15 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| 8 | -.17 | .55* | -.17 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | .74* | -.23 | -.13 | - | -.07 | | | | | |
| 10 | .70* | -.57* | .36* | - | -.32* | .51* | | | | |
| 11 | .07 | -.14 | .85* | - | -.14 | -.18 | .35* | | | |
| 18 | .27 | .03 | .01 | - | .00 | .32* | .20 | .00 | | |
| 43 | .18 | -.07 | .16 | - | .07 | .24 | .15 | -.17 | .06 | |

Table VIII: Sweden

| Var. No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.23 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .18 | -.08 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | -.17 | .08 | .01 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | -.12 | .41* | -.03 | .07 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .73* | -.26 | .00 | -.13 | -.17 | | | | | |
| 10 | .52* | -.55* | .39* | -.05 | -.22 | .50* | | | | |
| 11 | .06 | .04 | .86* | .11 | .04 | -.10 | .29* | | | |
| 18 | .28 | -.01 | .11 | .07 | .02 | .23 | .25 | .08 | | |
| 43 | .12 | -.11 | -.18 | .04 | -.09 | .21 | .13 | -.18 | .11 | |

Table IX: Correlations of the 9 Demographic Variables and 1 Personality Factor:

A Summary of Country Clusters.

| Variable | No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | 5 | Norway | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | 6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kind of Institution | 7 | France<br>Germany | | | | | | | | | |
| Marital Status | 8 | | Belgium<br>England<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | Netherlands | | France<br>Belgium | | | | |
| Education of Respondent | 9 | Belgium<br>England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | | | | | | |

Table IX: (continued)

| Variable | No. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 43 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Salary | 10 | England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | England<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | England<br>Belgium<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | Belgium | Belgium<br>Netherlands<br>England<br>England<br>Norway | England<br>France<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | |
| Service | 11 | | | Belgium<br>England<br>Germany<br>France<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | | Belgium<br>England<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway<br>Sweden | | | |
| Class Size | 18 | England<br>Germany<br>Netherlands | | | | | England<br>Germany<br>Netherlands<br>Norway | Netherlands | | | |
| F-Scale | 43 | | | | France | | | | | | |

OCSR/CO/71, August 1955

## APPENDIX D: THE 15 "F-SCALE" ITEMS USED IN THE OCSR SURVEY IN SEVEN WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

| Item Number | | Col. Number |
|---|---|---|
| ( 1) | Human nature being what it is, there must always be war and conflicts. | V 41 |
| ( 2) | The most important thing a child should learn is obedience to his parents. | V 42 |
| ( 3) | A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk. | V 43 |
| ( 4) | Most people who don't get ahead just don't have enough will power. | V 44 |
| ( 5) | Women should stay out of politics. | V 45 |
| ( 6) | Our national life suffers from lack of discipline. | V 47 |
| ( 7) | Parents these days allow their children too much freedom. | V 48 |
| ( 8) | Only the person who has been taught strict discipline can fully appreciate freedom. | V 52 |
| ( 9) | Once a problem child, always a problem child. | V 53 |
| (10) | These days too much attention is being paid to the difficult child at the expense of normal children. | V 55 |
| (11) | People can be trusted. | V 46 |
| (12) | Children would rather look up to a teacher than treat him as an equal. | V 49 |
| (13) | Modern education is effective in preparing children for the hazards of the world. | V 50 |
| (14) | Honesty and hard work are not sufficiently rewarded these days. | V 51 |
| (15) | Only too often the home undoes the work of the school. | V 54 |

### RESPONSE FORMS AND THEIR SCORE

1=Disagree very much
2=Disagree to some extent
3=Disagree a little
4=No answer
5=Agree a little
6=Agree to some extent
7=Agree very much

## REFERENCES


Adams, J.S. Toward an understanding of inequity. J. abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1963, 67, 422-436.

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else., Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Blauner, R. Work satisfaction and industrial trends in modern society. In W. Galenson & S.M. Lipset (Eds.), Labor and trade unionism: an interdisciplinary reader. New York: Wiley, 1960, 339-360.

Burke, R. Are Herzberg's motivators and hygienes unidimensional? J. appl. Psychol., 1966, 50, 317-321.

Centers, R. and Bugental, Daphne. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. J. appl. Psychol., June 1966, 193-197.

Converse, P. and Robinson, J. The structure and meaning of time use, in press.

Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Gordon, G.G. "The relationships of 'satisfiers' and 'dissatisfiers' to productivity, turnover, and morale". APA convention paper, 1965, mimeo.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, Sheila. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Halpern, Gerald. "Relative contributions of motivator and hygiene factors to overall job satisfaction," APA convention paper, 1965, mimeo.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R.O., and Capwell, Dora F. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, Barbara. The motivation to work. (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley, 1959.

Homans, G.C. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Johnson, E.D. "An analysis of factors related to teacher satisfaction-dissatisfaction." Ph. D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1967. Order No. 67-4677.

Kilpatrick, F., Cummings, M. and Jennings, M. The image of the federal service. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1964.

Kornhauser, A. Mental health of the industrial worker. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Kuhlen, R.G. Needs, perceived need satisfaction opportunities, and satisfaction with occupation. J. appl. Psychol., 1963, 47, 56-64.

Lewin, K., Dembo, Tamara, Festinger, L., and Sears, Pauline Snedden. Level of aspiration. In Hunt, J. McV. (Ed.) Personality and the behavior disorders. Vol. I. New York: Ronald, 1944, 333-378.

Morse, Nancy C. Satisfaction in the white-collar job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center, 1953.

Ross, I.C., and Zander, A. Need satisfactions and employee turnover. Personnel Psychol., 1957, 10, 327-338.

Veroff, J., and Feld, S. Marriage and work in America: A study of motives and roles. New York: Reinhold, 1970.

Vilhelm, A., B.R. Fisher, and Rokkan, Stein. A comparative study of teachers' attitudes to international problems and policies. J. soc. issues, 1954, X, 25-40.

Vroom, V. Work and Motivation, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Weiss, R. and Kahn, R. Definitions of work and occupation. Social Problems, Fall 1960, 142-151.

Wilensky, H. Varieties of work experience. In Borow (Ed.), Man in a world at work. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Miflin, 1964.