COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, TEACHERS AND
JOB SATISFACTION

An abstract of a Dissertation by
Michael D. Book
December 1982
Drake University
Advisor: Dr. Charles Rowley

The problem. The study determined what differences
existed between the levels of job satisfaction registered by
teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and
the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from
schools without certified bargaining units.

Procedures. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a
measure of satisfaction with twenty-one different aspects of
the work environment, was administered to teachers from
selected Iowa public schools with certified bargaining units
and without certified bargaining units. Means were calculated
for each job satisfaction scale and the Hotelling's $T^2$, a
multivariate analysis, was conducted. An additional analysis
of the data was conducted using the nonparametric chi-square.

Findings. No significant differences existed between
the levels of job satisfaction of teachers from schools with
certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction
of teachers from schools without certified bargaining units.

Conclusions. A review of the literature indicated
varied and complex reasons existed for increased teacher
militancy and organization. Teacher dissatisfaction was
found to be one of the major factors in increased bargaining
activity. However, the findings of the study indicated that
teachers from schools with certified bargaining units are no
more dissatisfied with twenty-one aspects of their jobs than
teachers from schools without certified bargaining units.

Recommendations. The needs of individual staff members
are important. Boards of education and school administrators
should create an environment which places an emphasis on the
positive contributions of the collective bargaining process
that seek to satisfy the needs of individual staff members.
Studies of the leadership styles of administrators and boards
of education should be conducted to determine whether or not
the type of leadership influenced the job satisfaction levels
among the teachers in the study. Replications of this study
in states other than Iowa should be conducted to determine
whether teachers who have been involved in the collective
bargaining process for shorter or greater periods of time
differ significantly in their job satisfaction levels. Similar
studies should be conducted examining factors such as age, sex,
experience, and training to determine if such demographic data
influence teachers' job satisfaction levels.
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CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

School administrators are witnessing dramatic political, sociological, and economic changes which are affecting educational personnel policies and practices. Castetter describes these changes:

The twentieth century has been referred to as the second great transition in the history of mankind. This period has been identified by Boulding as the time of the transition from civilized to postcivilized society. The magnitude, rate, and scope of change in the affairs of man during this era have been unprecedented. Vast changes are taking place not only in science and technology, but in social institutions as well, including modifications in the moral, religious, aesthetic, political, economic, and educational aspects of life. Educational institutions have not been excluded from this upheaval. At no time has the ferment in education been more dramatic than during the 1960's. It was then that teachers began to organize extensively in protest against employment conditions. The movement has since led to demands for better salaries, protection from physical assault, economic security, freedom from paternalism, and the right to participate in decisions affecting the conditions under which school personnel work.¹

Serving as a pacesetter for the extensive organization of teachers was the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

O'Neil has identified major influences in the development of teacher militancy that have had a profound effect in the increase of collective bargaining activity since World War II.1 They are:

1. More men have entered careers in public education during the past twenty years than in the entire century before.

2. The shortage of teachers during the two decades prior to the end of the Sixties placed teachers in a seller's market.

3. Gains that could be won by employees through collective action were demonstrated by labor unions.

4. School management and the public did not respond to inequities in teacher pay, assignment, conditions of work, and in other matters of importance to teachers.

5. The public, as well as those within the teaching profession, became aware of the discrepancies in the economic rewards for teaching, as compared to those in other occupations.

6. Teachers' self-perceptions as second-class citizens became solidified and precipitated a revolt through the courts and their own organizations.

7. The level of education and preparation of teachers continued to increase.

8. The inevitable counteractions to teacher militancy itself have become a new set of stimuli, which have broadened the cleavage between school boards and administrators and their teachers, and helped produce a new generation of teacher demands.

In response to those demands, the principle of "self-governance" was developed in 1970 by the National Education Association (NEA). The NEA journal, Today's Education, defined the idea as "Governance . . . self-regulation . . . autonomy for the teaching profession. By whatever name, the meaning is the same: the fixing of responsibility for professional decisions with the teaching profession."¹

Included in the concept of self-governance was control over certification, or, over who shall teach; evaluation of teaching performance, or how teaching is to be done; and conditions under which professional services shall be rendered including curriculum, class size, pupil discipline, teacher assignment, transfer and working conditions, class load and hours of employment, educational policy and goals, and a host of others relating directly or indirectly to self-governance or control of the profession.²

¹O'Neil, p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 6.
Legislation for self-governance by Iowa teachers was supported and lobbied for by members of the Iowa State Education Association (ISEA). That support, in part, led to the successful passage of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) in 1974 by the Iowa legislature (Appendix A).

The collective bargaining law for public employees gave teachers the right to continue their promotion of the concept of self-governance. The mandatory subjects of bargaining as defined in Section 9 of the PERA include wages, hours, vacations, insurance, holidays, leaves of absence, shift differentials, overtime compensation, supplemental pay, seniority, transfer procedures, job classifications, health and safety matters, evaluation procedures, procedures for staff reduction, in-service training, and other matters mutually agreed upon by the two parties. Other subjects of bargaining are permissive and only mandatory subjects can be brought to impasse procedures.

Since the passage of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act, local education associations in 77 percent of Iowa's 443 school districts have become certified bargaining units and have legally established the right to formally negotiate with their school boards.¹

¹Iowa Association of School Boards, "Supplement to IASB Employee Relations Memo" (Des Moines: Iowa Association of School Boards, 1979), Tab #18.
Discussion of the Problem

The laws of the State of Iowa and the Iowa Constitution dictate that the affairs of public schools be administered by a school board, and that school districts are organized for the purpose of management, control and government. It is a political or civil subdivision of the state established for the purpose of aiding in the exercise of the governmental function which relates to the education of children. 1

The Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) endorses the principle that the powers of a school district are derived from the legislature. It maintains that a collective bargaining agreement cannot give the school board power to do something that it cannot by statute already do. "The collective bargaining agreement (contract) serves as a restriction upon the school board's authority." 2

O'Neil concluded that both teachers and boards find that many of the matters formerly decided on the basis of state code or local rules are frozen to change because control has been transferred out of traditional repositories and into the world of contract law. 3 Teacher negotiations

---

1 Wesley A. Wildman and Fred B. Lipton, Analysis of Teacher Contract Proposals (Des Moines: Iowa Association of School Boards, 1975), p. iii.

2 Wildman and Lipton, p. iv.

3 O'Neil, p. 8.
have been identified as a legal move to capture, by legal means, essential controls away from school boards.

School boards must carefully define their roles in the negotiation process and identify major influences within their districts that have an effect on increased formal bargaining activity. Two major influences have been teachers' needs and their levels of satisfaction.

According to Abraham Maslow, all people are in the process of seeking, to various degrees, the satisfaction of certain basic needs. These human needs are physiological needs, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization.¹ The extent to which teachers exert an effort to satisfy their needs through employer-employee negotiations may be a reflection of the degree to which the needs of the employees are perceived by themselves as being met.

Teachers' needs are varied and complex. They may, then, differ in their levels of aspiring to satisfy their needs or they may be at varying distances from having their felt needs satisfied.

Eight years after the passage of Iowa's collective bargaining law, 23 percent of the school districts in Iowa do not have certified bargaining units. It is then presumed

that there are differences between groups of teachers in
different schools.

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the differences between the
levels of job satisfaction of teachers in certified bar­
gaining units and the levels of job satisfaction of teachers
who are not in certified bargaining units.

Rationale of the Study

As the practice of collective bargaining extends to
increasing numbers of school systems throughout the nation,
it becomes apparent that greater attention must be given to
organization or to reorganization of the personnel function.¹

The collective bargaining process is closely related
to the personnel function of a school district. The pro­
cesses and outcomes of collective bargaining are important
to many people. School district employees' lives are en­
riched or made more difficult as a consequence of collective
bargaining. Educational services of students may be
affected. Public officials must cope with economic and
political consequences of bargaining. Some are citizens
whose goal of greater involvement in educational decisions
may seem threatened by bargaining.

The collective bargaining process must produce an

¹Castetter, p. 385.
environment in which school administrators and boards of education can protect the interests of the school and ultimately the student. Thus, established goals can be met, while taking advantage of all opportunities in the collective bargaining process to satisfy the needs of individual staff members and to create a framework conducive to goal achievement.¹

The environment of collective bargaining has been studied extensively by Cresswell and Murphy² who have drawn the following conclusions:

1. The social and political environment seems to be growing more open to collective bargaining. The legal framework in which bargaining occurs is becoming more and more tolerant of teachers' needs to organize and bargain collectively.

2. Teacher militancy as a movement seems to be giving way to teacher unionism as an institution. Bargaining has become less an ideological crusade and more a routine operation of well-organized unions and associations.

3. Boards of education, courts, and legislatures seem unsure of appropriate responses to the teacher militancy movement and the institutionalization which seems to

¹Castetter, p. 386.

4. Bargaining is establishing two strong parties, one representing management and board of education interests, the other representing the interests of organized teachers. Other parties with interests in educational decision making find they must work through one of these two parties.

5. Teacher union activity is stressing two major motivating drives. One is that teachers feel they are not receiving their just economic rewards; the other is that teachers are not happy with their present organizational status and will not be satisfied until they have achieved greater influence over the decision mechanisms of the schools employing them.

6. Collective bargaining as a result of teacher militancy is in part attributable to the general growing militancy of society. Teachers have been influenced by success in the civil rights movement and other aggressive expressions of aggrieved groups.

The environment of collective bargaining has an important effect on an organization and its goals. School administrators, then, must study the level of job satisfaction among teachers so that common goals of the educational organization can be identified, pursued, and realized.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction
registered by teachers from schools that formally negotiated a contract with the school board and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from school districts that did not formally negotiate collective bargaining agreements with the school board.

The need for more information on the relationship between collective bargaining and job satisfaction prompted the following hypothesis:

**Null Hypothesis**

There is no difference between the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that do not have certified bargaining units.

**Significance of the Study**

A study of work satisfaction is significant in that work is a major factor in the lifestyles of Americans. For a considerable number of people, the need for a sense of participation, achievement, and meaning is often left unsatisfied by the jobs performed at the workplace.¹

The degree to which teachers exert an effort to satisfy their needs through employer-employee negotiations

may have enormous significance for the school system, its personnel, its students, and the community. The process of collective bargaining will have a profound effect on the extent to which goals of the school can be realized.

If it is known that the level of job satisfaction is related to the attitudes of teachers toward pursuing collective bargaining, it may be beneficial for both parties to mutually identify and pursue common goals of the educational organization as well as the needs of the teachers. School systems are comprised of people, and people will determine whether the system succeeds or stagnates, serves its clients effectively, or squanders its limited resources aimlessly.¹

Education of children should be a common goal of boards of education, teachers, administrators, and community people. Should employee satisfaction levels influence the realization of that goal? It is important that the school administrators study those satisfaction levels and select strategies that will either maintain or improve upon those levels.

Definition of Terms

American Federation of Teachers. Commonly referred to as AFT, this is a "union of classroom teachers affiliated

¹Castetter, p. 30.
with the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)."¹ Most of the AFT strength lies in large bargaining units in large cities.

**Arbitration.** If the two parties cannot settle a dispute by negotiation and mediation, many negotiated agreements provide for arbitration. In arbitration, both parties agree beforehand to accept the decision of the person or persons they have mutually chosen to settle the dispute.² There are two kinds of arbitration. Impasse arbitration occurs during the negotiation process and grievance arbitration occurs during the life of the contract.

**Certified Bargaining Unit.** An employee group that has legally established a right to formally negotiate with an employer.

**Collective Bargaining.** A method whereby representatives of the employees and employer determine the conditions of employment through direct negotiations, normally resulting in a written agreement or contract setting forth the wages, hours, and other conditions to be observed for the duration of the contract.³


³Gilroy and others, p. 50.
**Contract.** A written agreement, generally of specified duration, arrived at as a result of negotiation between an employer and employees. The contract sets forth conditions of employment such as wages, hours, fringe benefits, and the procedure to be used in settling differences that may arise during the term of the contract.¹

**Demands.** Proposals, offers, stipulations, or issues which are presented by either the employer or the employee's organization for negotiation.

**Fact-finding.** Investigation of an employer-employee dispute by a board or panel. Fact-finding boards issue reports which describe the issues in the dispute and frequently make recommendations for their resolution.²

**Impasse.** A deadlock in the negotiating process where there is no meeting of minds. Neither party will make further modification of its position. Usually indicated by a breakdown in the bargaining process where discussions cease.³

**Management.** Term applied to the employer and his representatives who are responsible for the administration and direction of an enterprise.⁴ In schools this would include superintendents, assistant superintendents, other

---

¹Gilroy and others, p. 51.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 52.
⁴Ibid.
central office administrators, principals, and assistant principals. Departmental heads, athletic directors, and other such positions may be listed as either management or labor depending on state laws, local policies, or the job descriptions.

Mediation. The introduction of a third party neutral used for settling a dispute where agreement is resolved by the parties themselves as opposed to arbitration where the decision is made for the parties.

National Education Association. Commonly referred to as NEA, this is the largest educational organization in the nation. The NEA has affiliations at both the state and local levels.

Negotiations. The collective bargaining process by which a group within an organization asserts itself such that the desires of the individual employees become known and considered by the management of that organization.

Private Sector Bargaining. The extension of collective bargaining into two areas: craft-union bargaining in handi-craft industry, and industrial-union bargaining in mass production industry.¹ A 1974 amendment to the National Labor Relations Act included not-for-profit hospitals and nursing homes.

Professional Negotiations. Term preferred by the NEA but with the same meaning as the union term "collective bargaining."

Professional Negotiator. Person who negotiates for either employee or employer as his profession.

Public Sector Bargaining. The extension of collective bargaining to United States government agencies and state and local political subdivisions. Teachers, police, firefighters, and postal workers are public sector employees.

Superintendent. School district's chief administrator and chief executive officer of the board.

Teacher. A school employee who spends all or part of the time in the classroom and who is in direct contact with students in promoting the learning process.¹

Teacher Salary and Salary-related Items. Teachers' wages and those fringe benefits which require financial outlay.

Limitations
The scope of the study was limited to public sector bargaining encompassing selected Iowa public school districts with enrollments of 500 students or less.

Organization of the Study
Chapter 1 presents the background of the topic, the problem, the rationale, and the significance of the study.

¹Gilroy and others, p. 54.
Chapter 2 is a review of the literature as it pertains to this study.

Chapter 3 describes the designs of this study and the methodology that will be used.

Chapter 4 contains a statistical analysis of the collected data.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion of results of this study and their possible implications for future studies.
CHAPTER TWO

Related Literature

**Brief History of Collective Bargaining**

Teacher bargaining and militancy began in earnest with the strike against the New York public schools by the United Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO in 1962.¹ A written contract and a good economic package were the results of the strike.

A wave of militancy swept the ranks of classroom teachers following the New York teacher strike. Between 1968 and 1970 there were 312 teacher strikes involving over four million lost work days.² This militancy produced a dramatic rise in the number of teachers under collective bargaining agreements.

Most state and local teacher organizations are affiliated with one of two national organizations, the National Education Association (NEA) or the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The climb to power of these organizations as the voices of the teaching profession did much to forward the cause of collective bargaining in schools.

¹Beal, Wickersham, and Kienast, p. 489.

²Ibid., p. 490.
Prior to the end of the 1960's, the policies and practices of the two organizations were not in harmony. The AFT advocated collective bargaining and strikes when necessary. It excluded school administrators from its membership and saw its job as the advocate of both the pecuniary and professional interests of classroom teachers.¹

The NEA saw itself as primarily a professional organization of educators. It maintained a passive interest in economic and teacher working conditions. Teaching was work done primarily for public service and secondarily for earning one's living. It denounced the use of strikes and shunned the adversary relation it saw implicit in bargaining. The NEA stressed the oneness of all educators, and administrators were not only members, but traditionally dominated its leadership.² The NEA has, over the course of years, changed its stand from a passive interest in economic and teacher working conditions to an active voice in legislation and total school district concerns.

Now, in the 1980's, the NEA and its state and local affiliates are competing with the expanding American Federation of Teachers for recognition of exclusive negotiation rights in many school districts. This competition has occurred since the AFT affiliate, the United Federation of Teachers of New York City, was the victor over the NEA in a

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., p. 491.
major election held in 1961. The New York victory triggered the AFT to other victories in Philadelphia, Detroit, and other major areas.¹

By the late 1960's, both the AFT and NEA strongly supported collective bargaining as a right of the teaching profession. In addition to the rise of power of the teacher organizations, numerous court decisions and legislative enactments have also been instrumental in bringing collective bargaining to the public sector.

In 1935, the Wagner Act was signed into law. The act guaranteed and protected the rights of workers to organize unions and to bargain collectively through their chosen representatives. It prohibited employers from interfering with the efforts of workers to organize unions.

The Wagner Act, which created the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) as an independent administrative agency to implement its provisions, was amended with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947.

This act provided for a new and more nearly equal status between labor and management. Under Taft-Hartley, United States government and the states or any political subdivision of either were excluded from the jurisdiction of the NLRB.

In the 1960's, two presidential orders gave the right

¹Cresswell and Murphy, p. 24.
to public employees to bargain collectively. In 1962, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 which affirmed the right of federal employees to join or refrain from joining labor organizations. It set up procedures for bargaining unit determination and for recognition.¹

In 1967, President Johnson appointed a panel to review Executive Order 10988 and to recommend improvements. The major recommendations of the panel dealt with four substantive issues. They were the establishment of a workable third-party procedure for resolving negotiation impasse since strikes were forbidden, the establishment of a central authority to coordinate administration of the order and issue definitive interpretations of its provisions, simplification of the kinds of recognition accorded unions, and widening the scope of negotiations at all levels, primarily through decentralization of bargaining activity.²

Action on the panel's findings was taken in 1969 when President Nixon issued Executive Order 11491. This new order created the Federal Service Impasse Panel, dropped "formal" and "informal" recognition as defined in the old order, added specific criteria for bargaining unit determination and recognition and brought collective bargaining in federal employment closer to the industrial model.

¹Beal, p. 477.

²Ibid., p. 478.
In 1975, Executive Order 11838 broadened the scope of negotiations. All major changes in an agency's personnel policy and practices were made mandatory subjects of bargaining even when a contract was already in force.

These federal legislative enactments and the actions, policies, and practices of the major teacher organizations have influenced the development of major theories and processes of collective bargaining at the state level, including Iowa, where passage of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act in 1974 by the Iowa legislature gave public employees the right to bargain collectively.

*Collective Bargaining: Theory and Process*

Professional negotiation has been defined as a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local staff organization and school board, which provides an orderly method for the school board and staff organization to negotiate on matters of mutual concern, to reach agreement on these matters, and to establish channels for mediation and appeal in the event of an impasse.¹

Professional negotiations, as identified by Castetter, have several important characteristics essential to its understanding.² They are:


²Castetter, pp. 383-384.
1. The major goal of unions or employee associations is to maximize opportunities and security for the membership. These include a higher standard of living, financial protection, position security, rights, and opportunity for advancement. The main goal of the administration of a school system is to operate that system effectively in the public interest and to retain the authority and rights it needs to accomplish this purpose. Unions seek to restrict unilateral decision-making by the board of education, and to modify decisions so that they are in accord with the needs and desires of the membership. The school system resists moves that appear to encroach upon its prerogatives.

2. Collective bargaining goes beyond the willingness of a board of education to hear from, listen to, or be consulted about conditions of employment. Collective negotiation means codetermination of the terms of employment, which, when mutually agreed to, bind both parties to those terms.

3. Formal acknowledgment (recognition) by the board of education of an employee organization to represent all employees of that jurisdiction (members and nonmembers) means acceptance by the board of the collective negotiations principle.

4. Collective negotiation in the public sector gives the public employee the right to participate, through his chosen representative, in the determination of personnel policies and practices that affect conditions of employment. The extent of such participation and the principles and procedures governing its exercise are matters for which satisfactory solutions are yet to be reached.

5. If more than one personnel association is recognized by the board of education, each of the units separately designates its negotiating representative. Large school systems, for example, may have one negotiating unit for teachers, one for maintenance personnel, and one for secretarial and clerical workers. Coalition negotiation involves a systemwide entity representing all personnel, even though they belong to separate units.

6. Any negotiated agreement must be within the limits of the board's lawful authority.
7. Even when the board adheres to the principles of collective negotiations, it may receive the views of individuals or of other personnel groups not formally recognized as negotiating units. Agreement on the terms and conditions of employment, however, must be reached with the representatives officially designated by the recognized negotiating unit or units.

8. Collective negotiation imposes restrictions on both the school system and the personnel association or union. Unilateral action is prevented. The school system must negotiate with the official negotiating unit or units.

9. The collective negotiations process in a school system consists essentially of two subprocesses: agreement negotiation and agreement administration. This is considerably different from other personnel processes in that it transcends the boundaries of the school system by its impact on the political, social, economic, and educational facets of local communities, the state, and nation. A collective negotiations agreement in New York, for example, may have far-reaching consequences for school systems across the state and nation.

The ultimate goal of collective bargaining is the establishment of a sound and stable relationship between the school system and its teachers. Such a sound relationship should be an integral part in attaining the basic goals of an organization. Attaining the long-term system goals requires a positive philosophy of collective negotiations. Walton and McKersie have identified two basic kinds of bargaining relationships in the negotiations process.1

In distributive bargaining, the goals of both parties are in conflict. Views are assumed to be fixed, so that one

---

1 Castetter, pp. 392-393.
person's gain is another's loss. Goals are not perceived as conflicting in integrative bargaining. Problems are perceived as areas of mutual concern.

The traditional and most common form of negotiations in school systems is perhaps the distributive type. Less prevalent is the integrative which involves more of a cooperative approach to fact-finding, problem exploration, and agreement resolution. The form used by school districts, then, may be a factor in the union organization of their teachers.

Factors in Teacher Organization

The reasons for increased teacher militancy and organization are varied and complex. Teachers are concerned with many of the changes that are occurring in education. Perry and Wildman have identified several major factors in increased teacher organization since the 1960's.¹ They are:

1. The desire by teachers for more money and benefits which, they have discovered, collective negotiations perhaps can deliver.

2. The percentage of males in teaching is increasing and teachers of both sexes are better trained and prepared than ever before.

3. Teachers want a voice in formulating the rules and

policies of the system which control their lives.

4. Legislation that grants bargaining rights to teachers is both a crucial cause and effect of the new teacher militancy.

5. The NEA/AFT rivalry which is intensified by the desire of the larger labor movement to organize the white collar workers of this country.

6. The problems of the big city school system have generated teacher dissatisfaction which spurs organization.

7. The new militancy represents a defensive reaction to widespread disenchantment with and criticism of teachers and the public education enterprise.

8. Collective action, demonstrations, and thrusts for power are both fashionable and effective in our society.

According to Engel, teachers are demanding an opportunity to improve their professional as well as economic status and working conditions. Through their employee organizations, they hope to find a nearly equal voice with boards of education in developing educational policies.

Moskow\(^2\) has identified three areas of potential conflict in any school system which may result in teacher militancy. First, there is a possible conflict over the

\(^1\)Cresswell and Murphy, p. 23.

allocation of funds to public education. The attitude of a community may vary from a willingness to spend more on public education to a strong resistance to any further increases in the funds allocated. Teachers, on the other hand, usually want higher salaries and in some cases want more funds allocated to education in general.

Second, there is a possible conflict concerning the rules that govern the employee/employer relationship. A school administrator often wants to maintain a degree of flexibility on matters such as class size, number of teaching assignments, seniority, and transfer plans while the teachers want protection from any arbitrary application of the rules.

A third area of potential concern occurs over the professional function of the teacher. Professionals are often confronted with a wide variety of problems which require the application of a high degree of intelligence and specialized training. Thus, they seek greater control over their jobs and a share in the decision making that affects them.

Sinicrop and Gilroy have identified aggressive organizing by unions in the public sector to be a major force contributing to the growing interest in collective

---

bargaining. Also relevant to this interest is the growing feeling of public employees that the benefits being gained in the private sector are relegating the public employee to a form of second-class economic citizenship. Many semi-professional and professional public employees feel that they are not being treated as professionals and only through group activity can they achieve the status they feel is due them.

Lieberman\(^1\) considered six reasons for the adoption of collective bargaining in certain types of private and public employment. These reasons are as follows:

1. In enterprises employing large numbers of personnel doing the same type of work, the individual employees doing such work are practically helpless to improve their lot by individual negotiations.

2. Collective bargaining strengthens an occupational group.

3. People wish to have a voice in the determination of their working conditions. Through collective bargaining, employees can choose someone to ascertain, express, and advocate their views.

4. Collective bargaining offers the most feasible method of raising the status of the employees. The status of an employee group is partially determined on the extent

to which it has a voice in the determination of its working conditions.

5. The existence of large numbers of people doing the same kind of work leads to common interests which lead to joint action to advance those interests.

6. There are grave dangers in any system of employment which relies chiefly upon decisions handed down from the top to determine the conditions of employment. In some situations, there may be no substitute for coercion, but the fact is that there is an increase in employee efficiency and responsibility where employees have a corporate responsibility in the determination of their working conditions.

Lieberman emphasized that it is important to see that these reasons for collective bargaining are not confined to their value in protecting employees from exploitation. Employees have something positive to contribute to the determination of their conditions of service and to the efficiency of that service.

While collective bargaining has sometimes occurred as a response to dictatorial tactics of employers, and that many employers have accepted collective bargaining only under legal compulsion, collective bargaining has proved itself to be much more than a protective and defensive technique for which there would be no need if all employers were fair.

Lieberman maintains that an emphasis on the positive
contribution of collective bargaining is necessary and that the view that collective bargaining is something to be invoked only should the employer try to take unfair advantage of his employees is much too narrow. These relationships among employers and their employees have served as the basis for research in the area of job satisfaction.

**Job Satisfaction**

A review of the literature reveals that there are two basic theories of job satisfaction: one by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, and the theory of Robert Schaffer. The dimensions of these two theories are found in Table 1. Schaffer conceptualized job satisfaction as a function of individual needs and need satisfaction. He hypothesized that overall job satisfaction varies directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied. The stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on the fulfillment of that need.

Schaffer's study supported his hypothesis. The strongest needs correlated more closely with the overall measure of job satisfaction than did the weaker needs. Found to be the strongest need was creativity and challenge. Mastery and achievement were second, social welfare was third, and dependence was last.

Using a sample of 200 engineers and accountants from the Pittsburgh area, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman
Table 1
Theories of Job Satisfaction

A. The Needs of Schaffer's Theory

Recognition and approbation
The need to have one's self, one's work, and other things associated with one's self known and approved by others.

Affection and interpersonal relationships
The need to have a feeling of acceptance by and belongingness with other people. The need to have people with whom to form these affective relationships.

Mastery and achievement
The need to perform satisfactorily according to one's own standards. The need to perform well in accordance with the self-perception of one's abilities.

Dominance
The need to have power over and control of others.

Social welfare
The need to help others, and to have one's efforts result in benefit to others.

Self-expression
The need to have one's behavior consistent with one's self-concept.

Socioeconomic status
The need to maintain one's self and one's family in accordance with certain group standards with respect to material matters.

Moral value scheme
The need to have one's behavior consistent with some moral code or structure.

Dependence
The need to be controlled by others. Dislike of responsibility for one's own behavior.

Creativity and challenge
The need for meeting new problems requiring initiative and inventiveness and for producing new and original works.
Table 1 (continued)

Economic security
The need to feel assured of a continuing income.
Unwillingness to "take a chance" in any financial matters.

Independence
The need to direct one's own behavior rather than to be subject to the direction of others.

B. The Factors of the Motivation to Work Theory

Motivators (job content)
Achievement
Recognition
The work itself
Responsibility
Advancement

Hygiene factors (job environment)
Company policy and administration
Technical abilities of supervision (incompetence)
Salary
Interpersonal relations--supervision
Working conditions
Interpersonal relations--peers
Personal life
designed a study to test the concept that man has two sets of needs: his needs as an animal to avoid pain and his need as a human to grow psychologically.\footnote{Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966), p. 71.}

The engineers and accountants were asked to describe times in their lives when they felt particularly good and when they felt particularly bad about their jobs. The interviewers probed for the reasons why the engineers and accountants felt as they did. The workers were also asked if the feelings of satisfaction in regard to their work had affected their performance, their personal relationships, and their well being. The subjects also described a sequence of events that resulted in negative feelings about their jobs.\footnote{Ibid., p. 72.}

These factors were found to be high determiners of job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement, the last three being of greater importance for lasting change of attitudes. These five factors appeared very infrequently when the workers described events surrounding feelings of job dissatisfaction.

These factors were found to be primarily related to job dissatisfaction. The major dissatisfiers were company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal


\footnote{Ibid., p. 72.}
relations, and working conditions. These factors served only to bring about job satisfaction and were rarely involved in events that led to positive job attitudes.

Since the dissatisfier factors essentially describe the environment and serve to prevent job dissatisfaction while having little effect on positive job attitudes, they have been labeled as "hygiene" factors. This is an analogy to the medical use of the term meaning "preventative and environmental." ¹

The satisfier factors were labeled "motivators" since findings of the study suggest that they are effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and effort.² At a psychological level, the two dimensions of job attitudes reflected a two-dimensional need structure: one need system for the avoidance of unpleasantness and a parallel need system for personal growth.³

Herzberg's Theory should be of interest to managers because it can lead to higher production and effort--these are the management's interests. The worker is interested in himself as an individual. He looks around his environment and seeks methods by which he can interact most profitably with the situation in which he finds himself. The needs of the organization and the needs of the individual

¹Herzberg, p. 74.
²Ibid.       ³Ibid., p. 75.
are matched when man is seeking fulfillment of these needs to grow psychologically.

**Job Satisfaction in Education**

An examination of job satisfaction among teachers may provide school administrators with important concepts for understanding the basis of and need for emphasizing motivation and commitment of teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt applied Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory to teachers and formulated the following conclusions:

1. There are certain conditions in work that teachers expect to enjoy. If these conditions are present in sufficient quantity, teachers will perform adequately, but only adequately. If these conditions are not present in sufficient quantity, teachers will be dissatisfied and work performance will suffer.

2. The conditions in work which teachers expect as part of the traditional legal work relationship are called **hygienic factors**. Their absence results in teacher dissatisfaction and poor performance. Their presence maintains the traditional legal work relationship but does not motivate performance. Hygienic factors are associated with the participation investment in work.

3. The factors which contribute to teachers' exceeding the traditional work relationship are called **motivators**. The absence of motivators does not result in dissatisfaction and does not endanger the traditional work relationship. Motivational factors are associated with the performance investment in work.

4. Satisfaction at work is not a motivator of performance per se, but results from quality performance. Administrators and supervisors should not use satisfaction as a method of motivating teachers, but satisfaction should be thought of as a goal that teachers seek, one that is best obtained through meaningful work.
5. Administrators and supervisors who use job satisfaction to motivate teachers are practicing human relations. This has not been proven to be an effective approach. Human relations emphasize the hygienic factors.

6. Administrators and supervisors who consider job satisfaction as a goal that teachers seek through accomplishing meaningful work and who focus on enhancing the meaningful view of work and the ability of teachers to accomplish this work are practicing human resources supervision. This has been proven to be an effective approach. Human resources development emphasizes the motivational factors.¹

Sergiovanni concluded that teachers who are more interested in hygienic factors than motivational factors either have the potential for motivation seeking but are frustrated by insensitive and closed administrative, supervisory, and organizational policies and practices; have the potential for motivation seeking but decide to channel this potential into other areas of their lives; or do not have the potential for motivation seeking on or off the job. Those in the latter two categories use their jobs as a means to achieve goals not related to school.² Sergiovanni continues:

Teachers who have the potential for motivation seeking, but who elect to seek satisfactions of this kind outside of the school, are by and large good teachers who give honest labor in exchange for what they hope to gain from the school. Extraordinary performance is lacking among them, however, for such teachers do not have a strong commitment to the school


²Ibid., p. 169.
and its purposes. Teachers of this kind will be with us for a long time, but they cannot be depended upon to substantially upgrade the nation's schools or to display much interest in becoming full partners in the school enterprise, unless they can become attracted to the motivational factors. Teachers interested primarily in hygienic factors, but who have potential for being influenced by the motivation factors, can make significant contributions to the school's work if kindly, but firmly and competently, supervised, or when combined with motivation seekers in schools with differentiated roles and responsibilities for teachers. Hygienically oriented teachers who have the potential for motivation seeking, but who are frustrated by the school and its administration are unfortunate casualties. When we deny teachers opportunities to channel motivation expressions they desire, we not only waste valuable human resources, but deny youngsters important opportunities for growth in their schooling. In general, hygienically oriented teachers think of their jobs too much in terms of salary, working conditions, supervision, status, job security, school policies and administration, and social relationships.¹

Summary of Related Literature

The actions, policies, and practices of the two major teacher organizations have influenced the development of major theories and processes of collective bargaining for teachers. Following a strike against the New York public schools in 1962, teacher bargaining and militancy began in earnest.

Numerous court decisions and legislative enactments have also been instrumental in bringing collective bargaining to the public sector. The Wagner Act in 1935 guaranteed

¹Sergiovanni and Starratt, p. 170.
the rights of workers to organize and the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 provided for a more nearly equal status between labor and management. Presidential orders during the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon eras also defined procedures and policies for collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining provides an orderly method for school boards and teachers to negotiate on matters of mutual concern. The ultimate goal of collective bargaining is the establishment of a sound and stable relationship between the school system and its teachers. This sound relationship should be an integral part in achieving the basic goals of a school.

Achieving these goals requires a positive approach to bargaining. In integrative bargaining, there is a cooperative approach to fact-finding, problem exploration, and agreement resolution. In distributive bargaining, views are assumed to be fixed and the goals of both parties are in conflict. Distributive bargaining is the most common used by school districts and may be a factor in the union organization of teachers.

Reasons for increased teacher militancy and organization are varied and complex. Factors include the desire for more money, benefits, and a voice in formulating the rules and policies of the systems which control their lives.

The collective bargaining process affects the
relationships among employers and employees which has an important effect on the school and its goals. These relationships have served as a basis for research in the area of job satisfaction.

Two basic theories of job satisfaction exist. Robert Schaffer conceptualized job satisfaction as a function of individual needs and need satisfaction. Herzberg's Theory identifies five "motivator" factors as high determiners of job satisfaction. They include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Five "hygiene" factors were found to be related to job dissatisfaction. The major dissatisfiers were company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.

Sergiovanni and Starrat applied Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory to teachers and concluded that supervisors who consider job satisfaction as a goal that teachers seek through accomplishing meaningful work and who focus on enhancing this view are practicing human resources supervision which emphasizes motivational factors that are attributed to higher employee performance.
CHAPTER THREE
Methods and Procedures

In analyzing the literature, it was determined that existing prototype studies were available in the area of job satisfaction. The methodology of this study was built upon the strengths of the existing research in order to obtain comparable data and knowledge.

Selection of the Sample

The Iowa Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) was asked to identify those Iowa school districts with certified bargaining units under the provisions of Chapter 20, Code of Iowa.

Those school districts were compared to a master list of all Iowa public school districts furnished by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction. All districts with enrollments of 500 students or less were categorized either as having a certified bargaining unit or as not having a certified bargaining unit.

Ten school districts were randomly selected from each category. The Department of Public Instruction was asked to identify all certified teachers from the selected twenty school districts.
Five teachers from each of the twenty school districts were randomly selected as respondents to the questionnaire.

**The Instrument**

The *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (MSQ) was used to measure job satisfaction levels of the respondents (Appendix B). The Questionnaire is a product of the Work Adjustment Project studies at the University of Minnesota's Industrial Relations Center. The MSQ was developed as a measure of satisfaction with a number of different aspects of the work environment.

The MSQ consists of 100 items. Each item refers to a work reinforcer in the work environment. The respondent indicates how satisfied he is with the reinforcer on his present job. Five response alternatives are presented for each item: "Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied); Satisfied; Very Satisfied."

Each MSQ scale consists of five items. The items appear in blocks of twenty, with items constituting a given scale appearing at twenty-item intervals.

The twenty principal scales are ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision--human relations, supervision--technical, variety, and working conditions. An overall measure of general job satisfaction
is obtained by summing across all twenty categories.\textsuperscript{1} Each scale is defined in Appendix C.

Robert M. Guion, Professor of Psychology at Bowling Green State University, wrote "Clearly, the MSQ gives reasonably reliable, valid, well-normed indications of general satisfaction at work and of 20 aspects of that satisfaction, collapsible into intrinsic and extrinsic components."\textsuperscript{2}

Guion concludes that "the MSQ is well developed; it holds up well in comparison with a major alternative instrument (Job Descriptive Index), and it can give detailed diagnostics or parsimonious summary statements according to an investigator's needs."\textsuperscript{3}

Lewis E. Albright, Director, Organization and Management Development, Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation, concluded that the data on the reliability "looked quite satisfactory."\textsuperscript{4}

Regarding internal consistency, Albright found:

Hoyt reliability coefficients were computed for some 27 occupational groups for all 20 scales plus General Satisfaction. Of the 567 coefficients,

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{1} Oscar K. Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972), p. 1493.
  \item\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 1680.
  \item\textsuperscript{4} Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, p. 1493.
\end{itemize}
83 percent were .80 or higher and only 2.5 percent were lower than .70. Stability of the MSQ was determined by retesting students and employed persons at one-week and one-year intervals, respectively. For the one-week period, stability coefficients ranged from .66 for the Co-workers scale to .91 for Working Conditions, with a median of .83. One-year retest correlations were somewhat lower, ranging from .35 for Independence to .71 for Ability Utilization, median of .61. Canonical correlation analysis was also performed on the retest data and indicated that both the one-week and one-year coefficients (.97 and .89, respectively) were significant beyond the .001 level.¹

Administering the Instrument

After the twenty school districts were selected, the superintendent of each school district received a courtesy letter explaining that five teachers in his district would be receiving a questionnaire to be completed for research purposes at Drake University (Appendix D).

Each teacher was mailed a Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. A cover letter accompanied the MSQ and explained the purposes of the research project (Appendix E).

In addition to the MSQ, each respondent was asked to answer questions relating to sex, age, teaching level, experience, and training. The MSQ sheet requesting confidential information was substituted with a personal data sheet.

Each teacher was asked to return the instrument in a self-addressed stamped envelope. Three weeks after the

¹Buros, The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, p. 1493.
initial mailing, those who had not responded were sent a second request and MSQ (Appendix F). After an additional three weeks, it was assumed that all those who were going to cooperate had done so.

**Analysis of the Data**

The completed instruments were prepared for statistical processing at Drake University's Dial Computer Center. The Standard Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was utilized in the processing of the data. Means were calculated for each of the twenty-one job satisfaction scales and the Hotelling's $T^2$ test, a multivariate analysis, was conducted.

The result of the $T^2$ test was transformed into an F value. The calculated F value was compared against a .05 critical value of the tabled F ratio. An F value that exceeded the tabled critical value indicated significant differences existed between the sample means and the null hypothesis was rejected. An F value less than the tabled critical value indicated that no significant differences existed between the sample means and the null hypothesis was retained. A significant result in the Hotelling's $T^2$ would have required further analysis by a two-group linear discrimination function to determine which dependent variable(s) contributed to the overall significant differences.

An additional analysis of the data was conducted using
the nonparametric chi-square. The .05 level of significance was again used to determine whether significant differences existed between the sample means. A calculated value for each job satisfaction level scale was obtained and compared against the critical value in the $X^2$ table. A calculated value that exceeded the tabled critical value indicated significant differences existed between the sample means and the null hypothesis was rejected. A calculated value less than the tabled critical value indicated that no significant differences existed between the sample means and the null hypothesis was retained.

Statistical Treatment

The multivariate analysis used in this study was the appropriate statistical tool. It would have been inappropriate to use a separate univariate analysis such as the independent t test for each of the dependent variables in this study for two reasons. First, the application of univariate tests--one for each dependent variable--would have caused the probability of a Type I error to be higher than the level of significance that was used. The second reason is that as the number of dependent variables increases, the probability of finding a significant difference by chance alone also increases.¹ For the same reasons, a

two-group linear discriminant function was the appropriate follow-up test. ¹

The multivariate, Hotelling's $T^2$ test, is based upon the double assumption that the sample data have been drawn from multivariate normal populations and that these populations have equal dispersion matrices. ² The nonparametric chi-square was chosen, then, as an additional statistical procedure since it tests hypotheses that do not specify normality or homogeneity of variance assumptions about the populations from which the samples were drawn. ³

¹Huck, Cormier and Bound, p. 181.

²Ibid., p. 184.

³Ibid., p. 197.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of the Data

This chapter is a presentation of a statistical analysis of the data indicating to what degree, if any, the hypothesis was found to be supported within recognized limits.

The study was designed to determine whether differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that do not have certified bargaining units.

Presentation of the Data

Questionnaires were returned by thirty-seven teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and by thirty-nine teachers from schools without certified bargaining units. This represented a 76 percent return, with teachers from all twenty selected school districts returning questionnaires.

Descriptive Data

The first set of tables, identified as Tables 2 through 8, presents the information obtained from the personal data
sheet that accompanied the Minnesota Satisfaction
Questionnaire. Teachers from schools with certified bar-
gaining units are identified in all tables as Group I and
teachers from schools without certified bargaining units
are identified as Group II.

The respondents were grouped according to their sex.
The results of the grouping and tabulation are reported in
Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further grouping based on age was conducted. The
results of that grouping and tabulation are found in
Table 3.

Teachers were also grouped according to their levels
of education. The results are found in Table 4.
Table

Age Categories of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Education Levels of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher than MA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teaching levels of teachers from both groups of schools were tabulated and the results of that grouping are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Teaching Levels of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Level</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked to indicate the number of years of teaching experience in their present schools. The results of their responses are found in Table 6. The total years of teaching experience for the teachers in all districts were also tabulated. The results of that tabulation are found in Table 7.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers were also asked to identify whether their jobs had been reduced or eliminated during the 1980-81 school year. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elimination or Reduction</th>
<th>Number of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Group II Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers in Groups I &amp; II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Data

Means were calculated for each of the twenty-one job satisfaction levels registered by teachers in schools with certified bargaining units and in schools without certified bargaining units. The sample means for each job satisfaction level are shown in Table 9.

A Hotelling's $T^2$ test was conducted and had the value 33.04; the associated F value was 1.15; with degrees of freedom 21 and 54. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors, the probability of exceeding such an F value would be greater than .05 and the null hypothesis should be retained.
Table 9
Means of Job Satisfaction Levels Registered by Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale</th>
<th>Mean Level of Group I Teachers</th>
<th>Mean Level of Group II Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>19.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>20.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Values</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>20.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>17.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Human</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Technical</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>16.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction</td>
<td>71.81</td>
<td>73.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result of the Hotelling's $T^2$ test was not significant and did not require further analysis by a two-group linear discrimination function to determine which dependent variable(s) contributed to the overall significant differences. Due to a skewness of the distribution of answers for the job satisfaction scales, the data for the study were also analyzed by means of the nonparametric, chi-square.

The set of chi-square tables, identified as Table 10 through Table 30, illustrates the frequency of item responses for each job scale. Each scale could have had a minimum response of five (low satisfaction) and a maximum response of twenty-five (high satisfaction).

As shown in Table 10, there are no significant differences between teachers for ability utilization.

Table 10

$x^2$ for Ability Utilization of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 0.30$ w/3 df
The results in Table 11 indicate that no significant differences existed between the teachers for achievement.

\[ x^2 \] for Achievement of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.27 \text{ w/3 df} \]

The chi-square test for activity resulted in no significant differences between the two groups. The results are shown in Table 12.

As shown in Table 13, there were no significant differences between teachers with regard to advancement.

Between the two teacher groups, there were no significant differences for the job scale, authority. The results of the chi-square test are reported in Table 14.

The results in Table 15 indicate no significant differences between the teachers for company policy.
Table 12

$X^2$ for Activity of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.20$ w/2 df

Table 13

$X^2$ for Advancement of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 3.53$ w/4 df
Table 14

$X^2$ for Authority of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=4.69 \text{ w}/3 \text{ df}$

Table 15

$X^2$ for Company Policy of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=5.76 \text{ w}/4 \text{ df}$
With regard to compensation, there were no significant differences between the two groups of teachers. The results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

\( \chi^2 \) for Compensation of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 2.87 \) w/4 df

As reported in Table 17, there were no significant differences between teachers for co-workers.

Between the two teacher groups, there were no significant differences for creativity. The results are shown in Table 18.

The results in Table 19 indicate no significant differences existed between the teachers for independence.

As reported in Table 20, there were no significant differences between teachers for moral values.
### Table 17

**X^2** for Co-workers of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.46 \text{ w/3 df} \]

### Table 18

**X^2** for Creativity of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.09 \text{ w/3 df} \]
Table 19

$x^2$ for Independence of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 1.28$ w/2 df

Table 20

$x^2$ for Moral Values of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 1.07$ w/2 df
As shown in Table 21, no significant differences existed between teachers for recognition.

Table 21

\[ x^2 \] for Recognition of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.62 \] w/3 df

The results in Table 22 indicate no significant differences between teachers for responsibility.

The chi-square test for security resulted in no significant differences between the two teacher groups. The results are shown in Table 23.

As shown in Table 24, there were no significant differences between teachers with regard to social services.

Between the two teacher groups, there were no significant differences for social status. The results are shown in Table 25.
Table 22

$x^2$ for Responsibility of Teachers in Schools with Certified
Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified
Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 5.66$ w/3 df

Table 23

$x^2$ for Security of Teachers in Schools with Certified
Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified
Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 7.10$ w/4 df
Table 24

χ² for Social Services of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 0.42 w/2 df

Table 25

χ² for Social Status of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 2.84 w/4 df
The results in Table 26 indicate no significant differences between the teachers for supervision-human.

Table 26

$X^2$ for Supervision-Human of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.84$ w/4 df

With regard to supervision-technical, there were no significant differences between the two groups of teachers. The results are shown in Table 27.

As reported in Table 28, there were no significant differences between teachers for variety.

Between the two teacher groups, there were no significant differences for working conditions. The results are shown in Table 29.

The results in Table 30 indicate no significant differences existed between the teachers for general satisfaction.
Table 27

$X^2$ for Supervision-Technical of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 2 25 39 8 76

$x^2=2.83$ w/4 df

Table 28

$X^2$ for Variety of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 5 41 29 76

$x^2=1.48$ w/3 df
### Table 29

**$X^2$ for Working Conditions of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group II</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.30 \text{ w/4 df}$

### Table 30

**$X^2$ for General Satisfaction of Teachers in Schools with Certified Bargaining Units and in Schools without Certified Bargaining Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Scale Responses</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80-89</th>
<th>90-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group II</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.59 \text{ w/5 df}$
Summary

This chapter was a presentation of the statistical analysis of the data. The study was designed to determine what differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that do not have certified bargaining units.

Two statistical analyses were conducted after the means were calculated for each of the twenty-one job satisfaction scales. The results of the Hotelling's $T^2$ and the chi-square were reported and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are found in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER FIVE

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to determine what differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that formally negotiate a contract with the school board and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that do not formally negotiate collective bargaining agreements with the school board.

 Procedures

One hundred teachers from twenty Iowa public school districts were selected as the sample population. Fifty teachers were from ten schools categorized as having certified bargaining units and fifty were from ten schools categorized as not having certified bargaining units.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a measure of satisfaction with twenty-one different aspects of the work environment, was mailed to each teacher. Seventy-six percent of the teachers selected returned the MSQ.

Means were calculated for each of the twenty-one job satisfaction scales and the Hotelling's $T^2$, a multivariate analysis, was conducted. An additional analysis
of the data was conducted using the nonparametric, chi-square.

Findings

The following hypothesis was tested using the Hotelling's $T^2$ and the chi-square:

There is no difference between the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction registered by teachers from schools that do not have certified bargaining units.

Results of the Hotelling's $T^2$ test indicated that no significant differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction of teachers from schools with certified bargaining units and the levels of job satisfaction of teachers from schools without certified bargaining units. The results of the chi-square also indicated that no significant differences existed between the levels of job satisfaction of the two groups of teachers.

Conclusions

There are varied and complex reasons for increased teacher militancy and organization. A review of the literature indicated that teacher dissatisfaction was found to be one of the major factors in increased bargaining activity.

The findings of this study indicated, however, that teachers from schools with certified bargaining units are no more dissatisfied with twenty-one aspects of their jobs.
than teachers from schools without certified bargaining units. On the basis of this conclusion, the following recommendations seem appropriate.

**Recommendations**

1. Studies similar to this should be conducted examining factors such as age, sex, experience, and level of training of respondents to determine if such demographic data influence teachers' job satisfaction levels.

2. The Iowa Public Employment Relations Act has existed eight years. Replications of this study in states other than Iowa should be conducted to determine whether teachers who have been involved in the collective bargaining process for shorter or greater periods of time differ significantly in their job satisfaction levels.

3. The needs of individual staff members are important. Boards of education and school administrators should create an environment which places an emphasis on the positive contributions of the collective bargaining process that seek to satisfy the needs of individual staff members.

4. A review of the related literature indicated that the relationship between management and teachers may be a factor in union organization. Studies of the leadership styles of administrators and boards of education should be conducted to determine whether or not the type of leadership influenced the job satisfaction levels between the teachers.
Discussion

School administrators and boards of education are indeed witnessing dramatic political, sociocultural, and economic changes that are affecting educational personnel practices and policies. A basic knowledge of human needs is essential for the management process and one of the differences between a good manager and a mediocre one will likely be the ability to understand and work with people. School systems are comprised of people and the need for a sense of participation, achievement, and meaning for school employees is imperative if the common goal of educating children is to be identified, pursued, and realized.
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APPENDIX A

IOWA PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS ACT
Chapter 20, 1975 Code of Iowa

SECTION 1. NEW SECTION. Public policy. The general assembly declares that it is the public policy of the state to promote harmonious and cooperative relationships between government and its employees by permitting public employees to organize and bargain collectively; to protect the citizens of this state by assuring effective and orderly operations of government in providing for their health, safety, and welfare; to prohibit and prevent all strikes by public employees; and to protect the rights of public employees to join or refuse to join, and to participate in or refuse to participate in, employee organizations.

SEC. 2. NEW SECTION. Title. This Act shall be known as the "Public Employment Relations Act".

SEC. 3. NEW SECTION. Definitions. When used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Public employer" means the state of Iowa, its boards, commissions, agencies, departments, and its political subdivisions including school districts and other special purpose districts.

2. "Governing body" means the board, council, or commission, whether elected or appointed, of a political subdivision of this state, including school districts and other special purpose districts, which determines the policies for the operation of the political subdivision.

3. "Public employee" means any individual employed by a public employer, except individuals exempted under the provisions of section four (4) of this Act.

4. "Employee organization" means an organization of any kind in which public employees participate and which exists for the primary purpose of representing public employees in their employment relations.

5. "Board" means the public employment relations board established under section five (5) of this Act.

6. "Strike" means a public employee's refusal, in concerted action with others, to report to duty, or his willful absence from his position, or his stoppage of work, or his abstinence in whole or in part from the full, faithful, and proper performance of the duties of employment, for the purpose of inducing, influencing, or coercing a change in the conditions, compensation, rights, privileges, or obligations of public employment.

7. "Confidential employee" means any public employee who works in the personnel offices of a public employer or who has access to information subject to use by the public employer in negotiating or who works in a close continuing working relationship with public officers or representatives associated with negotiating on behalf of the public employer.
"Confidential employee" also includes the personal secretary of any of the following: any elected official or person appointed to fill a vacancy in an elective office, member of any board or commission, the administrative officer, director, or chief executive officer of a public employer or major division thereof, or the deputy or first assistant of any of the foregoing.

8. "Mediation" means assistance by an impartial third party to reconcile an impasse between the public employer and the employee organization through interpretation, suggestion, and advice.

9. "Arbitration" means the procedure whereby the parties involved in an impasse submit their differences to a third party for a final and binding decision or as provided in this Act.

10. "Impasse" means the failure of a public employer and the employee organization to reach agreement in the course of negotiations.

11. "Professional employee" means any one of the following:
   a. Any employee engaged in work:
      (1) Predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work;
      (2) Involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance;
      (3) Of such a character that the output produced or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time; and
      (4) Requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, or physical processes.
   b. Any employee who (i) has completed the courses of specialized intellectual instruction and study described in subparagraph four (4) of paragraph a of this subsection, and (ii) is performing related work under the supervision of a professional person to qualify himself or herself to become a professional employee as defined in paragraph a of this subsection.

12. "Fact-finding" means the procedure by which a qualified person shall make written findings of fact and recommendations for resolution of an impasse.

SEC. 4. NEW SECTION. Exclusions. The following public employees shall be excluded from the provisions of this Act:

1. Elected officials and persons appointed to fill vacancies in elective offices, and members of any board or commission.

2. Representatives of a public employer, including the administrative officer, director, or chief executive officer of a public employer or major division thereof as well as his deputy, first assistant, and any supervisory employees.

Supervisory employee means any individual having authority in the interest of the public employer to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other public employees, or the responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment. All school
superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, and assistant principals shall be deemed to be supervisory employees.

3. Confidential employees.

4. Students working as part-time public employees twenty hours per week or less, except graduate or other post-graduate students in preparation for a profession who are engaged in academically related employment as a teaching, research, or service assistant.

5. Temporary public employees employed for a period of four months or less.

6. Commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Iowa national guard.

7. Judges of the supreme court, district judges, district associate judges, and judicial magistrates, and the employees of such judges and courts.

8. Patients and inmates employed, sentenced, or committed to any state or local institution.

9. Persons employed by the state department of justice.

10. Persons employed by the commission for the blind.

SEC. 5. NEW SECTION. Public employment relations board.

1. There is established a board to be known as the public employment relations board. The board shall consist of three members appointed by the governor, with approval of two-thirds of the senate. No more than two members shall be of the same political affiliation and no member shall engage in any political activity while holding office and the members shall devote full time to their duties.

Each member shall be appointed for a term of four years, except that of the members first appointed, two members shall be appointed for a term of two years commencing July 1, 1974 and ending June 30, 1976, and one member shall be appointed for a term of four years commencing July 1, 1974 and ending June 30, 1978.

The member first appointed for a term of four years shall serve as chairman and each of his successors shall also serve as chairman.

2. Any vacancy on the commission which may occur when the general assembly is not in session shall be filled by appointment by the governor, which appointment shall expire at the end of thirty days following the convening of the next session of the general assembly. Prior to the expiration of the thirty-day period, the governor shall transmit to the senate for its approval the name of the appointee for the unexpired portion of the regular term. Any vacancy occurring when the general assembly is in session shall be filled in the same manner as regular appointments are made, and before the end of such session, and for the unexpired portion of the regular term.

3. In selecting the members of the board, consideration shall be given to their knowledge, ability, and experience in the field of labor-management relations. The chairman shall receive an annual salary of twenty-four thousand (24,000) dollars. The remaining two members shall each receive an annual salary equal to ninety percent of the salary received by the chairman.

4. The board may employ such persons as are necessary for the performance of its functions. Personnel of the board shall be employed pursuant to the provisions of chapter nineteen A (19A) of the Code.

5. Members of the board and other employees of the board shall be allowed their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the perform-
ance of their duties. All expenses and salaries shall be paid from appropriations for such purposes and the board shall be subject to the budget requirements of chapter eight (8) of the Code.

SEC. 6. NEW SECTION. General powers and duties of the board. The board shall:

1. Administer the provisions of this Act.
2. Collect, for public employers other than the state and its boards, commissions, departments, and agencies, data and conduct studies relating to wages, hours, benefits and other terms and conditions of public employment and make the same available to any interested person or organization.
3. Maintain, after consulting with employee organizations and public employers, a list of qualified persons representative of the public to be available to serve as mediators and arbitrators and establish their compensation rates.
4. Hold hearings and administer oaths, examine witnesses and documents, take testimony and receive evidence, issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of records, and delegate such power to a member of the board, or persons appointed or employed by the board, including hearing officers for the performance of its functions. The board may petition the district court at the seat of government or of the county wherein any hearing is held to enforce a board order compelling the attendance of witnesses and production of records.
5. Adopt rules and regulations in accordance with the provisions of chapter seventeen A (17A) of the Code as it may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. NEW SECTION. Public employer rights. Public employers shall have, in addition to all powers, duties, and rights established by constitutional provision, statute, ordinance, charter, or special act, the exclusive power, duty, and the right to:

1. Direct the work of its public employees.
2. Hire, promote, demote, transfer, assign, and retain public employees in positions within the public agency.
3. Suspend or discharge public employees for proper cause.
4. Maintain the efficiency of governmental operations.
5. Relieve public employees from duties because of lack of work or for other legitimate reasons.
6. Determine and implement methods, means, assignments and personnel by which the public employer's operations are to be conducted.
7. Take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the mission of the public employer.
8. Initiate, prepare, certify, and administer its budget.
9. Exercise all powers and duties granted to the public employer by law.

SEC. 8. NEW SECTION. Public employee rights. Public employees shall have the right to:

1. Organize, or form, join, or assist any employee organization.
2. Negotiate collectively through representatives of their own choosing.
3. Engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection insofar as any such activity is not prohibited by this Act or any other law of the state.

4. Refuse to join or participate in the activities of employee organizations, including the payment of any dues, fees or assessments or service fees of any type.

SEC. 9. NEW SECTION. Scope of negotiations. The public employer and the employee organization shall meet at reasonable times, including meetings reasonably in advance of the public employer's budget-making process, to negotiate in good faith with respect to wages, hours, vacations, insurance, holidays, leave of absence, shift differentials, overtime compensation, supplemental pay, seniority, transfer procedures, job classifications, health and safety matters, evaluation procedures, procedures for staff reduction, in-service training and other matters mutually agreed upon. Negotiations shall also include terms authorizing dues checkoff for members of the employee organization and grievance procedures for resolving any questions arising under the agreement, which shall be embodied in a written agreement and signed by the parties. If an agreement provides for dues checkoff, a member's dues may be checked off only upon the member's written request and the member may terminate the dues checkoff at any time by giving thirty days written notice. Such obligation to negotiate in good faith does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or make a concession.

Nothing in this section shall diminish the authority and power of the merit employment department, board of regents' merit system, educational radio and television facility board's merit system, or any civil service commission established by constitutional provision, statute, charter or special act to recruit employees, prepare, conduct, and grade examinations, rate candidates in order of their relative scores for certification for appointment or promotion or for other matters of classification, reclassification or appeal rights in the classified service of the public employer served.

The public employee retirement systems provided under chapters ninety-seven A (97A), ninety-seven B (97B), four hundred ten (410), and four hundred eleven (411) of the Code shall be excluded from the scope of negotiations.

SEC. 10. NEW SECTION. Prohibited practices.
1. It shall be a prohibited practice for any public employer, public employee, or employee organization to willfully refuse to negotiate in good faith with respect to the scope of negotiations as defined in section nine (9) of this Act.

2. It shall be a prohibited practice for a public employer or his designated representative willfully to:
   a. Interfere with, restrain, or coerce public employees in the exercise of rights granted by this Act.
   b. Dominate or interfere in the administration of any employee organization.
   c. Encourage or discourage membership in any employee organization, committee, or association by discrimination in hiring, tenure, or other terms or conditions of employment.
d. Discharge or discriminate against a public employee because he has filed an affidavit, petition, or complaint or given any information or testimony under this Act, or because he has formed, joined, or chosen to be represented by any employee organization.

e. Refuse to negotiate collectively with representatives of certified employee organizations as required in this Act.

f. Deny the rights accompanying certification or exclusive recognition granted in this Act.

g. Refuse to participate in good faith in any agreed upon impasse procedures or those set forth in this Act.

h. Engage in a lockout.

3. It shall be a prohibited practice for public employees or an employee organization or for any person, union, or organization or their agents willfully to:

a. Interfere with, restrain, coerce, or harass any public employee with respect to any of his rights under this Act or in order to prevent or discourage his exercise of any such right, including, without limitation, all rights under section eight (8) of this Act.

b. Interfere, restrain, or coerce a public employer with respect to rights granted in this Act or with respect to selecting a representative for the purposes of negotiating collectively on the adjustment of grievances.

c. Refuse to bargain collectively with a public employer as required in this Act.

d. Refuse to participate in good faith in any agreed upon impasse procedures or those set forth in this Act.

e. Violate section twelve (12) of this Act.

f. Violate the provisions of chapter seven hundred thirty-six B (736B), sections one (1), two (2) and three (3) of the Code, which are hereby made applicable to public employers, public employees and public employee organizations.

g. Picket in a manner which interferes with ingress and egress to the facilities of the public employer.

h. Engage in, initiate, sponsor or support any picketing that is performed in support of a strike, work stoppage, boycott or slowdown against a public employer.

i. Picket for any unlawful purpose.

4. The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of any unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this Act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit.

SEC. 11. NEW SECTION. Prohibited practice violations.

1. Proceedings against a party alleging a violation of section ten (10) of this Act, shall be commenced by filing a complaint with the board within ninety days of the alleged violation causing a copy of the complaint to be served upon the accused party in the manner of an original notice as provided in this Act. The accused party shall have ten days within which to file a written answer to the complaint. However, the board may conduct a preliminary investigation of the alleged violation, and if the board determines that the complaint has no basis in fact, the board may dismiss the complaint. The board shall promptly thereafter set a time and place for hearing in the
county where the alleged violation occurred. The parties shall be permitted to be represented by counsel, summon witnesses, and request the board to subpoena witnesses on the requestor's behalf. Compliance with the technical rules of pleading and evidence shall not be required.

2. The board may designate a hearing officer to conduct the hearing. The hearing officer shall have such powers as may be exercised by the board for conducting the hearing and shall follow the procedures adopted by the board for conducting the hearing. The decision of the hearing officer may be appealed to the board and the board may hear the case de novo or upon the record as submitted before the hearing officer, utilizing procedures governing appeals to the district court in this section so far as applicable.

3. The board shall appoint a certified shorthand reporter to report the proceedings and the board shall fix the reasonable amount of compensation for such service, which amount shall be taxed as other costs.

4. The board shall file its findings of fact and conclusions of law. If the board finds that the party accused has committed a prohibited practice, the board may, within thirty days of its decision, enter into a consent order with the party to discontinue the practice, or petition the district court for injunctive relief pursuant to chapter six hundred sixty-four (664) of the Code.

5. Any party aggrieved by any decision or order of the board may within ten days from the date such decision or order is filed, appeal therefrom to the district court of the county in which the hearing was held, by filing with the board a written notice of appeal setting forth in general terms the decision appealed from and the grounds of the appeal. The board shall forthwith give notice to the other parties in interest.

6. Within thirty days after a notice of appeal is filed with the board, it shall make, certify, and file in the office of the clerk of court to which the appeal is taken, a full and complete transcript of all documents in the case, including any depositions and a transcript or certificate of the evidence together with the notice of appeal.

7. The appeal shall be triable at any time after the expiration of twenty days from the date of filing the transcript by the board and after twenty days notice in writing by either party and the board upon the other.

8. The transcript as certified and filed by the board shall be the record on which the appeal shall be heard, and no additional evidence shall be heard. In the absence of fraud, the findings of fact made by the board shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole.

9. Any order or decision of the board may be modified, reversed, or set aside on one or more of the following grounds and on no other:
   a. If the board acts without or in excess of its powers.
   b. If the order was procured by fraud or is contrary to law.
   c. If the facts found by the board do not support the order.
   d. If the order is not supported by a preponderance of the competent evidence on the record considered as a whole.

10. When the district court, on appeal, reverses or sets aside an order or decision of the board, it may remand the case to the board for further proceedings in harmony with the holdings of the court, or it may enter the proper judgment, as the case may be. Such judgment or
decree shall have the same force and effect as if action had been originally brought and tried in said court. The assessment of costs in such appeals shall be in the discretion of the court.

11. An appeal may be taken to the supreme court from any final order, judgment, or decree of the district court.

SEC. 12. NEW SECTION. Strikes prohibited.
1. It shall be unlawful for any public employee or any employee organization, directly or indirectly, to induce, instigate, encourage, authorize, ratify, or participate in a strike against any public employer.

2. It shall be unlawful for any public employer to authorize, consent to, or condone a strike; or to pay or agree to pay any public employee for any day in which the employee participates in a strike; or to pay or agree to pay any increase in compensation or benefits to any public employee in response to or as a result of any strike or any act which violates subsection one (1) of this section. It shall be unlawful for any official, director, or representative of any public employer to authorize, ratify, or participate in any violation of this subsection. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent new or renewed bargaining and agreement within the scope of negotiations as defined by this Act, at any time after such violation of subsection one (1) has ceased; but it shall be unlawful for any public employer or employee organization to bargain at any time regarding suspension or modification of any penalty provided in this section or regarding any request by the public employer to a court for such suspension or modification.

3. In the event of any violation or imminently threatened violation of subsection one (1) or two (2) of this section, any citizen domiciled within the jurisdictional boundaries of the public employer may petition the district court for the county in which the violation occurs or the district court for Polk county for an injunction restraining such violation or imminently threatened violation. Chapter six hundred sixty-four (664) of the Code and the pertinent rules of civil procedure regarding injunctions shall apply. However, the court shall grant a temporary injunction if it appears to the court that a violation has occurred or is imminently threatened; the plaintiff need not show that the violation or threatened violation would greatly or irreparably injure him; and no bond shall be required of the plaintiff unless the court determines that a bond is necessary in the public interest. Failure to comply with any temporary or permanent injunction granted pursuant to this section shall constitute a contempt punishable pursuant to chapter six hundred sixty-five (665) of the Code. The punishment shall not exceed five hundred dollars for an individual, or ten thousand dollars for an employee organization or public employer, for each day during which the failure to comply continues, or imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or both such fine and imprisonment. An individual or an employee organization which makes an active good faith effort to comply fully with the injunction shall not be deemed to be in contempt.

4. If a public employee is held to be in contempt of court for failure to comply with an injunction pursuant to this section, or is convicted of violating this section, he shall be ineligible for any employment by the same public employer for a period of twelve months. His public
employer shall immediately discharge him, but upon his request the court shall stay his discharge to permit further judicial proceedings.

5. If an employee organization or any of its officers is held to be in contempt of court for failure to comply with an injunction pursuant to this section, or is convicted of violating this section, the employee organization shall be immediately decertified, shall cease to represent the bargaining unit, shall cease to receive any dues by checkoff, and may again be certified only after twelve months have elapsed from the effective date of decertification and only after a new compliance with section fourteen (14) of this Act. The penalties provided in this section may be suspended or modified by the court, but only upon request of the public employer and only if the court determines the suspension or modification is in the public interest.

6. Each of the remedies and penalties provided by this section is separate and several, and is in addition to any other legal or equitable remedy or penalty.

SEC. 13. NEW SECTION. Bargaining unit determination.
1. Board determination of an appropriate bargaining unit shall be upon petition filed by a public employer, public employee, or employee organization.

2. Within thirty days of receipt of a petition or notice to all interested parties if on its own initiative, the board shall conduct a public hearing, receive written or oral testimony, and promptly thereafter file an order defining the appropriate bargaining unit. In defining the unit, the board shall take into consideration, along with other relevant factors, the principles of efficient administration of government, the existence of a community of interest among public employees, the history and extent of public employee organization, geographical location, and the recommendations of the parties involved.

3. Appeals from such order shall be governed by appeal provisions provided in section eleven (11) of this Act.

4. Professional and nonprofessional employees shall not be included in the same bargaining unit unless a majority of both agree.

SEC. 14. NEW SECTION. Bargaining representative determination.
1. Board certification of an employee organization as the exclusive bargaining representative of a bargaining unit shall be upon a petition filed with the board by a public employer, public employee, or an employee organization and an election conducted pursuant to section fifteen (15) of this Act.

2. The petition of an employee organization shall allege that:
   a. The employee organization has submitted a request to a public employer to bargain collectively with a designated group of public employees.
   b. The petition is accompanied by written evidence that thirty percent of such public employees are members of the employee organization or have authorized it to represent them for the purposes of collective bargaining.

3. The petition of a public employee shall allege that an employee organization which has been certified as the bargaining representative does not represent a majority of such public employees and that the petitioners do not want to be represented by an employee organization or seek certification of an employee organization.
4. The petition of a public employer shall allege that it has received a request to bargain from an employee organization which has not been certified as the bargaining representative of the public employees in an appropriate bargaining unit.

5. The board shall investigate the allegations of any petition and shall give reasonable notice of the receipt of such a petition to all public employees, employee organizations and public employers named or described in such petitions or interested in the representation question. The board shall thereafter call an election under section fifteen (15) of this Act, unless:
   a. It finds that less than thirty percent of the public employees in the unit appropriate for collective bargaining support the petition for decertification or for certification.
   b. The appropriate bargaining unit has not been determined pursuant to section thirteen (13) of this Act.

6. The hearing and appeal procedures shall be the same as provided in section eleven (11) of this Act.

SEC. 15. NEW SECTION. Elections.

1. Upon the filing of a petition for certification of an employee organization, the board shall submit two questions to the public employees at an election in an appropriate bargaining unit. The first question on the ballot shall permit the public employees to determine whether or not such public employees desire exclusive bargaining representation. The second question on the ballot shall list any employee organization which has petitioned for certification or which has presented proof satisfactory to the board of support of ten percent or more of the public employees in the appropriate unit.

2. If a majority of the votes cast on the first question are in the negative, the public employees shall not be represented by an employee organization. If a majority of the votes cast on the first question is in the affirmative, then the employee organization receiving a majority of the votes cast on the second question shall represent the public employees in an appropriate bargaining unit.

3. If none of the choices on the ballot receive the vote of a majority of the public employees who could be represented by an employee organization, the board shall conduct a runoff election among the two choices receiving the greatest number of votes.

4. Upon written objections filed by any party to the election within ten days after notice of the results of the election, if the board finds that misconduct or other circumstances prevented the public employees eligible to vote from freely expressing their preferences, the board may invalidate the election and hold a second election for the public employees.

5. Upon completion of a valid election in which the majority choice of the employees who could be represented by an employee organization is determined, the board shall certify the results of the election and shall give reasonable notice of the order to all employee organizations listed on the ballot, the public employers, and the public employees in the appropriate bargaining unit.

6. A petition for certification as an exclusive bargaining representative shall not be considered by the board for a period of one year from the date of the certification or noncertification of an exclusive bargaining representative or during the duration of a collective bargaining
agreement which shall not exceed two years. A collective bargaining agreement with the state, its boards, commissions, departments, and agencies shall be for two years and the effective date of any such agreement shall be July first of odd-numbered years. However, if a petition for decertification is filed during the duration of a collective bargaining agreement, the board shall award an election under this section not more than one hundred eighty days nor less than one hundred fifty days prior to the expiration of the collective bargaining agreement. If an employee organization is decertified, the board may receive petitions under section fourteen (14) of this Act, provided that no such petition and no election conducted pursuant to such petition within one year from decertification shall include as a party the decertified employee organization.

SEC. 16. NEW SECTION. Duty to bargain. Upon the receipt by a public employer of a request from an employee organization to bargain on behalf of public employees, the duty to engage in collective bargaining shall arise if the employee organization has been certified by the board as the exclusive bargaining representative for the public employees in that bargaining unit.

SEC. 17. NEW SECTION. Procedures.

1. The employee organization certified as the bargaining representative shall be the exclusive representative of all public employees in the bargaining unit and shall represent all public employees fairly. However, any public employee may meet and adjust individual complaints with a public employer.

2. The employee organization and the public employer may designate any individual as its representative to engage in collective bargaining negotiations.

3. Negotiating sessions, including strategy meetings of public employers or employee organizations, mediation and the deliberative process of arbitrators shall be exempt from the provisions of chapter twenty-eight A (28A) of the Code. Hearings conducted by arbitrators shall be open to the public.

4. The terms of a proposed collective bargaining agreement shall be made public and reasonable notice shall be given to the public employees prior to a ratification election. The collective bargaining agreement shall become effective only if ratified by a majority of those voting by secret ballot.

5. Terms of any collective bargaining agreement may be enforced by a civil action in the district court of the county in which the agreement was made upon the initiative of either party.

6. No collective bargaining agreement or arbitrators' decision shall be valid or enforceable if its implementation would be inconsistent with any statutory limitation on the public employer's funds, spending, or budget or would substantially impair or limit the performance of any statutory duty by the public employer. A collective bargaining agreement or arbitrators' award may provide for benefits conditional upon specified funds to be obtained by the public employer, but the agreement shall provide either for automatic reduction of such conditional benefits or for additional bargaining if the funds are not obtained or if a lesser amount is obtained.

7. If agreed to by the parties nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit supplementary bargaining on behalf of public employees.
in a part of the bargaining unit concerning matters uniquely affecting those public employees or cooperation and coordination of bargaining between two or more bargaining units.

8. The salaries of all public employees of the state under a merit system and all other fringe benefits which are granted to all public employees of the state shall be negotiated with the governor or his designee on a statewide basis, except those benefits which are not subject to negotiations pursuant to the provisions of section nine (9) of this Act.

9. A public employee or any employee organization shall not negotiate or attempt to negotiate directly with a member of the governing board of a public employer if the public employer has appointed or authorized a bargaining representative for the purpose of bargaining with the public employees or their representative, unless the member of the governing board is the designated bargaining representative of the public employer.

SEC. 18. NEW SECTION. Grievance procedures. An agreement with an employee organization which is the exclusive representative of public employees in an appropriate unit may provide procedures for the consideration of public employee grievances and of disputes over the interpretation and application of agreements. Negotiated procedures may provide for binding arbitration of public employee grievances and of disputes over the interpretation and application of existing agreements. An arbitrator's decision on a grievance may not change or amend the terms, conditions or applications of the collective bargaining agreement. Such procedures shall provide for the invoking of arbitration only with the approval of the employee organization, and in the case of an employee grievance, only with the approval of the public employee. The costs of arbitration shall be shared equally by the parties.

Public employees of the state shall follow either the grievance procedures provided in a collective bargaining agreement, or in the event that no such procedures are so provided, shall follow grievance procedures established pursuant to chapter nineteen A (19A) of the Code.

SEC. 19. NEW SECTION. Impasse procedures—agreement of parties. As the first step in the performance of their duty to bargain, the public employer and the employee organization shall endeavor to agree upon impasse procedures. Such agreement shall provide for implementation of these impasse procedures not later than one hundred twenty days prior to the certified budget submission date of the public employer. If the parties fail to agree upon impasse procedures under the provisions of this section, the impasse procedures provided in sections twenty (20), twenty-one (21) and twenty-two (22) of this Act shall apply.

SEC. 20. NEW SECTION. Mediation. In the absence of an impasse agreement between the parties or the failure of either party to utilize its procedures, one hundred twenty days prior to the certified budget submission date, the board shall, upon the request of either party, appoint an impartial and disinterested person to act as mediator. It shall be the function of the mediator to bring the parties together to effectuate a settlement of the dispute, but the mediator may not compel the parties to agree.
SEC. 21. NEW SECTION. Fact-finding. If the impasse persists ten days after the mediator has been appointed, the board shall appoint a fact-finder representative of the public, from a list of qualified persons maintained by the board. The fact-finder shall conduct a hearing, may administer oaths, and may request the board to issue subpoenas. The fact-finder shall make written findings of facts and recommendations for resolution of the dispute and, not later than fifteen days from the day of appointment, shall serve such findings on the public employer and the certified employee organization.

The public employer and the certified employee organization shall immediately accept the fact-finder's recommendation or shall within five days submit the fact-finder's recommendations to the governing body and members of the certified employee organization for acceptance or rejection. If the dispute continues ten days after the report is submitted, the report shall be made public by the board.

SEC. 22. NEW SECTION. Binding arbitration.

1. If an impasse persists after the findings of fact and recommendations are made public by the fact-finder, the parties may continue to negotiate or, the board shall have the power, upon request of either party, to arrange for arbitration, which shall be binding. The request for arbitration shall be in writing and a copy of the request shall be served upon the other party.

2. Each party shall submit to the board within four days of request a final offer on the impasse items with proof of service of a copy upon the other party. Each party shall also submit a copy of a draft of the proposed collective bargaining agreement to the extent to which agreement has been reached and the name of its selected arbitrator. The parties may continue to negotiate all offers until an agreement is reached or a decision rendered by the panel of arbitrators.

As an alternative procedure, the two parties may agree to submit the dispute to a single arbitrator. If the parties cannot agree on the arbitrator within four days, the selection shall be made pursuant to subsection five (5) of this section. The full costs of arbitration under this provision shall be shared equally by the parties to the dispute.

3. The submission of the impasse items to the arbitrators shall be limited to those issues that had been considered by the fact-finder and upon which the parties have not reached agreement. With respect to each such item, the arbitration board award shall be restricted to the final offers on each impasse item submitted by the parties to the arbitration board or to the recommendation of the fact-finder on each impasse item.

4. The panel of arbitrators shall consist of three members appointed in the following manner:

a. One member shall be appointed by the public employer.

b. One member shall be appointed by the employee organization.

c. One member shall be appointed mutually by the members appointed by the public employer and the employee organization. The last member appointed shall be the chairman of the panel of arbitrators. No member appointed shall be an employee of the parties.

d. The public employer and employee organization shall each pay the fees and expenses incurred by the arbitrator each selected. The
fee and expenses of the chairman of the panel and all other costs of arbitration shall be shared equally.

5. If the third member has not been selected within four days of notification as provided in subsection two (2) of this section, a list of three arbitrators shall be submitted to the parties by the board. The two arbitrators selected by the public employer and the employee organization shall determine by lot which arbitrator shall remove the first name from the list submitted by the board. The arbitrator having the right to remove the first name shall do so within two days and the second arbitrator shall have one additional day to remove one of the two remaining names. The person whose name remains shall become the chairman of the panel of arbitrators and shall call a meeting within ten days at a location designated by him.

6. If a vacancy should occur on the panel of arbitrators, the selection for replacement of such member shall be in the same manner and within the same time limits as the original member was chosen. No final selection under subsection nine (9) of this section shall be made by the board until the vacancy has been filled.

7. The panel of arbitrators shall at no time engage in an effort to mediate or otherwise settle the dispute in any manner other than that prescribed in this section.

8. From the time of appointment until such time as the panel of arbitrators makes its final determination, there shall be no discussion concerning recommendations for settlement of the dispute by the members of the panel of arbitrators with parties other than those who are direct parties to the dispute. The panel of arbitrators may conduct formal or informal hearings to discuss offers submitted by both parties.

9. The panel of arbitrators shall consider, in addition to any other relevant factors, the following factors:
   a. Past collective bargaining contracts between the parties including the bargaining that led up to such contracts.
   b. Comparison of wages, hours and conditions of employment of the involved public employees with those of other public employees doing comparable work, giving consideration to factors peculiar to the area and the classifications involved.
   c. The interests and welfare of the public, the ability of the public employer to finance economic adjustments and the effect of such adjustments on the normal standard of services.
   d. The power of the public employer to levy taxes and appropriate funds for the conduct of its operations.

10. The chairman of the panel of arbitrators may hold hearings and administer oaths, examine witnesses and documents, take testimony and receive evidence, issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of records, and delegate such powers to other members of the panel of arbitrators. The chairman of the panel of arbitrators may petition the district court at the seat of government or of the county in which any hearing is held to enforce the order of the chairman compelling the attendance of witnesses and the production of records.

11. A majority of the panel of arbitrators shall select within fifteen days after its first meeting the most reasonable offer, in its judgment,
of the final offers on each impasse item submitted by the parties, or the recommendations of the fact-finder on each impasse item.

12. The selections by the panel of arbitrators and items agreed upon by the public employer and the employee organization, shall be deemed to be the collective bargaining agreement between the parties.

13. The determination of the panel of arbitrators shall be by majority vote and shall be final and binding subject to the provisions of section seventeen (17), subsection six (6), of this Act. The panel of arbitrators shall give written explanation for its selection and inform the parties of its decision.

SEC. 23. New SECTION. Legal actions. Any employee organization and public employer may sue or be sued as an entity under the provisions of this Act. Service upon the public employer shall be in accordance with law or the rules of civil procedure. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to make any individual or his assets liable for any judgment against a public employer or an employee organization.

SEC. 24. New SECTION. Notice and service. Any notice required under the provisions of this Act shall be in writing, but service thereof shall be sufficient if mailed by restricted certified mail, return receipt requested addressed to the last known address of the parties, unless otherwise provided in this Act. Refusal of restricted certified mail by any party shall be considered service. Prescribed time periods shall commence from the date of the receipt of the notice. Any party may at any time execute and deliver an acceptance of service in lieu of mailed notice.

SEC. 25. New SECTION. Internal conduct of employee organizations.

1. Every employee organization which is certified as a representative of public employees under the provisions of this Act shall file with the board a registration report, signed by its president or other appropriate officer. The report shall be in a form prescribed by the board and shall be accompanied by two copies of the employee organization's constitution and bylaws. A filing by a national or international employee organization of its constitution and bylaws shall be accepted in lieu of a filing of such documents by each subordinate organization. All changes or amendments to such constitutions and bylaws shall be promptly reported to the board.

2. Every employee organization shall file with the board an annual report and an amended report whenever changes are made. The reports shall be in a form prescribed by the board, and shall provide the following information:
   a. The names and addresses of the organization, any parent organization or organizations with which it is affiliated, the principal officers, and all representatives.
   b. The name and address of its local agent for service of process.
   c. A general description of the public employees the organization represents or seeks to represent.
   d. The amounts of the initiation fee and monthly dues members must pay.
   e. A pledge, in a form prescribed by the board, that the organization will comply with the laws of the state and that it will accept
members without regard to age, race, sex, religion, national origin, or physical disability as provided by law.

f. A financial report and audit.

3. The constitution or bylaws of every employee organization shall provide that:
   a. Accurate accounts of all income and expenses shall be kept, and annual financial report and audit shall be prepared, such accounts shall be open for inspection by any member of the organization, and loans to officers and agents shall be made only on terms and conditions available to all members.
   b. Business or financial interests of its officers and agents, their spouses, minor children, parents, or otherwise, that conflict with the fiduciary obligation of such persons to the organization shall be prohibited.
   c. Every official or employee of an employee organization who handles funds or other property of the organization, or trust in which an organization is interested, or a subsidiary organization, shall be bonded. The amount, scope, and form of the bond shall be determined by the board.

4. The governing rules of every employee organization shall provide for periodic elections by secret ballot subject to recognized safeguards concerning the equal right of all members to nominate, seek office, and vote in such elections, the right of individual members to participate in the affairs of the organization, and fair and equitable procedures in disciplinary actions.

5. The board shall prescribe rules and regulations necessary to govern the establishment and reporting of trusteeships over employee organizations. Establishment of such trusteeships shall be permitted only if the constitution or bylaws of the organization set forth reasonable procedures.

6. An employee organization that has not registered or filed an annual report, or that has failed to comply with other provisions of this Act, shall not be certified. Certified employee organizations failing to comply with this Act may have such certification revoked by the board. Prohibitions may be enforced by injunction upon the petition of the board to the district court of the county in which the violation occurs. Complaints of violation of this section shall be filed with the board.

7. Upon the written request of any member of a certified employee organization, the auditor of state may audit the financial records of the certified employee organization.

SEC. 26. NEW SECTION. Employee organizations — political contributions. An employee organization shall not make any direct or indirect contribution out of the funds of the employee organization to any political party or organization or in support of any candidate for elective public office.

Any employee organization which violates the provisions of this section or fails to file any required report or affidavit or files a false report or affidavit shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than two thousand dollars.

Any person who willfully violates this section, or who makes a false statement knowing it to be false, or who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine or not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than thirty days.
or shall be subject to both such fine and imprisonment. Each individual required to sign affidavits or reports under this section shall be personally responsible for filing such report or affidavit and for any statement contained therein he knows to be false.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit voluntary contributions by individuals to political parties or candidates.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or deny any civil remedy which may exist as a result of action which may violate this section.

SEC. 27. NEW SECTION. Conflict with federal aid. If any provision of this Act jeopardizes the receipt by the state or any of its political subdivisions of any federal grant-in-aid funds or other federal allotment of money, the provisions of this Act shall, insofar as the fund is jeopardized, be deemed to be inoperative.

Editor's Note: This copy of Chapter 20, 1975 Iowa Code, was reprinted from the Acts of the 1974 Regular Session, 65th General Assembly. These sections appear in the Iowa Code with the designations "20.1, 20.2, etc."
Confidential

Your answers to the questions and all other information you give us will be held in strictest confidence.

Name ___________________________________________ Today’s Date ____________________ 19

1. Check one: □ Male □ Female

2. When were you born? _______________ 19

3. Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

   4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
   Grade School High School College Graduate or Professional School

4. What is your present job called? _______________________________________________________

5. What do you do on your present job?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

6. How long have you been on your present job? ______ years ______ months

7. What would you call your occupation, your usual line of work?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

8. How long have you been in this line of work? ______ years ______ months
PERSONAL DATA SHEET

1. SEX: _____ Male _____ Female

2. AGE: _____ 20-29 _____ 50-59
   _____ 30-39 _____ 60 and over
   _____ 40-49

3. EDUCATION:
   _____ Less than a bachelors degree
   _____ Bachelors degree
   _____ Masters degree
   _____ Higher than a masters degree

4. TEACHING LEVEL:
   _____ K-6
   _____ 7-12

5. TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOL:
   _____ 0-9 years _____ 20-29 years
   _____ 10-19 years _____ 30 and over

6. TOTAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
   _____ 0-9 years _____ 20-29 years
   _____ 10-19 years _____ 30 and over

7. HAS YOUR PRESENT JOB BEEN REDUCED OR ELIMINATED FOR THE 1981-82 SCHOOL YEAR?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the following pages you will find statements about your present job.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

- if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under "Very Sat." (Very Satisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under "Sat." (Satisfied);
- if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under "Dissat." (Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under "Very Dissat." (Very Dissatisfied).

- Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.

- Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.
Asic yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

---

### On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

### On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. The chance to tell other workers how to do things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Company policies and the way in which they are administered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The way my boss handles his/her employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The way my job provides for a secure future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The chance to make as much money as my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The physical surroundings where I work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The chances of getting ahead on this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The chance to develop close friendships with my co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The chance to make decisions on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The way I get full credit for the work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Being able to take pride in a job well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Being able to do something much of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The chance to help people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The chance to try something different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The chance to be alone on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The routine in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The chance to supervise other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. The chance to make use of my best abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. The chance to &quot;rub elbows&quot; with important people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The way employees are informed about company policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. The way my boss backs up his/her employees (with top management).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

- **Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
- **Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

### On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Dissat</th>
<th>Dissat</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Very Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. How my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The pleasantness of the working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. The way promotions are given out on this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. The way my boss delegates work to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The friendliness of my co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The chance to be responsible for the work of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The recognition I get for the work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Being able to do something worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Being able to stay busy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. The chance to develop new and better ways to do the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. The chance to do things that don't harm other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. The chance to work independently of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. The chance to do something different every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The chance to be important in the eyes of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. The way my boss takes care of the complaints of his/her employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. How steady my job is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. The physical working conditions of the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. The way my boss provides help on hard problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can’t decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76. The way my co-workers are easy to make friends with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. The way they usually tell me when I do my job well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. The chance to do my best at all times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. The chance to be “on the go” all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. The chance to be of some small service to other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. The chance to do the job without feeling I am cheating anyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. The chance to work away from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. The chance to do many different things on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. The chance to tell others what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. The chance to make use of my abilities and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. The chance to have a definite place in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. The way the company treats its employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. The personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. The way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. How my pay compares with that of other workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. The working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. My chances for advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. The way my boss trains his/her employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. The responsibility of my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
MSQ Scales

1. Ability utilization. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.

2. Achievement. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

3. Activity. Being able to keep busy all the time.

4. Advancement. The chances for advancement on this job.

5. Authority. The chance to tell other people what to do.

6. Company policies and practices. The way company policies are put into practice.

7. Compensation. My pay and the amount of work I do.

8. Co-workers. The way my co-workers get along with each other.

9. Creativity. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.

10. Independence. The chance to work alone on the job.

11. Moral values. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.

12. Recognition. The praise I get for doing a good job.


15. **Social service.** The chance to do things for other people.

16. **Social status.** The chance to be "somebody" in the community.

17. **Supervision-human relations.** The way my boss handles his men.

18. **Supervision-technical.** The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.

19. **Variety.** The chance to do different things from time to time.

20. **Working conditions.** The working conditions.
APPENDIX D

Letter to Superintendents

March 30, 1981

Dear Fellow Superintendent:

As part of a research project of the College of Education at Drake University, I am undertaking a study to measure job satisfaction levels of teachers in Iowa schools.

Education of children should be a common goal of boards of education, teachers, administrators, and community people. Should employee satisfaction levels influence the realization of that goal, it is important that educators study those satisfaction levels and select strategies that will either maintain or improve upon those levels.

Five teachers from your school district have been selected to complete the highly regarded Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. All teachers and schools have been selected at random and complete anonymity will be maintained.

All teachers will receive their questionnaires by direct mail and they are to return them directly to me. Their input will be beneficial to teachers, administrators, and boards of education.

Your consideration of this matter is most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Book
Superintendent of Schools
Doctoral Candidate
Drake University
Dear Fellow Educator:

As part of a research project of the College of Education at Drake University, I am undertaking a study to measure job satisfaction levels of teachers in Iowa schools.

Education of children should be a common goal of boards of education, teachers, administrators, and community people. Should employee satisfaction levels influence the realization of that goal, it is important that educators study those satisfaction levels and select strategies that will either maintain or improve upon those levels.

Enclosed is the highly regarded Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire which requires approximately fifteen minutes to complete. All teachers and school districts have been selected at random and complete anonymity will be maintained.

A self-addressed stamped envelope has been enclosed for the questionnaire's return. The personal data sheet should also be completed.

Your consideration in this matter is most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Book
Research Assistant
Dear Educator:

Your help is urgently needed.

As part of a research project to measure job satisfaction levels of teachers in Iowa schools, you received a questionnaire two weeks ago. Your input will be extremely valuable to teachers, boards of education, and community members who wish to provide a quality education for their children.

All that you need do to render this very worthwhile contribution to education is complete the following questionnaire. Won't you please take fifteen minutes now and provide the information needed and return the form in today's mail?

Complete anonymity is guaranteed and a self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed.

Thank you for your important contribution.

Sincerely yours,

Mike Book
Research Assistant
College of Education