AN INVESTIGATION OF JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION AMONG THE TEACHERS IN SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Educational Administration

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

BY

SAMSON ADEBAYO OLADEBO
Evanston, Illinois

September, 1978

© 1978

SAMSON ADEBAYO OLADEBO

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION AMONG THE TEACHERS IN SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA

Samson Adebayo Oladebo

Purpose

This study was designed to measure and explain job satisfaction among secondary level teachers in Kano, Nigeria through a questionnaire instrument. The study measured (1) the degree of satisfaction among the teachers with ten components of job satisfaction: recognition, achievement, work itself, advancement, responsibility, salary, administrative policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, and working conditions; (2) differences in satisfaction with the ten components between teachers according to qualifications, sex, age, experience, reasons for entering the teaching profession, and school area; (3) differences in overall satisfaction between teachers according to these classifications.

Population

A total of 356 Nigerian teachers from 30 secondary institutions selected at random constituted the sample.

Usable questionnaires were obtained from 284 respondents.

Procedure

The procedure included an extensive review of the literature dealing with job satisfaction. The items of this study's instrument were selected from the list of job satisfaction items used by various researchers as relevant to the Nigerian educational system.

The instrument was comprised of a three-part questionnaire: (1) six items of demographic information; (2) fifty-eight items divided into ten components or scales for assessing job satisfaction; and (3) additional free responses from the respondents concerning other items or factors not covered by the questionnaire. Questionnaires were personally delivered and collected.

Degree of satisfaction was determined by the response frequency scores; high satisfaction scores were interpreted as "satisfaction," high dissatisfaction scores were interpreted as "dissatisfaction," and high scores between the two as "undecided."

The discriminant function analysis and multivariate analysis of variance were the statistical procedures applied to test the hypothesis of equal population means between groups of the six demographic classifications. A three-way analysis of variance was used to test the six alternative hypotheses.

Findings and Recommendations

The results revealed that teachers expressed satisfaction with teaching as a job; opportunity available to excel, achieve and grow on the job; responsibilities being given; the amount of supervision in their schools and/or their work; professional and personal interactions with principals, colleagues and students; and physical conditions and/or facilities available for doing the work. They expressed dissatisfaction with advancement--the actual potential for improvement in their status or position. Their opinions were undecided about recognition, salary, and administrative policies.

In comparing the teachers' satisfaction, the results indicated that qualification, age, teaching experience at secondary level, and area of employment made no significant difference in job statisfaction. However, teachers who entered the profession because of interest expressed significantly more satisfaction than those who were influenced solely by economic reasons. Female teachers as well as teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession expressed more overall satisfaction than their counter groups.

The results of testing Herzberg's two-factor (motivation-hygiene) theory indicated that the same variable associated with dissatisfaction is related to satisfaction.

Therefore, these results did not conform with Herzberg's conclusion that internal (motivation) factors act as satisfiers while external (hygiene) factors act as dissatisfiers. Reasons are discussed in terms of cultural differences between Nigeria and the United States.

On the basis of these findings, the following recommendations were offered: (1) Interest in the work itself seemed to be one major determinant of Kano teachers' overall satisfaction, suggesting that teachers should be recruited from among individuals showing an interest in education; (2) more female graduates should be encouraged to take up teaching as a career; (3) conditions of service should be improved to make teaching more attractive; (4) more in-service training programs, professional activities, and meaningful incentives are needed.

Approved by:

Anthony M. Cresswell

Anthony M. Cresswell
Associate Professor of Education and Management

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author of this research is indebted to many people and wished to express sincere thanks and appreciation to:

Professor Anthony M. Cresswell (Chairman of Doctoral Committee) for his advice, encouragement, patience and invaluable guidance throughout the doctoral program and for making this study a success.

Professor Norman D. Bowers for his generous and unique contributions to this study, particularly assisting in the statistical design of the study, and also for his recommendations.

Professor Arthur D. Smith for his contributions at the initial preparation of this study.

Alice Palmer for her invaluable suggestions and recommendations.

The author is indebted to the Ministry of Education, Kano State, Nigeria for the permission to conduct this research, the principals and vice principals of secondary institutions in Kano for their assistance, and the teachers who graciously consented to fill out the questionnaire which provided the data for this research.

A note of thanks is due to Mr. Bola Akanbi, who assisted the author during the distribution and collection of the questionnaire.

S. A. O.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	. . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES	. . . . .	v
Chapter		
I. INTRODUCTION	. . . . .	1
	Measurement of Job Satisfaction	
	Concept of Job Satisfaction	
	Secondary Education and Nigerian Teachers	
	Definition of Terms	
	Procedures	
	Limitations of the Study	
	Assumptions	
	Organization of the Remainder of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	. . . . .	23
	Introduction	
	The Concept of Job Satisfaction	
	Theories of Job Satisfaction	
	Traditional Theory	
	Need Hierarchy Theory	
	Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory	
	Expectancy Theory	
	Equity Theory	
	Two-Factor Theory	
	Supportive Studies on Two-Factor Theory	
	Controversy on Two-Factor Theory	
	Other Studies on Job Satisfaction	
	Summary	
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	. . . . .	57
	The Instrument	
	The Population	
	Procedures for Data Collection	
	Analysis Procedures	
	Discriminant Analysis	
	Multivariate Analysis of Variance	
	Three-Way Analysis of Variance	
	Summary	

Chapter Page

IV. FINDINGS 79

Degree of Satisfaction
Testing the Null Hypothesis
Testing the Alternative Hypotheses
Results of Free Responses
Summary

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 106

Summary of the Study
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER 125

APPENDIX B. LETTERS OF PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE THE STUDY 134

APPENDIX C. TABLES 15, 16, 17, AND 18 139

APPENDIX D. LIST OF SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA 158

BIBLIOGRAPHY 160

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Respondents Characteristics--Qualification, Sex, Age, Experience, Reasons for Entering Teaching, and School Area	62
2.	Nigerian Teachers at Secondary Institutions by Sex and Qualifications Representing the State and National Data	63
3.	Scale Means and Standard Deviations Based on Items, and Reliability Coefficients for the Ten Scales for a Sample of 71 Nigerian Teachers	66
4.	Intercorrelation Matrix of 10 Satisfaction Scales	69
5.	Frequency of Response for Degree of Satisfaction among Secondary Education Level Teachers in Kano, Nigeria Defined by Ten Scales	80
6.	Summary of the Degree of Satisfaction Among Secondary Education Level Teachers in Kano, Defined by the Frequency of Responses and Percentages	84
7.	Discriminant Function Analysis: Test of Significant Difference Between Two Groups of Teachers by Qualification, Sex, Age, Experience, Reasons, and Area on Job Satisfaction	86
8.	Standard Discriminant Function Coefficients for the Significant Difference Between Teachers Who Entered Teaching Because of Interest and Those Who Entered Because of Economic Reasons	87
9.	Multivariate Tests of Significance for Teachers by Qualification, Sex, Age, Experience, Reasons for Entering Teaching Profession, and Area of Work on Job Satisfaction	88

Table Page

10. Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction Defined by 10 Scales for 6 Demographic Classifications and for the Total Sample 89

11. Comparison for Satisfaction Between Groups in Each of the 6 Variable Classifications Defined by the 10 Scales 92

12. Total Scores and Average Scores for Teachers' Satisfaction Based on a Separate Item Question for 6 Demographic Classifications and for the Total Sample . . . 98

13. Comparison of Overall Satisfaction Based on a Separate Item Question Among Teachers by Qualification, Sex, and Age 99

14. Comparison of Overall Satisfaction Based on a Separate Item Question Among Teachers by Experience, Reasons for Entering the Profession, and Area of Work 100

15. Discriminant Function Coefficients for Six Variable Classifications Defined by the 10 Job Satisfaction Scales 140

16. Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction Defined by Each of the 10 Scales for 6 Variable Classifications and for the Total Sample by Random Groups 141

17. Response Frequency of the Total Sample Based on Items 151

18. Response Frequency Based on the Ten Scales N = 284 153

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Understanding and improving job satisfaction among teachers is a central problem in the study of education or the successful administration of educational institutions. The purpose of this study is to add to that understanding through assessing the determinants of job satisfaction among a sample of secondary institution teachers in Kano, Nigeria. The results of the study will add to the general understanding of job satisfaction, and aid in educational policy development in Nigeria.

Nigeria is now going through a period of self-awareness. It is developing educational policies geared toward meeting the needs of its development; notwithstanding, the need for an indigenous teaching staff at the secondary level cannot be over-estimated. The question of getting the youth motivated and prepared to enter the teaching profession and persuading those already in the profession to remain poses a problem for the government, ministries of education, and other bodies connected with decision-making in education. The investigation of job satisfaction among the teachers provides information for the efforts in

attracting, retaining staff, and in stimulating extra-ordinary performance.

The success of the educational system in achieving its objectives depends on the knowledge, skills, motivation, and morale of its personnel, especially teachers. If teachers become dissatisfied with their jobs for particular reasons, they could lose interest in their profession and so disrupt the main function of teaching. Keeping high morale and satisfaction among teachers requires skillful and steady actions from administrative leadership.

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

The study assessed job satisfaction by obtaining teachers' opinions about their work and working conditions, particularly in terms of how ten components of satisfaction (recognition, achievement and growth opportunity, work itself, advancement, responsibility, salary, administrative policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, and working conditions) contributed to overall satisfaction of the teachers. The main parts of the study were designed to:

1. Determine the degree of teachers' satisfaction with each of the ten components or scales
2. Compare teachers' satisfaction on each of the ten scales and determine if differences found were a factor of qualification (degree and non-degree), sex (male and female), age (under thirty and over

thirty years), teaching experience at secondary level (less than five and more than five years), reasons for entering teaching profession (interest in the profession and economic reasons), geographical area of work (urban and rural area schools)

3. Compare the teachers' overall satisfaction, according to their demographic classifications.

The following questions served as guidelines:

1. To what extend do the teachers express satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction as measured by each of the ten scales?
2. Do the teachers, according to their classifications respond differently concerning their satisfaction measured by the ten scales? The following null hypothesis was tested:

> There is no significant difference in the response to satisfaction on each of the ten scales between each of the following groups: degree and non-degree teachers, male and female teachers, teachers under and over thirty years of age, teachers with less than five years and those who had more than five years teaching experience at secondary level, teachers who entered teaching because of interest and those who entered because of economic reasons, teachers in urban and rural area schools.

3. Do the teachers according to their classifications respond differently with regard to the overall satisfaction? The following alternative hypotheses were tested:

a. Both degree and non-degree teachers will score equally high for overall satisfaction

b. Female teachers will score significantly higher than male teachers for overall satisfaction

c. Teachers who are over thirty years of age will score significantly higher than those who are under thirty years of age for overall satisfaction.

d. Teachers with more than five years teaching experience at the secondary level will score significantly higher than those who had less than five years teaching experience for overall satisfaction

e. Teachers who entered the teaching profession because of interest in the profession will score significantly higher than those who entered because of economic reasons for overall satisfaction

f. Teachers in urban area schools will score significantly higher than those in rural area schools for overall satisfaction

Concept of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been considered important not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it has been held that the worker who likes his/her job will work with efficiency and enthusiasm.[1] Therefore, considerable opinion has been expressed and research conducted concerning job satisfaction, particularly job satisfaction among teachers in an educational context.

As early as 1935, Robert Hoppock[2] conducted a study in which he made a comparison of satisfied and dissatisfied teachers. Later, Frederick Herzberg and his asso-

ciates[3] developed a comprehensive theory of job satisfaction that has led to numerous studies. The theory makes a distinction between two sets of job factors; one set is related to the actual doing of the job, the job content or the intrinsic aspects of the job. These factors are called motivators and include: recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement, and work itself. The other set is related to the environmental setting or extrinsic factors of the job; these are termed hygiene factors and include: salary, administrative policies, possibility of growth, interpersonal relations, supervision, working conditions, status, security, and personal life.

The effect of job satisfaction on achieving organizational goals and on improving the productivity of people working in private and public organizations has been receiving increasing attention. According to Lawler,[4] recent interest in job satisfaction ties in directly with the rising concern in many countries about the quality of life, and that there is an increasing acceptance of the view that material possessions and economic growth do not necessarily produce a high quality of life. He contends that job satisfaction is one measure of the affective quality of work life in organizations. Therefore, job satisfaction is worthy of understanding and increases even if it does not relate to performance.

Job satisfaction constitutes one dimension which has received considerable attention for the purpose of understanding the individual worker and the working environment. Accumulating evidence seems to suggest that the worker's perception of himself or herself and his/her organization has an effect on personal adjustment, commitment to work, and job productivity.

A number of studies have been conducted focusing on job satisfaction and its relationship to organizational climate, administrative policies, and efficiency, particularly on teacher-satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Sergiovanni, Duns and Stephens, Wernimont, Stockmoe, Tesar, Imphong, Cooper, Rada, Clarke, Keffer, Cohen and Cole). This study fits in this category as an investigation of the job satisfaction among secondary level teachers in Kano State, Nigeria.

Job satisfaction studies can also help management. Imphong[5] contends that competent management has to regularly seek feedback from its employees as to their feeling toward the administrative policies and working conditions. This feedback, according to Imphong, helps the management to recognize the weaknesses, come up with solutions, and launch improvements. Personnel policies, rules and regulations are intended to facilitate the employment and utilization of qualified personnel who are satisfied with their work and with the school system.

In the light of the above, there must be a periodic review or survey of teachers' morale, attitude, and the feeling of satisfaction toward their profession in order to find out changes, if any, in their feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This study provides a step toward that direction. It is also of value in that insight into the problem of teacher-turnover and attrition, recruitment, and retention may be gained by the study of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers in Nigeria. Such study can provide information which can be used by administrative and supervisory personnel of the ministry of education to develop conditions that can attract and hold teachers. It can also provide insight concerning recruitment and selection of teachers, and can generate additional educational research relevant to satisfaction of teachers.

Before discussing the specifics of the study, it is useful to consider the nature of the setting in which the study was conducted.

Secondary Education and Nigerian Teachers

Kano State is one of the nineteen states of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. The state came into existence on April 1, 1968 by a decree of the Federal Military Government which divided Nigeria into states. It is the only province of the former Northern Nigeria that changed its administrative status from that of a single province

to a full-fledged state. Kano has a population of about 6 million people (1963 census), which makes it now Nigeria's most populous state. It covers an area of 42,592 square kilometers (16,630 square miles). The climate is tropical, and the economy is based on agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Although the introduction of Western education in Kano State is relatively recent, the society, being predominantly Moslem, has for many centuries had a system of education based on Koranic schools. The central feature of Koranic schools has been the study of the Holy Koran by reading and writing in Arabic scripts. Many graduates of Koranic schools who continued with further education in Arabic were able to master various branches of learning such as law, mathematics, geography, history, theology, philosophy, etc. It was these learned people who, for many centuries before the advent of British administration, judicial, and educational cadre for the public services in the State. Today, the Koranic schools are being revolutionized to meet the modern standard of Western education.[6]

Western education did not receive the priority it deserved in Kano until after Nigeria attained independence. Still Western education has not been well grounded as in other parts of the country. And since the creation of states, Kano has come to appreciate more of its manpower needs. In the struggle to catch up educationally with

other states, the government has started to improve both the system and standard of education in the State. Evidence of this was the 1971-1972 budget for which education accounted for 30 percent of the recurrent expenditure, while in the last budget (1977-1978) over half the total recurrent expenditure went to education.[7]

A significant milestone in the educational development of the state was reached in September 1976 with the introduction of the Universal Primary Education Scheme in Nigeria. Also there has been a steady and remarkable improvement in post-primary education in the state. In order to avoid primary school-leaver problem, the current expansion of primary schools has necessitated the expansion of post-primary institutions. This expansion of post-primary institutions requires expansion of post-primary teacher supply.

Kano State, as some other Northern states in the country, has encountered some hardship in meeting manpower requirements (teachers) in post-primary institutions. Although the shortage is true of Nigeria as a whole, it is more serious for Kano as well as other parts of the Northern states than for the Southern states. This shortage has necessitated the recruitment of more non-Nigerian teachers. In the early 1970s the non-Nigerian teachers in Kano accounted for 40 percent of the total

teaching staff and about 75 percent of the degree teachers on the teaching staff.[8] According to the education statistics, published by the Ministry of Education, the percentage of non-Nigerian teachers dropped to 33.6 percent while they accounted for 53 percent of all the degree teachers on the teaching staff.[9]

The predominance of non-Nigerian teachers, according to Aleyideino, was one reason for the loss of many capable Nigerians from the teaching profession, many of whom found their way into politics or other administrative positions, Ministries of education have been incapable of replacing these teachers and at the same time meeting the demands for rapid expansion. Many Northern states including Kano came to rely on recruiting contracted teachers from overseas.[10]

A number of Nigerian writers have discussed this problem. Majasan[11] had once drawn attention to the fact that the teaching profession is losing its qualified teachers to other business in a time when it is unable to attract capable and interested youths. He noted:

> The general manpower shortage which made it difficult to interest talented people in teaching coupled with poor conditions of service has worsened the recruitment situation. Teaching has to compete with other occupations for abler young men and women, who for some reasons are not attracted to it. Most of those attracted are the ones who cannot succeed in entering other jobs, and therefore take up teaching. The majority of secondary institutions teaching staff are of this category.

Biobaku[12] also had emphasized the poor situation of the drift from the teaching profession and said:

> There is need to reinvest teaching with its true majesty as a noble profession. Teachers appear to be losing sight of their avocations. For many, teaching profession has ceased to be a calling, only an occupation to be abandoned as soon as possible.

Fafunwa[13] also pointed out that the teaching profession has not been able to command the respect it deserves, and that it has been for many Africans a means to an end rather than an end itself.

The Ashby Commission[14] once noted the withdrawal of teachers from the teaching profession and said:

> There is an awareness of the constant migration of teachers away from teaching so that the continual turnover of teaching staff may come to be loocked upon as a sort of preparation for position in other sector of the employment. The professional training of teachers is not the most serious o f the problems confronting Nigeria in its teaching profession, but much more serious are the difficulties of securing enough teachers with sufficient education and retaining them in the profession. The position could be alleviated by improving the conditions of service and other measures which could help confer stability on the teaching profession.

One of the major constraints to the desired improvement in secondary education is thus the serious shortage of qualified teaching staff resulting from high attrition and turnover. This covers teacher-withdrawal from the school by resignation, the cause of which Aleyideino[15] referred to as "lack of satisfaction from their job."

Earlier in 1968, the Federal Military Government

launched a crash program for the supply and training of teachers for post-primary institutions and undertook to cover the cost and training of all teachers. The students who benefited were bonded. But as Adesina[16] discovered in studying some recipients, 72 percent hoped to leave teaching as soon as they had completed their period of bonded teaching. He also found in another study that 147 out of 178 teachers stressed "poor condition of service" as major outstanding grievances of the teaching profession. Some of the poor conditions cited include: "underpayment compared with counterparts in the civil service," "no promotional prospects," "teachers are not respected and recognized by our society," and "lack of encouragement by governments," to mention a few.

In the efforts to enhance the situation, the Federal Military Government approved and implemented not only a substantial increase in the salary of teachers as attractive as counterpart employment outside the teaching profession, but also sanctioned further intensification of training programs backed with appropriate incentive ranging from substantial subsidies in the training college to retirement benefits. The government makes all teacher-training institutions free with some monthly allowance to attract and encourage students to enroll and choose teaching as a profession. Yet the continual drift from the profession still

remains uncontrolled. The shadow of this was reflected in the publication by the Nigeria Union of Teachers.[17] It advises the National Education Committee on the uniform implementation of the already approved condition of service of teachers by the Federal Military Government in order to minimize the perennial exodus from the teaching profession.

However, current concerns in Nigeria which require the teaching force to meet the needs of rapid development and expansion constitute, among other things, replacing teaching staff lost by attrition, replacing the existing unqualified teachers by qualified ones, and Nigerianizing most if not all the staffing positions. The task of getting young men and women motivated and/or prepared to enter the teaching profession, and retaining those already in the profession must take into consideration the way the present teachers feel about teaching and some aspects of their jobs. This may be achieved through an investigation of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the teachers.

The study is of great potential importance in providing an impetus to the struggle for the attainment of the desired teaching force. In the Third National Development Plan 1975-1980, the Federal Government of Nigeria[18] declares:

> Effort so far made to produce the required teaching force to meet the needs of rapid educational expansion have not attained the desired result. The persistent

> shortages have enforced the recruitment of untrained teachers to supplement the pool of trained teachers. . . . Expatriate teachers have been recruited at higher financial cost to fill acute short-falls in certain crucial areas. . . . Unless teachers become available in adequate numbers, accelerated expansion programs and anticipated increases in enrollment will remain unattainable. . . . Conditions of service in the profession itself will be made as attractive as counterpart employment outside the profession.

Although studies have been conducted concerning teachers' satisfaction, no study has been specifically designed and conducted in Nigeria, particularly in Kano State, regarding the feeling of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction among secondary level teachers. Understanding and identification of the aspects of the teaching job that contribute to teachers' satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction could have important implications not only for school administrators, but also other education authorities in Kano State as well as the country in general.

Definition of Terms

The following terms used in the study are defined as follows:

Secondary Educational Institutions: A formal, post-primary educational system in Nigeria comprising: secondary grammar schools, secondary commercial schools, grade II teachers training colleges, and technical/vocational training schools.

Secondary Grammar School: A post-primary institution that offers five- or six-year general education pro-

gram in preparing students for useful living within the society, and for higher education.

Secondary Commercial School: A post-primary institution similar in many respects to secondary grammar school except that its curriculum lays emphasis on commercial (business) subjects such as bookkeeping/accounting, shorthand, typewriting, etc.

Grade II Teachers Training College: A post-primary institution established specifically for training of teachers for primary schools.

Secondary Technical/Vocational School: A post-primary institution similar in many respects to secondary grammar school, and which leads to the acquisition of practical and applied skills as well as basic scientific knowledge.[19]

Degree: A university graduate with Bachelor of Arts or Science, Master of Arts or Science, and Doctoras degree.

Non-degree: A well-qualified graduate of higher educational institutions, other than a degree program of a university, with certificates such as Nigeria Certificate of Education, Grade I Teachers Certificate, National Diploma, and Higher National Diploma.

Ministry of Education: The department of government that has overall responsibility for supervising policies on education in Nigeria. This is analogous to Office of Education in the United States.

Administrative area: The local political jurisdiction.

Inspectors: The educational personnel from the Ministry of Education responsible for inspecting the schools and the teaching process to ensure that the system measures up to established criteria.

Job satisfaction: The pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's values.[20]

Job dissatisfaction: The unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues.[21]

Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: A function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing.[22]

Job satisfaction scales: The general categories of job satisfaction items that fall into ten scales as used in this study to measure teachers' satisfaction.

Recognition: Expression of appreciation and gratitude for teachers and their jobs.

Achievement and growth opportunities: Opportunities available to teachers through professionally supportive policies, actions, and activities, initated by the Ministry

of Education, its agencies, and/or by the teachers themselves to excel, achieve and grow on the job.

Work itself: The actual work performed in teaching.

Advancement: The opportunities available for the teachers in the actual potential for improvement in their status or position.

Responsibility: Being able to stick to any job assigned the teachers as a result of their perseverance, determination, and reliability.

Administrative policies: The formal rules and regulations used by the Ministry of Education or any of its agencies to conduct its work, as well as the attitudes of their officials toward the teachers.

Interpersonal relations: The nature of social and professional interactions that take place between the teachers and their school principals, colleagues, and students.

Working conditions: Adequacy, quality, and amount of facilities, equipment, instructional materials, and physical conditions of work generally.

Salary: The remuneration (pay) received for the job.

Supervision: Inspection of schools and teaching process to ensure that the system measures up to established criteria.

2. The teachers would provide adequate and accurate responses for analysis

3. The teachers who responded to the questionnaire were representative of the total population of teachers in Kano State, Nigeria

4. The researcher had adequate knowledge of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the study is organized as follows: Chapter II presents a review of job satisfaction literature with particular emphasis on concept of job satisfaction, theories and research on job satisfaction; Chapter III describes the design of the study; Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data obtained in the study; and Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter Notes

[1]J. Frankel, Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction (Los Angeles: ERIC Clearing House for Junior College, 1973), p. 1.

[2]R. Hoppock, Job Satisfaction (New York: Harper & Row, 1935), pp. 25-40.

[3]F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, 2d ed. (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1959), p. 111.

[4]E. E. Lawler, "Satisfaction and Behavior," in Hackman, Lawler, and Porter, Perspective on Behavior in Organization (New York: McGraw Hill, 1977), p. 39.

[5]R. M. Imphong, "An Investigation of the Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Beginning and Experienced Industrial Art Teachers in the State of Maryland" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1974), p. 17.

[6]Kano State, Kano State Handbook, Ministry of Home Affairs and Information Publications, Kano, Nigeria, 1976.

[7]J. W. Hanson (Project Director), Secondary Level Teachers: Supply and Demand in Nigeria (East Lansing, Mich.: Institute of International Studies in Education and African Affairs Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1973), p. 104.

[8]S. C. Aleyideino, in Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers, p. 111.

[9]Ministry of Education, Kano, Education Statistics for Kano State (Kano, Nigeria: Government Printers, 1976-1977).

[10]Aleyideino, in Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers, p. 110.

[11]J. A. Majasan, "The Qualifications, Recruitment, and Training of Staff for Teacher Education in Nigeria," Proceedings of the Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training, University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 15-19, 1969.

[12]S. O. Biobaku (Chairman), "Opening Address," Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training: A Report, Federal Ministry of Education & University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 15-19, 1969.

[13]A. B. Fafunwa, "The Overall Aims and Objectives of Teacher Education in Nigeria," Proceedings of the Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training, University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 15-19, 1969.

[14]Eric Ashby (Chairman), "The Report of the Commission on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria," Investment in Education (Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Education, 1960).

[15]Aleyideino, in Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers, p. 111.

[16]S. Adesina, in Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers, pp. 25-39.

[17]Nigerian Union of Teachers, "The Civic Rights of Teachers and Educational Administration with the New Local Government Councils," Daily Times Publications, Nigeria, (May 7, 1977), 28.

[18]Federal Republic of Nigeria, Third National Development Plan, 1975-1980, Lagos, Nigeria (1975), 244.

[19]Nigeria, Federal Ministray of Education, Statistics of Education in Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Information Printing Division, Lagos, Nigeria (1971), 3-4.

[20]E. A. Locke, "What is Job Satisfaction," Organization Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (1969), 316.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]A field trip to Kano, Nigeria was financed by Federal Government of Nigeria for the purpose of distributing the questionnaire to teachers of the selected schools and collecting the returns.

[24]The statistical procedures and the actual computer programs used in this study were developed from the Subprograms of the SPSS--Statistical Package of Social Science.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is particularly focused on the review of pertinent literature based on job satisfaction. The organization of the chapter includes the concept of job satisfaction, theories of job satisfaction, and various studies conducted on job satisfaction.

Considerable opinion has been expressed and research conducted concerning job satisfaction, particularly relative to factors associated with or causing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Studies and interpretations of job satisfaction, especially in education seem to be predicated upon the assumption that any factor can act to cause both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, depending upon the degree to which the factor is present or absent. School administrators, therefore, should realize that there does appear to be a high degree of correlation between good teaching and the personal satisfactions of the teachers.

Frankel[1] contends that the worker who likes his job will work with efficiency and enthusiasm. As this idea is also applied in an educational context, teachers who find

satisfaction in their jobs will create a better learning environment for students.

Anderson[2] states that it is no longer feasible for school administrators to ignore the implications of a teacher's attitude toward teaching, because that attitude has an effect upon the quality of instruction. The effective administrator, therefore, appreciates the importance of the attitudes and mental health of his/her staff members as he/she constantly endeavors to maintain and improve an enviornment conducive to the high satisfaction and good mental hygiene of his/her staff.

Call[3] draws attention to the fact that many business executives and textbooks on management emphasize that an employee's loyalty to a job or to an organization is dependent upon his/her attitudes and feelings toward that job or organization. In an article concerning the school board and teacher satisfaction, Redefer[4] points out that staff satisfaction is a good indication of the quality and excellence of a school's educational program. For the board of education, teacher satisfaction is a barometer of the adequacies of personnel policies and administrative procedure. If improvement in teaching staff satisfaction is to be made, it is essential that the administrator find out what teachers are saying concerning their feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction about their jobs.

The Concept of Job Satisfaction

A simple definition of job satisfaction was suggested by Hoppock,[5] who was one of the pioneers in research on job satisfaction. Hoppock defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say 'I am satisfied with my job.'"

As research developed, the need for an adequate definition of job satisfaction was felt. Some researchers point out that job satisfaction may be better defined if its dimensions are clearly understood. In discussing the conceptual problems of job satisfaction, Korman stated:[6]

> job satisfaction can be viewed as a multi-dimensional phenomenon in that several different components have varied somewhat from study to study and according to the research method, it seems fairly clear that among the major dimensions of job satisfaction are satisfaction with (1) supervisors, (2) pay, (3) co-workers, (4) company procedures, and (5) activities of the job.

An operational definition of job satisfaction was suggested by Martin Evans,[7] who noticed that job satisfaction consists of the following four levels: (a) overall satisfaction; (b) satisfaction with various aspects of the job such as pay, work itself, supervision, growth opportunities, etc.; (c) satisfaction with specific individual needs or goals; (d) the level of aspiration of needs and goals; (e) the strength of a particular aspect to the individual.

The effect of job satisfaction on achieving organizational goals and on improving the productivity of people working in private and public organizations has been receiving increasing attention. According to Lawler,[8] recent interest in job satisfaction ties in directly with the rising concern in many countries about the quality of life. There is an increasing acceptance of the view that material possessions and economic growth do not necessarily produce a high quality of life. Recognition is now being given to the importance of the kinds of effective reactions that people experience and to the fact that those are not always tied to economic or material accomplishment. For example, even the United States Government, through the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, have recently become active in trying to improve the quality of work life. Job satisfaction is one measure of the quality of life in organizations and is worth understanding and increasing, even if it does not relate to performance.

Job satisfaction also influences productivity. Lawler indicates that the term "job satisfaction" in past years has been used to refer to effective attitudes or orientations on the part of individuals toward jobs, and contends that much of the research on job satisfaction seemed to be stimulated by the desire to show that job satisfaction is important because it influences productivity.

Recently, many organizational psychologists seem to be studying job satisfaction simply because they are interested in finding its causes.

Concerns for the interest of individuals by the management is an important value to its organization. Finley, Sortain and Tate[9] also indicated that management serves its enterprise as well as the interest of its employees when it shows interest in the individual personality of the workers. Good working conditions and high morale are important values to the executive because it has been shown that those concerns for the value of the employee are important as the worker values wages, contracts, retirement plans, bonus incentives, and the like; he/she also wants to feel that his/her work is important in the eyes of his/her organization. The good reputation of his/her organization and profession meets his/her need for recognition and accomplishment among co-workers, friends, and others.

According to Katz and Kahn,[10] the maintenance subsystem whose function is to mediate between task demands and human needs to keep the structure in operation is considered an essential element in the general system theory of social organization. Rewards and sanctions are utilized to attract and hold personnel and to maintain the fabric of interdependent behavior necessary for task accomplishment. Keeping people in the organization satisfied and motivated to perform is a task that has to be accomplished by the

managerial leadership. In addition to economic rewards, morale is affected by prestige, status, gratification from interesting work, identification with group products, and satisfaction from decision-making.

Wernimont[11] believes that relationships among job variables can be more effectively studies and expanded when overall job satisfaction is viewed as a system. Dun and Stephen[12] pointed out that the success of any organization in a competitive and democratic society depends upon the productivity of its employees as well as the satisfaction which they derive from their jobs, fellow workers, management, and the rewards system of the organization.

In a study conducted by Chase[13] on teacher satisfaction and morale, a number of aspects found to be important factors relating to satisfaction for teachers include: the dynamic and stimulating leadership of the principal, helpfulness, opportunities for professional growth, respect, friendliness, and administrative qualities.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

According to Griffiths,[14] theory increases understanding of a phenomenon, it reveals its uniformities which enable people to predict according to established criteria, and also provides guides to action. Another function of theory was also suggested by Sheldon[15] as "making it possible for researchers to derive logical relations and

achieve new knowledge." This implies that successful implementation of these functions requires that theory and practice have to be the essential elements of the process of scientific inquiry and research. Their co-existence makes each one of the functions constantly re-define the other. But this necessary coexistence has its difficulties, especially in behavioral sciences where the researcher sometimes finds it difficult to delineate the limits of normative and descriptive theory. In the area of job satisfaction and motivation to work, theory has helped researchers achieve better understanding and a systematic arrangement of both what they know and what they need to know about job satisfaction.[16]

The theoretical treatment of job satisfaction has shed light on its psychological and environmental element during the past decades. A number of theories to explain job satisfaction have been developed, different approaches and techniques to secure data have been applied, and of course, different interpretations and conclusions have been reached. However, all of these theories seem to agree that job satisfaction improves employees' morale, diffuses tension between workers and management, and leads to organizational effectiveness.[17]

A controversial issue in theory and research on this subject has been whether job satisfaction and job dis-

necessarily motivated simply because the school and principal are friendly, either. While professional growth opportunities motivate teachers to perform well, the absence of these opportunities seldom produces enough dissatisfaction to cause teachers to change jobs.[18] Explaining this relationship is the core of the theories in job satisfaction.

Traditional Theory

Traditional theory, according to Wolf,[19] suggests that job satisfaction is unidimensional, meaning there is a linear relationship between job determinants and overall satisfaction. The same determinants can be related to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. House and Wigdor[20] also point out that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not mutually exclusive. Other studies show that any given factor may cause job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the same group of workers. However, they concluded that intrinsic job factors are considered to be more significant to both satisfying and dissatisfying job events.

Need Hierarchy Theory

This theory, known as Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory according to Ivancevich,[21] postulates that people in the work-place are motivated to perform by a desire to satisfy a set of internal needs. There are five categories

e. Self-actualization: The need to fulfill oneself by maximizing the use of abilities, skills, and potential is the highest level of the need hierarchy. Maslow describes people with this need as individuals who seek work assignments that challenge their skills and abilities, permits them to develop and to use creative or innovative approaches, and provide for general advancement and personal growth.

Ivancevich and others contend that Maslow's theory is built on the framework that unsatisfied needs serve as factors that arouse people to behavior. When need has been minimally fulfilled, it then ceases to be a motivator of behavior. This indicates that highly deficient need or needs which have gone unsatisfied for a long period of time serve to cause frustration, conflict, and stress.

Since the development of Maslow's need theory, numerous studies have been done on the need hierarchy theory in organizations. Sampling two thousand managers from different companies, Porter[22] indicated that managers high in the organization chain of command place greater emphasis on and were more satisfied with the need for esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization than were lower-level managers. Also at the lower level of management, small company managers were more satisfied than their counterparts in large companies. The managers at the higher

management levels in large companies were more satisfied than their counterparts in small companies.

Despite some interesting and supportive research, other findings have raised a number of issues and criticisms about the theory. Lawler and Suttle[23] identified two levels of needs instead of five: (1) a biological level, and (2) a global need level encompassing the higher order needs.

Locke[24] also commented that an individual's needs should be viewed not in a static, but in a dynamic context Individual needs are constantly changing due to the various situations in which people become involved. Also, more than one level of need may be operational at the same time for an individual; for instance, a project engineer may be striving to satisfy a self-actualization need while simultaneously being concerned with a safety need.

Although many of the current research results, according to Ivancevich, both fail to consistently support the need hierarchy approach and question its conceptual clarity. However, the theory is simple and is important to managers because individual needs, no matter how defined, are critical factors in understanding behavior.[25]

Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory

This theory, which is referred to as Alderfer's ERG Theory, is a recently proposed motivational approach that

seeks to establish human needs in organizational settings.

Alderfer condensed Maslow's hierarchy theory into three need categories: Existence (E), Relatedness (R), and Growth (G), and based them upon three major propositions:

a. The less each level of need has been satisfied, the more it will be desired

b. The more lower level needs have been satisfied, the greater the desire for high level needs

c. The less the higher level needs have been satisfied, the more the lower level needs will be desired.

Two important differences between the ERG theory and Maslow's Need Hierarchy were noted by Ivancevicy. He stated that the need hierarchy theory is based upon a satisfaction-progression approach, that is, an individual will progress to a higher order need once a lower order need has been satisfied. The ERG theory, according to Ivancevich, incorporates not only a satisfaction-progression approach but also a frustration-regression component. Frustration-regression describes the situation where a higher order need remains unsatisfied, or frustrated, and greater importance or desire is placed on the next lower need.[26]

A number of studies have been done to examine the ERG theory using samples of students, managers, and bank employees. Schneider and Alderfer,[27] in their studies,

reported stronger support for the ERG theory than for the hypotheses of Maslow's need hierarchy theory. They also concluded that need satisfaction is most appropriately conceptualized as a global construct in a general state of the organization.

Expectancy Theory

A process theory of work motivation called an Instrumentality or Expectancy theory was presented by Vroom,[28] whose framework shows that the motivational force that an individual exerts on the job is a function of (1) the perceived expectancy that certain outcomes will result from particular behavior; and (2) the valence for these outcomes. The valence of an outcome, according to Vroom, is in turn a function of its instrumentality for obtaining other outcomes and the valence of the outcomes.

Wofford[29] conducted a study on the relationship of job satisfaction to motivation and performance. He found that job satisfaction is highly related to the extent to which a person's job-related needs are met. It seems that job satisfaction can be improved through development of an expectation that efforts will be rewarded. Wofford also found that people who were high on job satisfaction and performance expressed higher expectation of reward and were high in need gratification. This can be called the expectancy theory of job satisfaction which means that

satisfaction is related to expectation and not performance.

Mitchell[30] also conducted a research on expectancy theory and revealed that (1) the dimensions of effort-to-performance and performance-to-reward expectancies have been generally shown as positively related to the individual outcomes of performance and satisfaction; (2) personality variables appear to have an effect on an individual's expectancy and valence perceptions; (3) the predictive power of the expectancy model with respect to performance and satisfaction is not significantly improved when expectancies and valences are combined as compared to the two variables noted in (1) above.

Lawler and Suttle,[31] and Schmidt[32] noted the problems with expectancy theory and concluded that the theory has become so complex that it has exceeded the measures which exist to test it; also, that the variables be-ng measured using survey questionnaires, which are usually different from researcher to researcher, have not been scientifically validated.

Equity Theory

Adams' equity theory suggests that job satisfaction is experienced when equity is maintained between a person's perceived job inputs and outcomes of others. That is, a discrepancy or inequity exists when a person perceives that the ratio of his/her job outcomes to job inputs as

compared with a reference person's outcomes to inputs are unequal. Inputs, according to Adams, are such aspects (efforts, skills, education, and task performance) that an individual employee brings to or puts into the job; outcomes are those rewards (pay, promotion, recognition, achievement, and status) that result from task accomplishment. The theory is a three-step process:

a. Comparison of outcome/input ratio between focal person and reference person
b. The decision of the comparison (equity = satisfaction, inequity = dissatisfaction)
c. Motivated behavior to reduce inequity.

The equity (or job satisfaction), according to Adams, is not a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, nor is inequity simply a matter of being underpaid. Rather, job satisfaction is reached when a person's perceived job inputs and/or outcomes stand psychologi-ally in a comparable relation to what he/she perceives are the inputs and/or outcomes of others. Inequity creates a state of tension which the individual tries to reduce.[33]

Ivancevich noted Adams' theory to suggest that job satisfaction results from the feelings that the organization treats its employees with fairness and equality. He concluded that the theory indicates that every employee is rewarded according to his/her contribution to the total

output of the organization; unfair administrative practices such as favoritism, bias, inconsistent laws and regulations, the demand for more work without equivalent pay and recognition make the employee disenchanted and careless about his/her work.[34]

Ivancevich also noted that the majority of the research efforts on equity theory conducted by Andrews, Goodman, and Freedman have focused on wages or pay levels as the basic outcome, and effort or performance level as the primary input factor. The limited research to date, he stated, has generally been supportive, especially the prediction of underpayment. Nonsupportive results have also been reported; for instance, in most reported studies the reference person has not always been clarified, and consistent overpayment responses have not been satisfactorily demonstrated. The theory also has focused only on the outcome of pay, while the general thrust of the contemporary theories of motivation have shown that "pay" is not the only factor that motivates the individuals.[35]

Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman[36] presented the motivation-hygiene theory. This theory is built on the contention that there are two independent sets of factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The job satisfaction factors are called "motivation factors,"

that deal primarily with the individual's need for self-actualization in his/her work (completion of a job, advancement, recognition, achievement, growth opportunities, and work itself). These factors lead to positive job attitudes.

The job dissatisfaction factors are called "hygiene factors" and deal with the environment of work (organization policy and administration, peer relationships, supervisory relationships, salary, opportunity for personal growth, and working conditions). They are powerless to affect job attitudes positively. However, the rise of dissatisfaction and poor performance can be prevented if the needs involved in the hygiene factors are satisfied.

The preposition of Herzberg's theory according to Mumford[37] suggests that to secure employees performing at a high level of productivity, the organization has to identify the needs of its employees and satisfy these needs. However, in the latter part of the 1960s and during the 1970s the motivation-hygiene theory attracted the interest of educators. There are evidences supporting and challenging Herzberg's theory.

Supportive Studies on Two-Factor Theory

Sergiovanni[38] replicated Herzberg's study using teachers in Rochester, New York. The result of the study supported Herzberg's theory; it found that (1) sources of

high job feelings for teachers tended to differ from events that appeared as sources of low job feelings; and (2) factors identified in the motivator class tended to focus on work itself, while factors labeled hygiene tended to focus on the condition of work.

According to Sergiovanni, a haunting question facing the use of the theory which relies heavily on research from areas other than education for support, is whether or not the theoretical propositions and supporting findings are applicable. He believes that the motivation-hygiene theory is applicable to educational organizations and to teachers and students for two reasons: (1) the theory is consistent with the humanistic belief pattern which forms one dimension of our applied science of educational administration, and (2) when Herzberg's hypothesis is tested, using teachers and other educators as respondents, results similar to those found for other groups are obtained.

The same study replicated suggests that factors which contribute to teachers' motivation (that stimulate extraordinary performance) form a cluster characterized by achievement, recognition, and responsibility. He concludes that the absence of these factors does not contribute to work dissatisfaction; however, dissatisfaction for teachers seems to result from poor interpersonal relations; incompetent, inadequate or unfair administrative and supervisory practices; and matters external to the school which

comprise one's personal life, and have potential to lower one's performance.

Savage[39] also replicated Herzberg's study with teachers in Georgia using interview technique. The results of the study generally supported Herzberg's theory with few minor exceptions, the most obvious of which was that good interpersonal relations, especially with students, were motivational rather than hygienic.

Another study conducted by Wickstrom[40] on teachers in Oregon supported the Savage findings that among teachers, good interpersonal relations is a motivator. However, the Wickstrom's study, using a questionnaire based on Herzberg's interview schedule, generally supported the theory. The results of Wickstrom's study showed that variables such as sex and job position played a role in determining which factors were motivational and which were hygienic.

Schmidt[41] conducted a study of job satisfaction among the sec-ndary school administrators, using the motivation-hygiene theory, and the results indicated that research in this area is not only with such personnel as accountants, engineers, teachers, but that the theory also applies to management level of public education. The results also indicated that recognition, achievement, and advancement are major forces motivated the administrators to lift their performance to approach their maximum potential.

In addition to testing Herzberg's theory, Keffer also carried out a study to determine the relationships between selected job satisfier factors, job dissatisfier factors, and demographic variables on overall job satisfaction of the field staff of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division. The findings revealed that there were substantial relationships between overall job satisfaction and both job satisfier/dissatisfier factors. The study also confirmed Herzberg's theory, concluding that achievement was the most important job dimension in predicting overall job satisfaction.[42]

Based on the theoretical studies of Paul F. Wernimont and Frederick Herzberg, Clarke conducted a study to determine sources of teacher-job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of senior high school teachers. Using Wernimont and Herzberg's internal job factors (recognition, achievement, work itself, advancement, and responsibility), and external job factors (salary, company policies, technical aspects of supervision, interpersonal relations in supervision, and working conditions), Clarke found that internal factors are more satisfying while external factors dissatisfying; in addition, both internal and external factors appear to be related to job satisfaction, though external factors are related more to dissatisfaction. He also concluded that school administrators who wish to increase the satisfac-

tion level of their teachers should be concerned with both internal and external job factors, and those who believe that teachers' performances would improve if they are less dissatisfied should concentrate on altering the external job factors.[43]

Controversy on Two-Factor Theory

Despite the important contributions made by Herzberg, the two-factor theory has been criticized and challenged. Recognizing that not all research has been supportive of the motivation-hygiene theory and its techniques of assessing job satisfaction, Whitsett and Winslow reviewed some studies which were critical of and/or failed to support Herzberg's theory.[44] They concluded that the major criticism of the theory concerns the methodology used to develop the theory--that the critical-incident method, while requiring people to look at themselves retrospectively, does not adequately provide a vehicle for the expression of other factors to be mentioned. Therefore, there is a tendency for the most recent events of a person's work experience to be identified with such a methodology. This tends to ignore or diminish the impact of past and possibly equally important events.

Also another methodological point concerns the nature of the original sample used by Herzberg. Critics have questioned whether it is justified to generalize to

other occupational groups from such a limited sample i.e., accountants and engineers). Therefore, the technology and environment of the two study groups may vary considerably from such groups as teachers, nurses, sales representatives, or secretaries in other areas of a country.

Wernimont and Wolf criticized Herzberg's theory as being a result of unsound inferences of incorrect approach. Wernimont claims that the terms "motivator" and "satisfier" cannot be used interchangeably. He administered a questionnaire to technical employees to investigate sources of personal satisfaction and work motivation. The results indicated that those factors that seem to have a heavier impact on motivation than on satisfaction certainly do not fall into any neat classification of intrinsic versus extrinsic. However, Wolf differentiated between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as an end state, and job motivation as a force to achieve an end state. He criticized Herzberg's method from two points: (1) the use of the critical incident technique tends to lead to biased results, and (2) the results are method-bound because people tend to remember and attribute causes of satisfaction to themselves and causes of dissatisfaction to the environment. He contended that the motivation factors identified by Herzberg are more powerful determinants of job satisfaction than are the hygiene factors.[45]

The additional criticisms have focused on the manner in which the two-factor theory may oversimplify the nature of job satisfaction. Campbell[46] noticed that satisfaction or dissatisfaction can reside in the content and context of the job jointly, and that little attention has been directed toward testing and motivation and performance implications of the theory; that is, emphasis of the theory has been on "satisfaction" and not on the motivation or performance of the individual employee.

Testing the validity of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, Attuwaybi[47] conducted a study to investigate the satisfying and dissatisfying factors of job satisfaction in a Libyan culture which is different from the American culture in which the theory was developed and mostly researched. He investigated the overall job satisfaction of elementary and junior high school teachers in Libya. Using a two-part questionnaire developed by the researcher around eight of Herzberg's sixteen factors of job satisfaction, his findings did not support the contentions of the motivation-hygiene theory. He concluded that the lack of support found in his investigation leads to the assumption that the theory is nationally bound and only valid in the United States. Therefore, organizations in other countries which may try to use the motivation-hygiene theory as a guide in their dealings with employees' morale and

development of personnel policies should be aware of this possible cultural factor.

Although the list of these criticisms and non-supportive findings are important, the value or the impact of the theory should not be underestimated. Like the need hierarchy approach, Herzberg's theory has a common-sense appeal to leaders in organizations about the nature of the work environment. However, there have been some other studies conducted on job satisfaction outside Herzberg's two-factor theory that are worth reviewing for the purpose of this study.

Other Studies on Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction and high morale lead to an increased effort for more effective performance. Anderson[48] studies teacher morale and its relationship to educational achievement of students. He found that high morale of teachers was related to higher educational achievement of students. He also concluded that it was no longer feasible to ignore the implications of teachers' attitudes toward their job.

Professional performance of a high standard requires administrative assistance in removing obstacles to successful performance. Benson, Charles, and Dunn[49] reported that studies on employment practices and working conditions have led to the conclusion that recruitment to the teaching

profession has to be adequate for the staffing needs and that good morale has to be maintained among employed teachers.

Likert suggested that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance became increasingly positive as the content of the job became more varied and challenging. The degree of job satisfaction, according to him, has become one of the criteria that measures organizational effectiveness.[50]

There is also a positive relationship between teaching effectiveness and total job satisfaction. Cooper[51] investigated the relationship between job satisfaction of teachers and teaching effectiveness as perceived by their students. He found that there was a positive relationship between teaching effectiveness and total job satisfaction.

The investigation of job satisfaction among the staff of an organization is a step in the process of organizational development. Rada[52] used a questionnaire instrument to survey community college teaching faculty members and investigated factors influencing their job satisfaction and the degree of fulfillment on selected items of job satisfaction. He contends that a job satisfaction audit is only one step in the process of organizational development while the next step is to examine the dimensions of satisfaction that are positive as well as those that are negative.

Recognizing previous research on teachers' job satisfaction which found interpersonal relation with students, peers, and administrators to be significantly related to teachers' job satisfaction, Behrman[53] pointed out that only one study which directly investigated the relative contribution of each type of interpersonal relations was methodologically weak; he thereby conducted a study on teacher-student relations as a predictor of teachers' job satisfaction. Using a forty-one-item, self-report questionnnaire, he found that perceived interpersonal relation with students, peers, and administrators were all significantly correlated with job satisfaction.

In discussing the teacher's effectiveness in performing his task, Knezevich[54] stated that conditions of employment affect morale, such as the work load, sick-leave policy, provision for substitute teachers, and planning periods, as well as salary and retirement benefits. Salary is important, but an increase in pay is not enought to reduce emotional pressures in a job undertaking. Morale is improved by the general atmosphere in the school system too.

According to the research by Napier,[55] high teacher morale is associated with the administrator's appreciation of teachers and support given to them in discipline problems. Trusting superiors, participation

in decision-making, adequate facilities and equipment, salaries, fair distribution of assignments, adequate policy for leaves, fair teaching load, and in-service training were found to be contributing factors in increasing job satisfaction of teachers.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of job satisfaction literature in which the concept of job satisfaction and major job satisfaction theories were discussed. The chapter also discussed the supportive and controversial studies on a two-factor theory in which the components of job satisfaction used in this study were based. Also, other studies based on the relationship between performance, morale and job satisfaction were reviewed.

From the review of the literature and other studies, the investigator concluded that both general and specific areas of job satisfaction have a mutual ground, share common principles, and strive for similar objectives.

The variety of research approached and diversity of results make valid comparisons of results tenuous. However, in spite of the lack of effective solutions to job satisfaction problems, the research and experimentations so far has led to increased cumulative knowledge of job satisfaction. As a result, steadily improving techniques and more sophisticated theories provide better tools in the

search for solutions related to the problems of job satisfaction. The individual and the societal complexities involved in the problems of job satisfaction are continually evolving as the society and individuals within it change. Therefore, new and better solutions will need to be found to respond to the new problems.

The researcher concluded from his review of the related literature and studies that a survey of job satisfaction among Nigerian teachers would make a useful contribution toward better understanding and successful administration of educational institutions in Nigeria.

The research design and procedures used in the present study will be presented in Chapter III.

Chapter Notes

[1]Frankel, Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction, p. 1.

[2]L. Anderson, "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, 46, No. 5 (1953), 693-98.

[3]Rex. Call, "Faculty and Morale," Journal of Higher Education, 28 (May, 1969), 269.

[4]F. Redefer, "The School Board and Teacher Morale," American School Board Journal, No. 145 (July, 1962), 6.

[5]Hoppock, Job Satisfaction, p. 47.

[6]A. K. Korman, Industrial and Organization Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1971), p. 302.

[7]M. G. Evans, "Conceptual and Operational Problems in the Measurement of Various Aspects of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applies Psychology, 53 (1969), 93-101.

[8]Lawler, "Satisfaction and Behavior," pp. 39-40.

[9]W. W. Finlay, A. Q. Sortain, and W. M. Tate, Human Behavior in Industry (New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1954), pp. 229-30.

[10]D. Katz, and R. L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organization (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966), pp. 40-42.

[11]P. F. Wernimont, "A System View of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applies Psychology, 56, No. 2 (1972), 173-76.

[12]J. D. Dun and E. C. Stephen, Management of Personnel (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1972), p. 19.

[13]F. S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 33 (November, 1951), 127-32.

[14]D. E. Griffiths, "Toward a Theory of Administrative Behavior," in R. F. Campbell and R. T. Gregg, eds., Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 357.

[15]R. C. Sheldon, "Some Observations on Theory in Social Science," in T. Parson & E. A. Shils, eds., Toward A General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 37-38.

[16]B. O. Smith, et al., "Science for Education," in W. S. Monroe, ed., Encyclopedia of Educational Research (New York: McMillan Co., 1969), p. 12.

[17]J. M. Ivancevich, A. D. Szilagyi Jr., and M. J. Wallace Jr., Organizational Behavior and Performance (California: Goodyear Publishers, 1977), pp. 103-4.

[18]T. J. Sergiovanni and F. D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 69-70.

[19]M. G. Wolf, "Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Reformulation of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation," Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, No. 3 (1970), 87-94.

[20]R. J. House and L. A. Wigdor, "Herzberg's Dual-factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism," in L. L. Cummings and W. E. Scott, eds., Readings in Organizations Behavior and Human Performance (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. (1969).

[21]Ivancevich, et al., Organizational Behavior and Performance, pp. 103-4.

[22]L. W. Porter, Organizational Pattern of Managerial Job Attitudes (New York: American Foundation for Management Research, 1964).

[23]E. E. Lawler and J. L. Suttle, "A Causal Correlation Test of the Need Hierarchy Concept," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance (1972), 265-87.

[24]E. A. Locke, "The Nature and Cause of Job Satisfaction," in M. D. Dunnette, ed., Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), p. 1309.

[25]Ivancevich, et al., Organizational Behavior and Performance, p. 104.

[26]Ibid., pp. 110-11.

[27]C. P. Schneider and C. P. Alderfer, "Three Studies of Measures of Need Satisfaction in Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly (December, 1973), 489-505.

[28]V. Vroom, Work and Motivation (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

[29]J. C. Wofford, "The Motivation Bases of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance," Personnel Psychology, 24 (1971), 501-18.

[30]T. R. Mitchell, "Expectancy Models of Job Satisfaction, Occupational Preference and Effort: A Theoretical Methodological, and Empirical Appraisal," Psychological Bulletin (1974), 1053-77.

[31]E. E. Lawler and J. L. Suttle, "Expectancy Theory and Job Behavior," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance (1973), 243-51.

[32]F. Schmidt, "Implication of Measurement Problem for Expectancy Theory Research," Organizational ahd Human Performance (1973), 243-51.

[33]J. S. Adams, "Toward an Understanding of Inequity," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (November, 1963), 422-36.

[34]Ivancevich, et al., Organizational Behavior and Performance, pp. 116-17.

[35]Ibid., pp. 118-19.

[36]F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, 2d ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1959), p. 111.

[37]E. Mumford, Job Satisfaction (London: Longman Group Limited, 1972), p. 5.

[38]T. J. Sergiovanni, "Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1965), Dissertation Abstract, 1965.

[39]R. M. Savage, "A Study of Teacher Satisfaction and Attitudes: Causes and Effects (Ph.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1967), Dissertation Abstracts, 1967.

[40]R. A. Wickstrom, "An Investigation into Job Satisfaction among Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1971), Dissertation Abstracts, 1971.

[41]G. L. Schmidt, "Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators," Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, No. 2 (Spring, 1976), 68-86.

[42]W. M. Keffer, "Job Satisfaction of Field Staff of The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1976), Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 4781A.

[43]R. L. Clarke, "Sources of Teachers Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Senior High School Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976), Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 4670A.

[44]D. A. Whitsett and E. K. Winslow, "An Analysis of Studies Critical of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory," Personnel Psychology (1967), 391-416.

[45]P. F. Wernimont, "Comparison of Sources of Personal Satisfaction and of Work Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 54 (1970), 95-102.

[46]J. P. Campbell, et al., Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness (New York: McGraw Hill, 1970), p. 354.

[47]O. B. Attuwaybi, "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Elementary and Junior High School Teachers in the Libya Arab Republic (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1975), Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 3253A.

[48]Anderson, "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," pp. 693-98.

[49]R. Benson, S. Charles, and L. A. Dun, "Employment Practices and Working Conditions," Review of Educational Research, 37 (1967), 272-79.

[50]R. Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961).

[51]J. F. Cooper, "Job Satisfaction of Mississippi Hunds Junior College Teachers as Related to Teaching Effectiveness" (Ph.D. dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1974), Dissertation Abstracts, 1974, 4604-05A.

[52]Alex. Rada, "A Study of Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Community College Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pacific, 1975), Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 2670A.

[53]E. H. Behrman, "Teacher-Student Relations as a Predictor of Teachers Job Satisfaction" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976), Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 4684A.

[54]S. J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, 2d ed. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969).

[55]T. G. Napier, "Teacher Morale" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1966), Dissertation Abstracts, 27 (1966), 1228A.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the design of the study, which includes the instrument used, the nature and selection of the population, the procedure for collecting the data, and the procedure for analyzing the data.

The Instrument

A questionnaire was developed around Herzberg's sixteen factors of job satisfaction to assess job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction of secondary level teachers in Kano. The items of the questionnaire were predicated on ten scales, which were the ten factors of job satisfaction based on the theoretical studies of Wernimont,[1] and Herzberg and his associates.[2] The ten factors included five internal job factors (recognition, achievement, advancement, and responsibility), which were also referred to as motivation factors, and five external job factors (salary, administrative policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, and working conditions), which were referred to as hygiene factors.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part one covered demographic informations, including the

teachers' educational or professional qualifications, sex, age, teaching experience at secondary level, reasons for entering teaching profession, and geographical area of schools. The reason was to ascertain whether or not the responses of the teachers' feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction and/or differences found in their responses might relate to the differences in their educational qualifications, sex, age, teaching experience, reasons for entering teaching profession and area of schools.

Morgan conducted a study in which respondents were asked to record and rate satisfying and dissatisfying sequence of sixteen factors of job satisfaction. The study determined the relationships between factors perceived to be important to job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and the demographic variables of age, sex, highest degree held, tenure status, and type of institution.[3] Woznik[4] also conducted a study to measure overall satisfaction using demographic variable of age, sex, level of education, music teaching experience, and place of employment of music teachers. In a study conducted by Adesina[5] on the turnover and attrition of teachers in Lagos, Nigeria, he contended that in the study of teachers a distinction must be made between teachers in urban areas and those in village (rural) communities, also as well as graduate and non-graduate teachers. Attuwaybi[6] conducted a study in

which he classified teachers according to their marital status, level of class taught, experience, and reasons for entering teaching profession.

Part Two of the questionnaire included fifty-eight items relating to aspects of the teaching job. These items were selected from the list of job satisfaction items from the studies of Clarke,[7] Murname,[8] Attuwaybi,[9] and Rada.[10] All the items were relevant to the Nigerian educational system except a few modifications which were made to make language relevant to that system. The modifications included substituting such terms as "local education authority" instead of county education authority; "Ministry of Education" instead of Office of Education; "inspectors" instead of supervisors, to mention a few.

Since the items were taken from the validated instruments used by those researchers, and that all items with, minor modifications, were relevant to Nigerian educational system, it is assumed, therefore, that this instrument shares the validity of the original.

Items 1 through 58 covered the ten scales while a separate item (59) asked for the overall satisfaction of the teachers. Teachers were asked to respond to the 59 items indicating the degree of satisfaction on a five-point rating scale: very satisfied, satisfied, undecided, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied. These ratings were given numerical weights of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively.

An additional section (Part Three) was concerned with other teachers' feelings of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction which the questionnaire did not cover. Opportunity was given to identify those areas through open-ended items. The respondents identified and ranked any other facets or factors the teachers considered important to their job satisfaction and those which they felt preventing or detracting them from their satisfaction on the job.

The Population

The subject population of this study is Nigerian teachers in Kano State secondary educational institutions. The secondary educational institutions include: secondary grammar and commercial schools, grade II teacher training colleges, and technical/vocational schools.

There were fifty-one of these secondary educational institutions in Kano State (see Appendix D for the list of schools), but for the purpose of this study, only forty-three of those schools which had been established before the 1975/76 school year were included. The others established after that period are considered new schools and as such may have some peculiar problems beyond the scope of this study. Thirty of those forty-three schools were selected at random for study (thirteen secondary grammar/commercial schools, fourteen grade II teacher training colleges, and three technical/vocational schools) representing all the

major four administrative divisions;[11] Kano metropolitan, Hadejia, Gumel, and Kazaure.

A total of 356 Nigerian teachers in those selected 30 schools constitute the sample in this investigation. Usable questionnaires were received from 284 or 80 percent of the teachers.

Procedure for Data Collection

Permission to undertake the study in Kano State, to visit schools and deliver questionnaires to teachers was sought from the State's Ministry of Education. The researcher also solicited the cooperation of the principals of the selected schools through the same Ministry of Education to facilitate the distribution and collection of the questionnaires (see Appendix B).

Mailing of the questionnaires was not feasible due to lack of effective mailing services in some of the areas where the schools are located. Instead the author delivered and collected the instrument. The letter of permission for conducting the study in Kano State, and a copy of the letter written to the principals for soliciting their cooperation were provided by the Ministry of Education (see Appendix B).

The principal of each school was approached to assist in coordinating the distribution and collection of the questionnaires. The vice principal assisted where the

principal was not available, and in some cases the teachers were approached by the researcher asking them to participate in the study. Each teacher received a copy of the questionnaire attached to a covering letter, was asked to answer the questionnaire, and return it to the coordinator from whom the questionnaires were collected by the researcher during the follow-up visits to the schools.

The teachers were classified according to the six demographic information. Table 1 shows the six variable classifications.

TABLE 1

RESPONDENTS CHARACTERISTICS--QUALIFICATION, SEX, AGE, EXPERIENCE, REASONS FOR ENTERING TEACHING, AND SCHOOL AREA

Classifications	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Total
Qualification:		
Degree	119	42
Non-degree	165	58
Sex:		
Male	220	77
Female	64	23
Age:		
Under 30 years	194	68
Over 30 years	90	32
Experience:		
Less than 5 years	204	72
More than 5 years	80	28
Reasons:		
Interest in profession	225	80
Economic reasons	59	20
Area:		
Urban	170	60
Rural	114	40

According to the demographic classifications shown, the number of female teachers is considerably lower than that of male teachers. This indicated that young women are still not entering the teaching profession in proportion to men.

The number of teachers according to age and experience shows that there are more younger teachers with few years teaching experience than the older, experienced teachers. This indicated that many experienced teachers have left teaching for other occupations.

The distribution of Nigerian teachers at secondary institutions by sex and qualifications in the sample indicated a true representative of the total population when compared with Kano State and National data as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

NIGERIAN TEACHERS AT SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS BY SEX AND QUALIFICATIONS REPRESENTING THE STATE AND NATIONAL DATA

	Sex	Degree	%	Non-degree	%
Kano State	M	214	78	269	96
	F	61	22	44	14
National	M	3,617	88	7,675	81
	F	478	12	1,839	19

SOURCES: Ministry of Education, Kano, Education Statistics for Kano State, 1976; Federal Ministry of Education, Statistics of Education in Nigeria, 1971.

NOTE: Figures for former North Central and North Western States, as well as Kwara and River States were missing from the data.

Analysis Procedures

The 284 responses were sub-divided into four equal random groups of 71. The first random group was used to ascertain the reliability, scaling of the data, and for intercorrelation of the various scores on the ten scales. The third random group and the scaling from the first group was used for discriminant analysis. This was validated on the fourth random group. This procedure, which Huck[12] called cross-validation, was to test the classification efficiency of the discriminant function derived from the independent variables (six variable classifications). There was a high degree of correspondence between the actual group membership of the individuals in the third and fourth random groups, which means that the cross-validation was successful.

As the discriminant analysis procedure is sometimes followed by multivariate analysis of variance depending on the type of study, the multivariate analysis of variance was computed with the third random group and replicated on the fourth group. The first random group was used to ascertain the reliability of the ten scales with Mctest program.[13] Scores are analyzed for items and subjects, showing means and standard deviations across items and subjects weights for each option; Mctest program computes absolute relative frequencies of each option.

Correlations between items and total score are also computed, as well as Hoyt Reliability (Cromback's alpha) coefficients. Weightings and scores were maximized through a procedure called Reciprocal Averages Technique.

Reciprocal Averages Technique, according to McConnell, is not new. Baker and Hoyt in 1972 traced its development from the 1930s; they showed that the weights derived under a reciprocal averages procedure are equivalent to those developed through Guttman's more involved internal consistency scaling. Quoting Mosier, they stated that the reciprocal averages technique has six useful properties as follows:

> 1. The reliability of each item and the internal consistency of the weighted inventory are maximized.
>
> 2. The correlation between the item and the total score is maximized and the product movement correlation coefficient becomes identical with the correlation ratio.
>
> 3. The relative variance of the distribution of scores (coefficients of variation) is maximized.
>
> 4. The relative variance of item scores within a single case is maximized.
>
> 5. The correlation between an item and total score is proportional to the standard deviation of the item weights for that item.
>
> 6. Questions which bear no relation to the total-score variable are automatically weighted so that they exert no effect in the scoring.[14]

The procedures described were applied to each of the ten scales, and the results indicated that there was

reasonable internal consistency between the items and each of the ten scales. The reliability coefficients for the ten scales ranged between .77 and .88. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients of the ten scales for a random sample of 71 subjects.

TABLE 3

SCALE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS BASED ON ITEMS, AND RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR THE TEN SCALES FOR A SAMPLE OF 71 NIGERIAN TEACHERS

Scales	No. of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability
1. Recognition	5	13.93	2.73	.80
2. Achievement and growth opportunity	7	25.88	2.97	.81
3. Work itself	10	39.26	3.33	.80
4. Advancement	4	12.42	2.68	.82
5. Responsibility	3	12.81	1.22	.77
6. Salary	5	15.23	3.61	.87
7. Administrative policies	5	15.75	3.84	.81
8. Supervision	6	21.73	4.40	.88
9. Interpersonal relations	4	17.26	2.29	.78
10. Working conditions	9	34.29	3.74	.79

The scales represent ten aspects of teachers' satisfaction:

1. Recognition (5 items--14, 20, 30, 37, and 44). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the amount of prestige they received on their job.

2. Achievement and growth opportunity (7 items--19, 25, 29, 33, 43, 46, and 51). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the opportunities available to them to excel, achieve, and grow on the job.

3. Work itself (10 items--1, 9, 15, 21, 26, 27, 34, 38, 44, and 48). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with teaching as a job, the actual doing of the job or task as a source of good or bad feeling.

4. Advancement (4 items--7, 13, 24, and 45). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the actual changes in their status or position and the way they were implemented by the Ministry of Education.

5. Responsibility (3 items--52, 53, and 54). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with being given responsibilities on their work, the work of others, or any other new assignments for which they were responsible.

6. Salary (5 items--4, 11, 17, 36, and 41). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with various elements of compensation, such as wages or salary.

7. Administrative policies (5 items--2, 8, 10, 22, and 39). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the administrative policies implemented by the principal of each school and the Ministry of Education.

8. Supervision (6 items--3, 6, 16, 55, 57, and 58). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the amount of supervision they had in their schools and/or in their work.

9. Interpersonal relations (4 items--31, 32, 40, and 56). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with professional and personal interactions with principals, colleagues, and students in the community.

10. Working conditions (9 items--5, 12, 18, 23, 28, 35, 42, 49, and 50). This scale contained items which measured teachers' satisfaction with the physical conditions of work, the amount of work, or the facilities available for doing the work.

To evaluate the characteristics of job satisfaction as reflected by these ten scales, a Pearson Product Movement Correlation analysis was computed for intercorrelation among all the ten scales. The correlation matrix is presented in Table 4.

The results as presented and the correlation values

of the ten scales indicated that the scales show significant relationships, but in no instances is as much as 50 percent of the variance common to both distributions.

TABLE 4

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF 10 SATISFACTION SCALES

Scales[a]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1.00									
2	.58	1.00								
3	.48	.48	1.00							
4	.70	.58	.38	1.00						
5	.28	.23	.30	.15	1.00					
6	.61	.52	.39	.63	.28	1.00				
7	.68	.56	.39	.65	.23	.58	1.00			
8	.52	.48	.44	.46	.27	.35	.58	1.00		
9	.41	.45	.39	.37	.36	.38	.37	.45	1.00	
10	.54	.53	.41	.49	.39	.47	.57	.47	.46	1.00

NOTE: n = 71. Significant level (df = 69) .01, $r \geq .30$; .05, $r \geq .23$

[a]Scales: (1) recognition; (2) achievement and growth opportunity; (3) work itself; (4) advancement; (5) responsibility; (6) salary; (7) administrative policies; (8) supervision; (9) interpersonal relations; (10) working conditions.

Various statistical procedures were applied for the objectives of this study. The first objective was to find out the degree of satisfaction. The absolute and relative frequencies of response for all the samples (according to the

Mctest analysis weights) were calculated for each of the ten scales to summarize satisfaction. High scores toward satisfaction were interpreted as "satisfaction," high scores toward dissatisfaction were interpreted as "dissatisfaction," while high scores between satisfaction and dissatisfaction were interpreted as "undecided." The results of this and subsequent analytical procedures are presented in Chapter IV.

Once satisfaction scores were computed, the data were subjected to series of statistical treatments. Testing of null hypothesis of equal means between each of the demographic classifications, and the third objective of testing the alternative hypotheses the following statistical procedures employed included: (1) discriminant analysis, (2) multivariate analysis of variance, and (3) three-way analysis of variance.

Discriminant Analysis

Discriminant analysis is a procedure for estimating the position of an individual on a line that best separates classes or groups. Cooley and Lohnes[15] state:

> The discriminant model may be interpreted as a special type of factor analysis that extracts orthogonal factors of the measurement battery for the specific test of displaying and capitalizing upon differences among criterion groups. The model derives the components which best separate the cells or groups in the measurement space.

The discriminant analysis is similar to multiple regression, which was originally planned, but the most obvious distinction is that the dependent variable used here is discrete, rather than continuous as it is with multiple regression. Also in multiple regression, the regression weights are selected so as to minimize the difference between a person's predicted and actual criterion score, but in discriminant function analysis, the coefficients are selected so as to maximize correct classification when the researcher is predicting with respect to a nominal criterion variable.[16]

Gramer and Bock[17] also referred to Collier who observed the relationship between regression analysis and discriminant function analysis:

> Since there is a formal relationship between regression analysis and discriminant function analysis for a two-group case, methods used for deleting variables in regression analysis could be carried over to discriminant function analysis.

The discriminant analysis was suitable for this study in that the variable classifications were dichotomous groups such as degree and non-degree, male and female, under thirty and over thirty years of age, less experienced and more experienced, interest and economic reasons, and urban and rural areas.

For the purpose of this research, the statistical and the actual computer programs used were developed from subprograms of the SPSS-Statistical Package of Social Science.[18]

For the two-group discrimination that was used in this study, the specific procedure employed printed the means and standard deviations for each group on each scale, and also yielded only one function. Since there were only two groups in each classification, only one discriminant function was possible. The procedure employed also allowed all the ten scales to be entered in the discriminant function analysis.

The scores of an individual were entered into the functions and the individual was assigned to the group. There are several ways of testing for significance of a discriminant function analysis. In this study, six tests by Wilk's lambda were computed. Lambda "is an inverse measure of the discriminating power in the original variables which has not yet been removed by the discriminant functions--thus the larger lambda is, the less discriminating power is present."[19] Lambda is transformed into the equivalent Chi-square statistic for an easy test of statistical significance. The application of this procedure can be seen in the next chapter.

Subprogram DISCRIMINANT[20] produces the standard discriminant function coefficients, which are of great analytic importance in that each coefficient, when the sign is ignored, represents the relative contribution of its associated variable to the discriminant function. The sign merely denotes whether the variable is making a positive or negative contribution.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is a method for study of group differences in a multidimensional measurement space. In this study there were six variable classifications representing treatment groups or independent variables, and ten scales representing dependent variables.

One of the objectives of the study was to compare the teachers' satisfaction on each of the ten scales according to the variable classifications of the teachers. The null hypothesis was that the six groups did not differ in terms of mean scores on all the ten scales; or for a more technical point of view, the null hypothesis in the study assumed that the population mean vectors for each of the six variable classifications were the same.

Specific procedure employed was to compute MANOVA for the six variable classifications with all the ten scales. This computation yielded six multivariate tests of significance by Pillais, Hotelling's trace criterion, Wilk's lambda, and Roy's largest root criterion. Of these methods, according to Huck,[21] the oldest and most frequently used procedure is Wilk's lambda. A significant difference is obtained from Wilk's lambda by getting small calculated values. The greater the disparity between the mean vectors, the smaller the value for lambda. Since a

complete table of critical values for lambda is not available, the program transforms lambda into an F value to reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis.

In this study, since a significant effect was found, it was important to know which levels of the treatment group differed on just one dependent variable or all of them. In other words, the dispersion differences noted were needed to be interpreted. Two ways of finding the significant differences were possible. First the coefficients from the discriminant function analysis were examined to determine which of the dependent variables (ten scales) were contributing to the significant F. Secondly, the associated univariate F-ratio in the multivariate analysis of variance was examined to find out which of the F-ratio corresponding to the dependent variable (each of the ten scales) was statistically significant.[22]

Three-Way Analysis of Variance

The last purpose of this study was to compare the overall satisfaction of the teachers. The following six alternative hypotheses were tested:

1. Both teachers with degree and non-degree will score equally for overall satisfaction
2. Female teachers will score significantly higher than male teachers for overall satisfaction.
3. Teachers who are over thirty years of age will

score significantly higher than teachers who are under thirty years of age for overall satisfaction

4. Teachers with more than five years teaching experience at secondary level will score significantly higher than those who have less than five years teaching experience for overall satisfaction.
5. Teachers who entered the teaching profession because of interest in the profession will score significantly higher than those who entered because of economic reasons for overall satisfaction
6. Teachers in urban area schools will score significantly higher than teachers in rural area schools for satisfaction.

These six alternative hypotheses were tested using a three-way analysis of variance for the first three demographic classifications (qualification, sex, and age), and for the other three demographic classifications (experience, reasons, and area). Also in addition, the total scores and average scores for each group were compared.

In this study, the design notation (2 x 2 x 2) ANOVA, according to Huck,[23] designates a three-way analysis of variance in which there were two levels of each factor. This procedure allowed the researcher to find out whether there were differences among the levels of each factor, and

whether or not the factors combined in such a way as to have a unique effect on the dependent variable (job satisfaction). These are referred to as the main effects and the interaction effects respectively. The application of this procedure can be seen in the next chapter.

Summary

The analysis of the usable responses from 284 teachers in Kano State, Nigeria generated an enormous pool of raw data. To analyze and interpret these data in a meaningful manner, the total samples were subdivided into four equal random groups. The preliminary analysis was computed on Mctest; and Pearson Product Movement Correlation analysis also was computed to ascertain the reliability and intercorrelations of the ten scales.

In addition to the response frequency scores for ascertaining the degree of satisfaction, three other statistical techniques were employed. These techniques were: (1) discriminant function analysis; (2) multivariate analysis of variance; and (3) three-way analysis of variance.

Chapter Notes

[1]Wernimont, "A System View of Job Satisfaction," pp. 175-76.

[2]Herzberg et al., The Motivation to Work, p. 111.

[3]Urban area schools are those schools in Kano township or municipal, while rural area schools are those outside Kano municipal.

[4]T. D. Morgan in L. S. Moxley, "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching Higher Education: An Examination of Herzberg's Two-factor Theory and Porter's Need Satisfaction Research," Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Reports (1977), 53.

[5]L. C. Wozniak in Moxley, "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching Higher Education," p. 53.

[6]Adesina in Hanson, Secondary Level Teachers, pp. 25-39.

[7]Attuwaybi, "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Elementary and Junior High School Teachers," p. 19.

[8]Clarke, "Sources of Teachers Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction," pp. 105-11.

[9]R. J. Murname and B. R. Phillips, "The School as a Work Place: What Matters to Teachers," Mathematical Policy Research, Seattle, Washington (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University, 1977).

[10]Attuwaybi, "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Elementary and Junior High School Teachers," pp. 140-48.

[11]Rada, "A Study of Factors Influence Job Satisfaction," pp. 120-22.

[12]These major four administrative divisions are apparently being reconstituted into twenty local government authorities, sixteen of which are in Kano metropolitan, two in Hadejia and one each in Gumel and Kazaure.

[13]S. W. Huck et al., Reading Statistics and Research (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 174.

[14]Mctest, written by John McConnell, is a generalized test and questionnaire analysis program to take the subject responses to tests or questionnaires and score them according to the weighting assigned to them.

[15]J. McConnell, MCTEST: A Test and Questionnaire Analysis Program (Evanston: Vogelback Computing Center, Northwestern University, 1976), p. 47.

[16]W. W. Cooley and P. R. Lohnes, Multivariate Data Analysis (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971), pp. 243-44.

[17]Huck et al., Reading Statistics and Research, pp. 160-69.

[18]E. M. Cramer and R. D. Bock, "Multivariate Analysis," Review of Educational Research, 36, No. 5 (December, 1966), 607.

[19]N. H. Nie, C. H. Hull, and D. H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), pp. 435-67.

[20]Ibid., p. 440.

[21]Subprogram DISCRIMINANT was designed and programmed by James Tuccy (Vogelback Computing Center, Northwestern University), and William Klecka. Several portions were adapted from other discriminant analysis programs.

[22]Huck et al., Reading Statistics and Research, p. 186.

[23]The statistical procedure and the actual computed programs used in this study were developed from the subprogram SPSS-MANOVA--Multivariate analysis of variance by Eli Cohen, and Phil Burns of Northwestern University, Vogelback Computing Center (1976).

[24]Huck et al., Reading Statistics and Research, p. 90.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter describes the data collected and the statistical analysis of the resulns. The chapter consists of four sections: the first section which includes this introduction presents the results of the degree of satisfaction among the teachers on each of the ten scales. Section Two presents data relating to the test of significant differences between each of the six demographic classifications on each of the ten scales. The third section presents results obtained from the test of the alternative hypotheses. The fourth section is the results of free responses.

Degree of Satisfaction

The first purpose of this study was focused on determining the degree of teachers' satisfaction on each of the ten scales. Table 5 shows the frequencies of response and their percentages for degree of satisfaction among the total sample of teachers on each of the ten scales.

Concerning recognition, one-third of the responses were toward satisfaction, another third were toward dissatisfaction, while the rest of the responses were between

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE FOR DEGREE OF SATISFACTION AMONG SECONDARY EDUCATION LEVEL TEACHERS IN KANO, NIGERIA DEFINED BY TEN SCALES[a]

Scales	Satisfied			Dissatisfied	
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Undecided	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1. Recognition	52	421	434	278	235
Percentage	3.66	29.65	30.56	19.58	16.55
2. Achievement & Growth Opportunity	119	1,031	389	320	129
Percentage	5.99	51.86	19.57	16.09	6.49
3. Work Itself	292	1,536	467	427	118
Percentage	10.28	54.08	16.44	15.03	4.15
4. Advancement	15	230	290	379	222
Percentage	1.32	20.25	25.53	33.36	19.54
5. Responsibility	36	628	82	80	26
Percentage	4.22	73.71	9.62	9.39	3.05
6. Salary	15	339	575	214	277
Percentage	1.05	23.87	40.49	15.07	19.50

7.	Administrative Policies	24	283	504	418	191
	Percentage	1.70	19.93	35.49	29.44	13.45
8.	Supervision	88	788	435	280	113
	Percentage	5.16	46.24	25.53	16.43	6.63
9.	Interpersonal Relations	173	744	102	90	27
	Percentage	15.23	65.49	8.98	7.92	2.38
10.	Working Conditions	156	1,363	283	507	247
	Percentage	6.10	53.26	11.06	19.81	29.50

NOTE: n = 284.

[a]See Appendix C for breakdowns of responses on items and scales.

satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This indicated that teachers had mixed feelings concerning the amount of prestige they received on their jobs.

Regarding achievement and growth opportunity, 58 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 22.5 percent toward dissatisfaction while 19.5 percent of the responses were undecided. This indicated that over half of the teachers felt satisfied with the opportunities available to them to excel, achieve, and grow on the job.

As to work itself, 64 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 19 percent toward dissatisfaction while 16 percent were undecided. This indicated that teachers were satisfied with teaching as a job and the actual doing of the job.

Regarding advancement, 53 percent of the responses were toward dissatisfaction, 21.5 percent were toward satisfaction while 25.5 were undecided. This indicated that teachers were dissatisfied with the actual potential for improvement in their status or position.

Concerning responsibility, 78 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 12 percent toward dissatisfaction while 10 percent were undecided. This indicated that teachers expressed high satisfaction with being given responsibilities in their work or any other assignments for which they were responsible.

Concerning salary, 40 percent of the responses were undecided, 35 percent showed dissatisfaction while 25 percent were toward satisfaction. This indicated that the highest responses did show undecided, but in no instances were 50 percent of the teachers either undecided, satisfied or dissatisfied with their salaries.

As to administrative policies, 43 percent of the responses were toward dissatisfaction, 36 percent undecided, while only 22 percent were toward satisfaction. This indicated that the highest responses did show dissatisfaction, but in no instances were 50 percent of the teachers either dissatisfied, satisfied or undecided about the administrative policies implemented by the principals and the Ministry of Education.

Regarding supervision, 51 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 26 percent undecided, while 23 percent of the responses were toward dissatisfaction. This indicated that over half of the teachers were satisfied with the amount of supervision they had in their schools and/or in their work.

Concerning interpersonal relations, 81 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 10 percent toward dissatisfaction, while 9 percent of the responses were undecided. This indicated that teachers generally were satisfied with professional and personal interactions with

principals, colleagues, and students at their respective schools.

Relating to working conditions, 59 percent of the responses were toward satisfaction, 30 percent toward dissatisfaction, while 11 percent of the responses were undecided. This indicated that over half of the teachers were satisfied with the physical conditions, amount of work and/or the facilities available for doing the work.

The summary of the degree of satisfaction defined by the frequency of responses and percentages is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF THE DEGREE OF SATISFACTION AMONG SECONDARY EDUCATION LEVEL TEACHERS IN KANO, DEFINED BY THE FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES AND PERCENTAGES

Degree of Satisfaction	Frequency of Responses	Percentage
Very satisfied	970	5.89
Satisfied	7,363	44.70
Undecided	3,561	21.62
Dissatisfied	2,993	18.17
Very dissatisfied	1,585	9.62
Total	16,472	100.00

NOTE: N = 284.

The results in Table 6 above indicate that 50 percent of the total responses were toward satisfaction, 28 percent toward dissatisfaction, and 22 percent were undecided.

The results of the differences in responses for each of the classifications are reported in the next section.

Testing the Null Hypothesis

The second objective of this study was to find out if any significant differences occurred between each of the six demographic classifications on each of the ten scales. The null hypothesis was: that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction between two groups of teachers when they are classified by qualification, sex, age, teaching experience at secondary level, reasons for entering teaching profession, and area of school.

A two-group discriminant analysis involving six different test variables was computed, the data in Table 7 shows that one of the six tests yielded a high significant Chi-square at .01 level.

This indicated that significant difference was apparent for one variable classification of teachers with reasons for entering teaching profession, while no significant differences were found between the other five demographic classifications (qualification, sex, age, experience, and area).

TABLE 7

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS: TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO GROUPS OF TEACHERS BY QUALIFICATION, SEX, AGE, EXPERIENCE, REASONS, AND AREA ON JOB SATISFACTION

Variable Classification	Chi-Square
Qualification (Degree & Non-degree	12.02
Sex (Male & Female)	12.53
Age (Under 30 & over 30 years)	7.45
Experience (Under 5 and over 5 years)	7.64
Reasons (Interest in profession & economic reasons)	27.47[a]
Area (Urban & Rural	6.72

NOTE: n = 71.

[a] $P < .01$

Table 8 shows the coefficients for the ten scales for one function that was significant. The coefficients indicated that all the dependent variables (ten scales) were considered making contributions to the discriminating function, but the degree of contribution differs considerably.

Table 9 shows the multivariate tests of significance for each of the six demographic classifications.

The null hypothesis of equal means between teachers by qualification, sex, age, experience, and area were not rejected, while that of teachers with reasons for entering the teaching profession was rejected at .01 level of significance. This indicates that significant differences in

TABLE 8[a]

STANDARD DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEACHERS WHO ENTERED TEACHING BECAUSE OF INTEREST AND THOSE WHO ENTERED BECAUSE OF ECONOMIC REASONS[b]

Scales	Discriminant Function Coefficients
Recognition	- .25
Achievement & growth opportunity	- .14
Work itself	.89
Advancement	.15
Responsibility	- .31
Salary	1.11
Administrative policies	- .46
Supervision	.18
Interpersonal relations	- .37
Working conditions	- .10

[a] $n = 71$.

[b] See Appendix C for the coefficients of all the demographic classifications.

overall satisfaction between teachers who entered the teaching profession because of interest and those who entered because of economic reasons. No significant difference exists between other demographic classifications.

Table 10 shows the sample size, means, and standard deviations for satisfaction defined by the ten scales for the six demographic classifications and for the total sample.

TABLE 9[a]

MULTIVARIATE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR TEACHERS BY QUALIFICATION, SEX, AGE, EXPERIENCE, REASONS FOR ENTERING TEACHING PROFESSION, AND AREA OF WORK ON JOB SATISFACTION

Variable Classifications	Wilk's Lambda	F-ratio[b]
Qualification		
Degree & Non-degree	.88	.85
Sex		
Male & Female	.82	1.30
Age		
Under 30 & over 30 years	.89	.74
Experience		
Under 5 & over 5 years	.89	.76
Reason		
Interest & Economic	.79	3.22[c]
Area		
Urban & Rural	.90	.66

[a] $n = 71.$

[b] $DF = 10,60$

[c] $P < .01.$

Table 11 shows the results of the univariate F-tests in multivariate analysis of variance computed for comparing the means for satisfaction between each of the six demographic classifications as defined by the ten scales.

In comparison between degree versus non-degree teachers, none of the ten scales was significant. Therefore the null hypothesis of equal means on each of the ten

TABLE 10

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SATISFACTION DEFINED BY 10 SCALES FOR 6 DEMOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATIONS AND FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE[a]

		1. Recognition		2. Achievement		3. Work Itself	
Classification	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Qualification:							
Degree	119	14.26	2.36	25.88	2.79	38.94	3.57
Non-degree	165	13.39	2.33	25.60	2.59	38.80	3.17
Sex:							
Male	220	13.62	2.48	25.68	2.71	38.72	3.34
Female	64	14.21	1.96	25.85	2.54	39.32	3.32
Age:							
Under 30	194	13.81	2.30	25.73	2.62	38.67	3.49
Over 30	90	13.64	2.55	25.70	2.81	39.26	2.96
Experience:							
Under 5	204	13.66	2.34	25.77	2.58	38.62	3.45
Over 5	80	13.99	2.48	25.59	2.92	39.47	2.97
Reason:							
Interest	225	14.07	2.27	25.99	2.62	39.51	2.99
Economic	56	12.57	2.36	24.76	2.58	36.38	3.33
Area:							
Urban	170	14.03	2.43	25.74	2.67	39.28	3.09
Rural	114	13.34	2.25	25.69	2.69	38.23	3.60
Total N =	284	13.76		25.72		38.86	

4. Advancement		5. Responsibility		6. Salary		7. Admin. Policies	
Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
12.63	3.28	12.81	1.24	15.21	3.55	15.69	3.57
11.95	3.04	12.78	1.12	14.79	3.27	15.15	3.53
12.10	3.19	12.73	1.27	14.70	3.48	15.20	3.61
12.70	3.00	13.03	.66	15.88	2.88	15.98	3.31
12.44	3.04	12.79	1.17	15.15	3.33	15.57	3.57
11.79	3.38	12.81	1.18	14.56	3.39	14.95	3.50
12.29	3.03	12.74	1.28	15.00	3.36	15.34	3.52
12.10	3.48	12.94	.83	14.86	3.47	15.47	3.65
12.61	3.13	12.88	1.13	15.42	3.33	15.69	3.53
10.79	2.80	12.51	1.32	13.22	3.07	14.23	3.46
12.38	3.29	12.89	1.14	15.14	3.50	15.72	3.60
12.03	2.95	12.65	1.21	14.69	3.21	14.86	3.43
12.24		12.80		14.97		15.38	

TABLE 10--Continued

Classification	n	8. Supervision Mean	8. Supervision Std. Dev.	9. Interpersonal Relations Mean	9. Interpersonal Relations Std. Dev.	10. Working Conditions Mean	10. Working Conditions Std. Dev.
Qualification:							
Degree	119	21.31	3.85	17.12	1.90	34.16	3.03
Non-degree	165	21.63	3.74	17.22	1.95	33.75	3.47
Sex:							
Male	220	21.50	3.79	17.10	2.01	33.83	3.42
Female	64	21.47	3.79	17.43	1.57	34.24	2.82
Age:							
Under 30	194	21.39	3.84	17.21	1.23	34.00	3.13
Over 30	90	21.73	3.67	17.10	2.13	33.74	3.64
Experience:							
Under 5	204	21.33	3.89	17.13	1.97	33.87	3.23
Over 5	80	21.91	3.49	17.29	1.82	34.04	3.46
Reason:							
Interest	225	21.83	3.78	17.37	1.78	34.21	3.26
Economic	56	20.31	3.46	16.46	2.26	32.97	3.17
Area:							
Urban	170	21.68	3.80	17.30	1.79	34.08	3.35
Rural	114	21.22	3.76	16.98	2.10	33.69	3.21
Total N =	284	21.50		17.18		33.93	

[a]See Appendix C for breakdowns for random groups.

TABLE 11

COMPARISON FOR SATISFACTION BETWEEN GROUPS IN EACH OF THE 6 VARIABLE CLASSIFICATIONS DEFINED BY THE 10 SCALES

Scales	Qualification Degree vs. Non-degree			Sex Male vs. Female		
	MS_b*	MS_w	F-ratio	MS_b	MS_w	F-ratio
1. Recognition	2.73	7.55	.36	2.34	3.88	.60
2. Achievement	.82	8.94	.09	.85	6.74	.12
3. Work Itself	4.77	11.24	.42	.39	9.93	.03
4. Advancement	10.82	13.59	.79	4.40	8.73	.50
5. Responsibility	1.88	1.49	1.26	.98	1.30	.75
6. Salary	1.68	13.21	.12	33.39	9.36	3.63
7. Administrative Policies	4.27	14.94	.28	.03	10.11	.00
8. Supervision	7.88	19.50	.02	36.76	19.07	1.93
9. Interpersonal Relations	.11	5.33	.02	.01	2.83	.00
10. Working Conditions	3.10	14.18	.22	.17	8.47	.02

Age Under 30 vs. Over 30			Experience Under 5 vs. Over 5			Reason Interest vs. Economic		
MS_b	MS_w	F-ratio	MS_b	MS_w	F-ratio	MS_b	MS_w	F-ratio
5.11	3.84	1.33	1.63	3.89	.42	36.74	5.49	6.69**
.23	6.74	.03	4.33	6.69	.64	44.28	5.66	7.82***
6.79	9.84	.69	16.02	9.70	1.65	165.72	10.70	15.48***
25.96	8.42	3.08	11.34	8.63	1.31	49.68	8.60	5.68**
.14	1.32	.10	.08	1.32	.06	.07	1.55	.04
7.65	9.74	.78	13.45	9.65	1.39	143.90	10.58	13.50***
19.46	9.83	1.97	17.67	9.86	1.79	22.54	12.05	1.87
.23	11.65	.01	.05	11.66	.00	21.72	10.28	2.11
.01	2.83	.00	.32	2.82	.11	1.36	2.92	.47
.01	8.47	.00	1.38	8.45	.16	36.37	12.07	3.01

TABLE 11--Continued

Scales	Area Urban vs. Rural		
	MS_b	MS_w	F-ratio
1. Recognition	.07	3.91	.01
2. Achievement	3.22	6.70	.48
3. Work Itself	26.78	9.55	2.80
4. Advancement	.00	8.80	.00
5. Responsibility	.60	1.31	.46
6. Salary	.00	9.85	.00
7. Administrative Policies	1.34	10.09	.13
8. Supervision	1.70	11.63	.14
9. Interpersonal Relations	.96	2.81	.34
10. Working Conditions	.64	8.46	.07

NOTE: n = 71; DF = 1, 69.

*Mean squares between and within groups.

**p .05

***p .01

scales was not rejected. This indicated that no statistically significant difference was shown by teachers with degree and teachers without degree qualifications.

For male versus female teachers, none of the ten scales was significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis of equal means on each of the ten scales was not rejected.

Comparing teachers under thirty years of age and those over thirty years of age, no statistically significant difference was found. Therefore, the null hypothesis of equal means for the groups was failed to be rejected.

Concerning teachers with less than five years teaching experience at secondary level and those with more than five years teaching experience, no statistically significant difference was found. Therefore, the null hypothesis of equal means was not rejected.

Comparing teachers who entered teaching profession because of interest and those who entered because of economic reasons, statistically significant differences were found. Therefore, the null hypothesis of equal means between the groups was rejected. However, the following dispersion differences were noted:

Significant difference at .05 level between the groups was found for recognition scale, which means that

recognition was more important for teachers who entered teaching because of interest than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons.

Significant difference at .01 level between the groups was found for achievement and growth opportunity scale, which means that achievement and growth opportunity was more important for teachers who entered teaching because of interest than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons.

Significant difference at .01 level between the groups was obtained for work itself scale, which means that work itself was more important for teachers who entered teaching because of interest than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons.

Significant difference at .05 level between the groups was obtained for advancement scale, which means that teachers who entered the profession because of economic reasons were more highly dissatisfied with advancement than those who entered the profession because of interest.

Significant difference at .01 level between the groups was obtained for salary scale, which means that teachers who entered teaching because of interest

showed more satisfaction for salary than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons.

In comparison between teachers in urban area schools and those in rural area schools, no statistically significant difference was found. Therefore, the null hypothesis of equal means between the groups was failed to be rejected.

Testing the Alternative Hypotheses

The last purpose of this study was to compare the teachers' overall satisfaction. Table 12 shows the sample size, total scores, and average scores for each demographic classification.

A three-way analysis of variance computed for the first three demographic classifications is shown in Table 13.

According to Table 13 below, these findings were obtained:

The hypothesis which stated that both the teachers with degree and those without degree qualification would score equally for overall satisfaction was supported as no significant difference was found.

The hypothesis which stated that female teachers would score significantly higher than male teachers for

TABLE 12

TOTAL SCORES AND AVERAGE SCORES FOR TEACHERS' SATISFACTION BASED ON A SEPARATE ITEM QUESTION FOR 6 DEMOGRAPHIC CLASSIFICATIONS AND FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Classifications	n	Total Scores	Average Scores
Qualification:			
Degree	119	391	3.29
Non-degree	165	534	3.24
Sex:			
Male	220	697	3.17
Female	64	228	3.56
Age:			
Under 30 years	194	621	3.20
Over 30 years	90	304	3.37
Experience:			
Under 5 years	204	657	3.22
Over 5 years	80	268	3.35
Reasons:			
Interest	225	775	3.44
Economic	56[a]	147	2.49
Area:			
Urban	170	572	3.36
Rural	114	353	3.10
N =	284	925	3.26

[a]Three cases missing out of 284 processed.

overall satisfaction was supported as significant difference at .01 level was found.

The hypothesis which stated that the teachers who were over 30 years of age would score significantly higher than

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF OVERALL SATISFACTION BASED ON A SEPARATE ITEM QUESTION AMONG TEACHERS BY QUALIFICATION, SEX, AND AGE[a]

Sources	SS	MS	df	F-ratio
Qualification	.70	.70	1	.66
Sex	7.28	7.28	1	6.86[b]
Age	2.56	2.56	1	2.41
Qualification by Sex	2.81	2.81	1	2.65
Qualification by Age	.16	.16	1	.15
Sex by Age	.50	.50	1	.47
Qualification by Sex by Age	.20	.20	1	.19
Within groups	292.76	1.06	276	. . .
Total	309.25	1.09	283	. . .

[a] N = 284.

[b] p .01

those who were under thirty years of age for overall satisfaction was not supported as no significant difference was found between the groups.

Table 14 shows a three-way analysis of variance computed for the other three demographic classifications. According to Table 14, these findings were obtained:

The hypothesis which stated that teachers with more than five years teaching experience at secondary level would

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF OVERALL SATISFACTION BASED ON A SEPARATE ITEM QUESTION AMONG TEACHERS[a] BY EXPERIENCE, REASONS FOR ENTERING THE PROFESSION, AND AREA OF WORK

Sources	SS	MS	df	F-ratio
Experience	.01	.01	1	.01
Reasons	10.65	10.65	1	10.91[b]
Area	.06	.06	1	.07
Experience by Reasons	.00	.00	1	.00
Experience by Area	1.05	1.05	1	1.07
Reasons by Area	1.35	1.35	1	1.38
Experience by Reasons by Area	.96	.96	1	.98
Within Groups	266.61	.98	273	. . .
Total	302.51	1.08	280[c]	. . .

[a] N = 284.

[b] p .01.

[c] Three cases missing out of 284 processed.

score significantly higher than those who had less than five years teaching experience for overall satisfaction was not supported by this finding as no significant difference was found between the groups.

The hypothesis which stated that teachers who

entered the teaching profession because of interest in the profession would score significantly higher than those who entered because of economic reasons for overall satisfaction was supported by this finding as significant difference at .01 was found between the groups.

The hypothesis which stated that teachers in the urban area schools would score significantly higher than those in rural area schools for overall satisfaction was not supported as no significant difference was found between the groups.

Results of Free Responses

In addition to specific items, the questionnaire used in this investigation also provided for free responses or comments by the teachers. Only a few of them used the opportunity to express their concerns, and that majority of those who responded to this part did not rank their responses. However, teachers were asked to identify those factors, in addition to those listed in the questionnaire, which they considered important to their job satisfaction and those they felt prevented or detracted them from their job satisfaction. The responses are listed as follows:

Factors contributing to their job satisfaction

1. Teaching is non-competitive for posts as in other occupations
2. The joy of imparting knowledge to young generation

3. The joy of widening one's knowledge through teaching
4. Professional and personal interaction with students, colleagues and other members of the community
5. Availability of sufficient time for personal improvement, leisure and/or recreation and for preparation of daily assignments
6. Cooperative attitude of principals and other teaching staff
7. Good security such as pension and/or retirement benefits derived from teaching job
8. Enjoyment of leave grant and allowances
9. Car advance and car basic allowance provided for middle class teachers as has been done for upper class
10. The pleasure derived from extra-curricular activities.

Factors which prevent or detract them from job satisfaction

1. Lack of high recognition for teaching profession
2. Undisciplined attitude of students
3. Lack of sufficient accommodation for teachers
4. Poor salary and incentives commensurate with the amount of input in teaching job
5. Slow action on promotional exercises
6. Inadequate dedication to work by teachers
7. Lack of opportunity as an officer in teaching field to participate in decision-making
8. Lack of professional ethics.
9. Teachers are looked-down upon

10. Inequality in the treatment of teachers
11. Unfulfillment of many promises made by education authorities
12. Poor mobility of teachers
13. Teaching profession appears to be a dumping ground for many people who never can find other jobs
14. Nonchalant attitude of the education authorities to teachers' welfare
15. Teachers are the worst victims of the high inflation
16. Lack of advancement opportunity
17. Recruitment of non-Nigerian staff who are less qualified
18. Lack of adequate evaluation of teachers' abilities
19. Infrequent refresher courses (in-service programs) for teachers
20. Non-implementation of improved condition of service

Aspects of teaching job which received the highest degree of dissatisfaction expressed by the teachers on the questionnaire include the following:

1. The way the State education authorities handle teacher's grievances and complaints
2. The present promotion system
3. The encouragement provided for teachers to seek more education and training
4. The encouragement provided for teachers to stay on their jobs

5. The efforts of the Ministry of Education in improving the quality of teaching
6. The recognition teachers received from the Ministry of Education for their work
7. The present weekly working-days.

Summary

In summarizing the analyses of data for this study, the results, according to the degree of satisfaction, revealed that teachers expressed satisfaction with the aspects of their work such as the opportunities available to them to excel, achieve, and grow on the job; teaching as a job; the responsibilities being given or any assignment being responsible for; amount of supervision they had in their schools and/or their work; professional and personal interactions with the principals, colleagues, and students in the community; and physical condition and/or facilities available for doing the work. They expressed dissatisfaction with advancement--the actual potential for improvement in their status or position. They also had mixed feelings about recognition, their salary, and administrative policies as the results indicated that in no instances were 50 percent of the teachers either satisfied, dissatisfied or undecided.

In comparing the teachers' satisfaction with the ten scales, the results indicated that differences between groups

were apparent for only one of the six categories of teachers (teachers with reasons for entering teaching profession). The differences noted were: Teachers who entered the teaching profession because of interest in the profession expressed more satisfaction than those who were influenced by economic reasons.

Only two of the alternative hypotheses were supported by the findings, which indicated that female teachers as well as teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession expressed more satisfaction than their counter groups for overall satisfaction.

The summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The study assessed job satisfaction by obtaining teachers' opinions about their work and working conditions, particularly how the ten components of job satisfaction contributed to the overall satisfaction of the teachers. The main part of the study was designed to:

1. Determine the degree of teachers' satisfaction with each of the ten components or scales of job satisfaction
2. Compare teachers' satisfaction with each of the ten scales when teachers were classified according to qualifications, sex, age, teaching experience at secondary level, reasons for entering teaching profession, and geographical area of school
3. Test the six alternative hypotheses related to teachers' overall satisfaction according to their demographic classifications.

The subject population selected for the study was Nigerian teachers in Kano State secondary educational institutions. A total of 356 Nigerian teachers from 30 secondary

institutions selected at random constituted the sample in this study. Questionnaires were delivered in person to those teachers, and usable questionnaires were obtained from 284 teachers.

The items of the instrument used in this study were selected from the list of job satisfaction items named by various researchers as relevant to Nigerian educational system.

The instrument comprised a three-part questionnaire. The first part sought six bits of demographic information, i.e., qualification, sex, age, teaching experience at secondary level, reasons for entering the teaching profession, and geographical area of school. The second part included fifty-eight items divided into ten components or scales for assessing job satisfaction, and one item (item 59) dealing with overall job satisfaction. The third part sought free responses from the respondents concerning other items or factors not covered by the questionnaire that affected their satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The degree of satisfaction was determined by the response frequency scores obtained from Mctest analysis. High scores toward satisfaction were interpreted as "satisfaction"; high scores toward dissatisfaction were interpreted as "dissatisfaction"; while high scores between the two were interpreted as "undecided" opinion.

The discriminant function analysis and multivariate analysis of variance were the statistical procedures applied to test the hypothesis of equal population means between groups of the six variable classifications on the ten job satisfaction scales for comparing teachers' satisfaction. The three-way analysis of variance was applied to test the six alternative hypotheses for comparing teachers overall satisfaction.

The results, according to the degree of satisfaction, revealed that teachers were satisfied with some aspects of their work on achievement and growth opportunity, work itself, responsibility, supervision, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. They felt dissatisfied with advancement--the actual potential for improvement in their status or position, but had mixed feelings about recognition, their salary, and administrative policies as the results indicated that in no instances were as much as 50 percent of the teachers either satisfied, dissatisfied or undecided.

In comparing the teachers' satisfaction with the ten scales, the results indicated that differences between groups were apparent for only one of the six categories of teachers (teachers with reasons for entering teaching profession). The differences noted were: Teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more highly satisfied with recognition, achievement and growth

opportunities, work itself, and salary than those who were influenced by economic reasons; also those who entered because of economic reasons were more highly dissatisfied with advancement than their counterparts who were interested in teaching.

Only two of the alternative hypotheses were supported by the findings, which indicated that female teachers as well as teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more satisfied than their counter groips for overall satisfaction.

Conclusions

On the basis of the results of the various data analyses, certain conclusions could be drawn and some recommendations also offered.

Concerning the degree of satisfaction on each of the ten scales, the frequency of responses to the questionnaire revealed that over 50 percent of the total responses were toward satisfaction with achievement and growth opportunity, work itself, responsibility, supervision, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. It is then concluded that a greater number of teachers felt satisfied with those aspects of their job. Over 50 percent of the total responses were toward dissatisfaction with advancement. It is concluded that teachers were dissatisfied about the actual potential for improvement in their status

or position. On recognition, salary, and administrative policies, high responses were between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This concludes that teachers were undecided whether or not they felt satisfied with recognition, their pay, and the administrative policies of the Ministry of Education and its agencies.

The greatest percentage of the overall responses was toward satisfaction. The reason for this, perhaps, might be attributed to the greater efforts of the State during the past five years in promoting the significance of education, especially by training more indigenous young teachers and spending over half of the State's recurrent expenditure on education. To this effect is another fact mentioned in Chapter I that the reduction in percentage of non-Nigerian teachers in Kano State from 40 in early 1970s to 33 of the total teaching staff in 1977, and from 75 to 53 percent of the degree teachers. This has been an improvement on the efforts to allure more indigenous youths into teaching. This also has influenced the teachers' attitude toward satisfaction with teaching as a profession.

Correlates of satisfaction expressed in this study avoid ready classification according to Herzberg's hypothesis. The mix of motivators (recognition, achievement, work itself, advancement, responsibility) and hygiene (salary, administrative policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions) does not suggest that variables which

are associated with satisfaction differ from those associated with dissatisfaction. Instead, variables linked with high level of satisfaction are also related to high level of dissatisfaction. This investigation has demonstrated that variables associated with satisfaction do not conform to the grouping categories suggested by motivation-hygiene theory. It can then be concluded that the same variable associated with dissatisfaction is related to satisfaction. The results of this study, therefore, do not conform with Herzberg's conclusions that internal (motivation) factors act as satisfiers while external (hygiene) factors act as dissatisfiers. In this study, dissatisfaction and satisfaction were found simultaneously in both motivation and hygiene factors of Herzberg's theory.

Full support of the two-factor theory may require use of the full method, i.e., the results of the study may be supportive of the theory only if the full Herzberg's interview technique and analysis are used. This similar conclusion has been found by Wernimont,[1] Wolf,[2] and Attuwaybi.[3] Therefore, further research should be done into the postulates of the theory using different populations, and different research techniques or methods. But the theory is well enough accepted and has been written about in a positive manner frequently enough to warrant its practical application in the work setting in education.

However, the reasons for the differences between this study and Herzberg's might be local-cultural factors. One reason might be attributed to the different values attached to teaching job in the United States and Nigeria. In the United States, teachers do value and recognize teaching as a job that can be supplemented by other income, while in Nigeria, teachers are restricted to their teaching job and being forbidden to engage in other income producing activities. Nigerian teachers, therefore, value teaching as a full-time job, though they are not as highly paid as teachers in the United States. So, salary can be seen as an important issue. But since there was a recent general increase in salaries (see Chapter I), teachers seem to have mixed feelings about the current amount, thus the undecided pattern of responses.

Another reason might be the conditions of entering the teaching profession. In the United States, teachers enter into contract every year; many individuals consider a satisfying working conditions (locations, buildings, and other facilities) before accepting a contractual teaching job. In Nigeria, for instance, only the non-Nigerian teaching staffs are employed on contract, the Nigerian teachers are placed on permanent, teaching positions, with retirement benefits. Most, if not all, Nigerian teachers consider being employed first without giving considerations to the physical conditions and/or facilities available before

accepting teaching employment. Therefore, while Nigerian teachers esteem teaching as a full-time job, they as well require a high recognition and better pay for the job to be satisfied. Therefore, researchers or organizations in other countries which may use teachers as sample for study should be aware of the differences in culture and values attached to teaching as a job.

Relating the findings of this study to that of Sergiovanni's study,[4] teachers in Kano, Nigeria differed from teachers in Rochester, New York, in their attitudes toward teaching as a job. Work itself was not highly contributing to satisfaction among Sergiovanni's subjects as achievement, recognition, and responsibility which were highly satisfying to them. In the Nigerian sample, for instance, work itself, among other components of satisfaction scales, greatly contributed to overall job satisfaction. Also, the recognition scale contributed highly to the satisfaction of Sergiovanni's subjects, but teachers in Kano, Nigeria had split decisions as a third--of the teachers showed satisfied, dissatisfied and undecided feelings respectively. The reason for this difference among the two studies might be locally or culturally bound. Teachers in Rochester, New York were comparing their profession with many other prestigious jobs which required comparable amounts of schooling and higher qualifications. In Nigeria, however, teachers are permitted (licensed) to

teach without graduating from college or holding teaching qualifications. In other words, teachers in Nigeria consider teaching an appealing job in terms of the amount and level of education required.

Relating this finding to Wernimont's study[5] which used the ten job satisfaction factors, internal factors were more satisfying while external factors were dissatisfying. In contrast to his findings, this study differs in that advancement, (included in internal or satisfying factors) was dissatisfying to teachers in Kano, Nigeria, while supervision, interpersonal relations and working conditions (included in external or dissatisfying factors in Wernimont's study) were among the components teachers in Kano considered satisfying.

Having established which job satisfaction factors or components were highly associated with satisfaction or contributing to the differences found among the teachers, it is appropriate to posit an explanation as to why they are important.

There is research evidence supporting the findings of this study concerning work itself as one major component of job satisfaction influencing the overall satisfaction and the differences found among the teachers. Moxley[6] found work itself, among others, to be associated with satisfaction, and thereby concluded that personal interest in work itself was strongly related to one's job satisfaction--that

is, the higher the interest of the teacher in the job, the higher the job satisfaction would be. This conclusion should not be interpreted to mean that other components or scales were not associated or contributing to overall satisfaction. Rather, all were related to overall satisfaction with different degrees of contribution.

Even though salary is also one among the job satisfaction components or scales determining satisfaction or contributing to the differences found among the teachers, it has its effect on teachers' morale. Strickland[7] found that salary was ranked high among the factors reported as reducing the morale of teachers in North Carolina. His study was based on a questionnaire sample of 2,799 teachers. The responses on salary scale in this study underscored the undecided opinion. This indicated that teachers could neither show high dissatisfaction nor high satisfaction with their pay because teachers salaries have improved during the past four years, and as is usual with all workers, teachers always want more pay. No doubt it is understandable that they are concerned about salaries. The high rate of inflation in Nigeria has an affect upon the teachers' undecided opinions about their ability to meet their financial needs and their salary in terms of long-term plan.

In comparing teachers' satisfaction with each of the ten scales of job satisfaction, teachers were classified

according to qualification, sex, age, teaching experience at secondary level, reasons for entering teaching profession, and geographical area of school. It was concluded that difference in overall satisfaction was found not to be significantly related to level of education (qualification), age, place of employment, and teaching experience. This means that significant difference was not found between groups in each of the classifications as they showed satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction according to their means. One classification that showed significant difference was teachers with reasons for entering the teaching profession. These differences were obtained:

1. Concerning recognition, teachers who entered the teaching profession because of interest were more satisfied than those who entered because of economic reasons.
2. Teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more satisfied with achievement and growth opportunity than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons
3. Teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more satisfied with their work than their counterpart teachers who were influenced by economic reasons

4. Concerning advancement, teachers who entered the profession because of economic reasons were more highly dissatisfied than those who entered teaching because of interest in the profession
5. Regarding salary, teachers who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more satisfied than those who entered teaching because of economic reasons.

The alternative hypotheses dealing with teachers' overall satisfaction were tested according to the same classifications, using a three-way analysis of variance for each set of three groups in the classification. Only two of the hypotheses were supported. These findings indicated, according to the total scores and the mean scores, that female teachers as well as those who entered teaching because of interest in the profession were more satisfied than their counter groups for overall satisfaction.

It is apparent that the reasons for entering the teaching profession accounted for the major significant differences obtained among the six variable classifications of teachers. Therefore, the findings of this investigation, in terms of the Nigerian educational system, suggest that prospective teachers should be recruited from among those who have high personal interest in teaching as a job. This suggestion, however, should not be interpreted as a guarantee that such teachers would be productive teachers.

Although the teachers expressed satisfaction with working conditions, which was referred to as the physical condition and material available for the work, dissatisfaction was expressed in the free responses about some aspects of condition of service such as housing or accommodation for teachers, salary, and participation in decision-making.

Achieving and maintaining a teaching service of high morale and satisfaction among teachers requires establishing a service in which teachers are similarly recognized and rewarded, and one in which teachers enjoy condition of service. Even if we were to discount the claim that the profession is being deserted by its well-qualified and experienced members, it is difficult to be convinced that condition of service and economic rewards can be ignored when attempting to improve the quality of teaching in Nigeria. For instance, the economic and academic loss that might occur when teachers are disaffected or believed they are being treated unfairly may be as serious a loss as the outright attrition that could result from unsatisfactory feelings.

One consideration, closely related to job satisfaction and teacher welfare, deserves mention: housing or accommodation as one major condition of service. Accommodation for non-Nigerian teachers is normally provided, which is indeed a normal condition of contract service. However,

this is not always the case as far as local teachers are concerned. In urban areas, where housing may easily be rented, lack of official housing is not of serious consequence, but in rural areas, where suitable accommodation is not so readily available, education authorities have as much an obligation to provide houses for their own teachers as they do for the teachers from overseas. This is particularly true where teachers are subject to transfer from one area to another in the general interests of the service. Unless provision of this kind is made and teachers can be assured of suitable accommodation for themselves and their families, it will be impossible to attract them to rural areas and sustain their full satisfaction in their work.

One should also look not only to financial consideration but to the total working environment of the teacher, including the extent to which the teacher believes him or herself to be esteemed, when attempting to enhance teacher satisfaction. It is, therefore, believed that remedies for lack of continuity in the teaching force cannot be found solely by reducing differences between the salaries of teachers and the salaries of those in other sectors; it is also necessary that principals and Ministry of Education officials assume more professional and more democratic approaches when formulating policies or assigning responsibilities.

Of at least equal importance, however, will be more effective educational leadership on the part of all school administrators. One of the factors which influenced teachers' dissatisfaction was "lack of opportunity to participate in decision-making." It is believed that sound personnel policies which take account of the judgment of teachers are still far too seldom practiced; far too many school administrators and sometimes Ministry officials fail to involve teachers or use them in resolving problems in schools. Where staff are not effectively involved in the decisions that affect them, one of the main "non-economic" incentives for remaining in the profession vanishes.

Recommendations

Administrative effectiveness in education is ultimately determined by the human condition which exists in the school. Among formal organizations the school is unique, for both its process and product, its means and ends, are basically human. It is not likely that schools will be successful in developing awareness, creativity, respect, sensitivity, responsibility, a desire for learning, a spirit of inquiry, a capacity for love, and similar conditions in youngsters unless schools are organized and operated in such a way as to be able to champion and nurture these conditions. These growth and development goals which are held for youngsters are best achieved by teachers and other

adults who are also committed to these goals for themselves--both as persons and professionals.[8]

The concern of the school should be directed toward producing educated students, adding to knowledge, and serving social needs. The other goal is to maintain itself as an efficiently functioning system in its environment. As such, the concern for the social and psychological welfare of its members is a necessary goal. However, it is erroneous to take the emphasis on the human aspects in organizational administration to mean less concern with efficiency. The educational system must emphasize planned change in its operations and personnel policies to keep teachers satisfied to be able to cope with the system's demand for productivity and organizational allegiance.

In the light of the findings of this investigation, the following recommendations are presented:

1. In every work situation there are components of job satisfaction each specifying specific needs of the workers. Organizations ought to identify these components and take necessary measures to ensure their fulfillment.

2. Interest in work itself seems to be one of the major determinants of Kano teachers' overall satisfaction. This suggests that teachers should be recruited from among the individuals showing interest in the work itself.

3. Positive steps should be taken as much as possible by the government to encourage more female as well as male graduates to take up teaching as their life-long profession.

4. It is also necessary to improve conditions of service sufficiently to make teaching as attractive as other occupations requiring similar training and qualifications.

5. There is a need for more in-service training programs, professional activities, and meaningful incentives including vertical mobility, to help teachers grow on the job professionally and academically.

6. This study is only a beginning; there were a number of constraints and limitations. The findings give evidence that the process used could be useful in assisting the researcher and other investigators in further research on job satisfaction.

7. The following areas of further study are thus recommended:

a. Other researchers should perform replications of this survey in an effort to substantiate the findings of this study

b. Further study is needed to determine if the results would be similar for different groups of teachers, that is, different levels, different geographical areas, and different population centers in Nigeria

c. A follow-up study should be made to determine whether teachers' attitudes change during the year

d. More research is needed to determine if a teacher's level of satisfaction is related to his satisfaction with life in general

e. School principals should be studied for their job satisfaction

f. Studies of this type should be conducted among the final year students in various teacher-training institutions for the purpose of recruiting those who are interested in the teaching profession.

Chapter Notes

[1]Wernimont, "A System View of Job Satisfaction."

[2]Wolf, "Need Gratification Theory."

[3]Attuwaybi, "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Elementary and Junior High School Teachers."

[4]T. J. Sergiovanni, "Factors which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (1967), 66-82.

[5]Wernimont, "A System View of Job Satisfaction," p. 86.

[6]Linda S. Moxley, "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching High Education: An Examination of Herzberg's Two-factor Theory and Porter's Need Satisfaction Research," Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Reports, (1977).

[7]B. F. Strickland, "A Study of Factors Affecting Teacher Morale in Selected Administrative Units of North Carolina (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1963), Dissertation Abstracts (1963), 4598-99A.

[8]T. J. Sergiovanni and F. D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), preface, p. vii.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

April 20, 1978

Dear Teacher,

As part of my doctoral studies, and toward my doctoral dissertation, I am in the process of conducting a research which deals with the way teachers feel about some aspects of their profession. The information I need for the study are included in the questionnaire, and the information collected from you will be a very important part of the study.

Your participation and co-operation is of vital importance as you will please spare a few minutes of your time to respond to the attached questionnaire.

The questionnaire is designed to determine your satisfaction with your job as a teacher. The first part of the questionnaire asks for information about your background, the second part requests your feeling about each of the items, and the third part requests you to rank any other factors influencing your job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Your assistance in completing the questionnaire will help this study achieve its main objective which is to provide suggestions for improving the teaching profession in Nigeria.

I can assure you that whatever information gathered from you will be held confidential and used for research purposes only.

Please complete the questionnaire, put it back in the envelope supplied, and hand it over to the teacher, who will be appointed, and from whom I will collect all on my follow-up visit.

Thank you very much for your anticipated assistance and co-operation.

Very sincerely yours,

S. A. Oladebo

Enclosure:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

Instruction: Please answer each of the six questions by checking(✓) any one that applies to you. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME.

1. What is your educational qualification? Check one of the two groups.

   Degree (BA, BSc, MA, PhD) _____

   Non-Degree (NCE, Grd.I, ND, HND) _____

2. Are you Male? _____

   Female? _____

3. How old are you? Please check one of the two.

   30 years or less _____

   More than 30 years _____

4. How many years teaching experience at secondary school level?

   5 years or less _____

   More than 5 years _____

5. Why do you enter teaching profession? Check one only.

   Interest in the profession _____

   Economic reasons _____

6. Do you teach in Kano Metropolitan Area? Check one.

   Yes _____

   No _____

Part II

Instructions:

Please answer the following questions indicating the degree of satisfaction which you feel toward each of the aspects of your job listed on the next pages.

...If you feel that your job gives you more than expected, check (✓) the box under VERY SATISFIED, which means, "I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job."

...If you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check (✓) the box under SATISFIED, which means, "I am satisfied with this aspect of my job."

...If you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check (✓) the box under UNDECIDED, which means, "I cannot decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job."

...If you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check (✓) the box under DISSATISFIED, which means, "I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job."

...If you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check (✓) the box under VERY DISSATISFIED, which means, "I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job."

Scale:
5 = Very Satisfied (VS)
4 = Satisfied (S)
3 = Undecided (U)
2 = Dissatisfied (D)
1 = Very Dissatisfied (VD)

Now turn to the next pages, read each statement carefully and decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement. Be frank and honest.

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH.....	VERY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	UNDECIDED	DISSATISFIED	VERY DISSATISFIED
1. Your work as a teacher?					
2. The way your state education authorities handle teachers' grievances and complainte?					
3. The professional guidance you receive from your principal?					
4. Your present salary?					
5. The overall quality of your school building?					
6. The methods the inspectors use to evaluate your work?					
7. The present promotion system?					
8. The fairness with which the Ministry of Education implements policies and regulations?					
9. The personal satisfaction which you derive from teaching					
10. The efficiency with which the Ministry of Education implements policies and regulations?					
11. Your salary compared with the salary of other people in other professions who had similar qualification?					
12. The instructional materials and equipment which you have in your school?					
13. The encouragement provided for teachers to seek more education and training?					
14. The recognition you receive from your principal?					

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH.....

	VS	S	U	D	VD
15. Your work and its contribution to the progress of the state in which you work?					
16. The methods used by your principal to evaluate your work					
17. The amount of your annual salary increase?					
18. The speed with which the Ministry of Education responds to teachers' request for texbooks & other materials?					
19. The in-service training programs provided by the Ministry of Education?					
20. The prestige which the teaching profession enjoys in Nigeria today?					
21. The degree to which your work fulfills personal goals and objectives?					
22. The role teachers play in influencing school policies and practices?					
23. The quality of textbooks?					
24. The encouragement provided for teachers to stay in their jobs?					
25. Your involvement in educational activities which allow you to develop academically and professionally?					
26. The interesting and challenging aspects of teaching?					
27. Your level of enthusiasm about teaching?					
28. The number of hours you work each week?					
29. The opportunity to grow and develop in your job?					
30. The amount of status or prestige you receive from your job?					
31. The amount of interpersonal relations with your students					

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH.....	VS	S	U	D	VD
32. The amount of interpersonal relations with your colleagues?					
33. The opportunities to help others in your job?					
34. Your work when you see the results of it on your students?					
35. The efforts of the Ministry of Education in improving the quality of teaching?					
36 Your ability to meet your family's financial needs?					
37. The recognition you receive from the Ministry of Education for your work?					
38. The chance to try out new ideas and techniques in teaching?					
39. The procedures by which some teachers are selected by the Ministry of Education to carry out special assignments?					
40. The freedom you have in expressing your opinion to your principal?					
41. Your salary when you think of long-term plan?					
42. The number of students in your class?					
43. Your growth as far as your knowledge and teaching skills are concerned?					
44. Your choice of teaching as a career?					
45. The procedure by which principals are appointed to their positions?					
46. Your participation in community affairs?					
47. The recognition which the teaching profession receives from the Kano State Government?					
48. The human value ascribed to teaching?					

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH.....	VS	S	U	D	VD
49. The present school calendar?					
50. The present weekly working-days?					
51. The progress that has been made in Education in Kano State?					
52. The extra hours you put in your work?					
53. The number of classes or groups for which you are responsible?					
54. The total amount of responsibilities you have?					
55. The amount of supervision you get in your school					
56. The people in the community or area where you teach?					
57. The professional guidance you receive from the inspectors that supervise your school?					
58. The way the inspectors provide capable supervisions of your school?					
59. Your job as a whole taking into considerations both the favorable and unfavorable aspects of the total job					

The questionnaire may not include other factors which influence you and which you feel are necessary to your job satisfaction. Would you kindly identify and rank those factors you consider important to your job satisfaction and those you feel prevent or detract from your job satisfaction.

Rank in order of importance (1 - most important; 2, 3, 4, etc.)

Factors contributing to your job satisfaction:	RANK
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

Rank in order of negative effect (1 - most negative; 2, 3, 4, etc)

Factors which prevent or detract from your job satisfaction:	RANK
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE THE STUDY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

April 12, 1978

The Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education
Kano, Kano State
Nigeria.

Dear Sir,

Permission to Conduct a Research in
Kano State Secondary Education Institutions

I am a Nigerian, doctoral student in the program of educational administration at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, U.S.A.; and proposing, as part of my doctoral studies, to conduct a survey of the indigenous teachers at the secondary education institutions (Grammar, Commercial, Teacher training, and Technical/Vocational) in all the administrative areas of Kano State.

The study which deals with the way the teachers feel about some aspects of their profession, will be conducted by means of questionnaire. Recognition has been given to the importance of this kind of study, which generally is being captioned "Job Satisfaction." Job satisfaction has been considered important not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it has been shown that the worker who likes his job will work with efficiency and enthusiasm, and also that those who find satisfaction in their jobs will create a better learning environment for students than those who do not.

This study will specifically identify the job factors contributing to the satisfactions and dissatisfactions among the teachers. A belief that a knowledge of such factors could have three major values: (1) the findings could be utilized by the administrators and other educational authorities in developing conditions which would attract and hold teachers; (2) the findings could be used in teacher training institutions for influencing students to consider teaching profession as a career; and (3) the awareness of the factors for satisfactions and dissatisfactions will aid in recruitment.

All information in the questionnaire will be used for research purposes only, and no person will be identified in this study or any possible report growing out of the study.

Overall results will be made available to the Ministry and other interested parties.

I would, therefore, appreciate immensely your permission to undertake the study, and as well as your assistance in seeking the co-operation of the principals of the secondary education institutions (existing before 1975/76 school year) in all the administrative areas, to facilitate my visit for the purpose of distribution and collection of the questionnaire.

The Permanent Secretary. April 12, 1978

Your earliest reply will be highly appreciated, while I thank you very much for your anticipated assistance and co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

S. A. Oladebo

* * *

Sirs:

I have reviewed the proposal and approve it as Mr. Oladebo's dissertation research

Anthony M. Cresswell
Associate Professor of Education and Management

AMC:mgt

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, KANO STATE

DIRECTORATE
(XXXXXXXXXX DIVISION)

Cables & Telegrams:
PERMED KANO

Telephone:

P. M. B
KANO/NIGERIA

In case of reply please quote Reference
No. CR/69/124

1st May, 1978

Mr. S. A. Oladebo
Dept. of Educ. Administration
School of Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Oladebo,

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN KANO STATE

Your letter dated April 12, 1978 refers.

I am directed to inform you that the Ministry of Education, Kano State permits you to conduct the research as requested.

(YUNUSA YUSUFU)
Chief Education Officer (Teacher Trn.)
For: Permanent Secretary.

/YY/Funmi/

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, KANO STATE

DIRECTORATE
(EXPERIENCE DIVISION)

Cables & Telegrams:
PERMED KANO

Telephone:

P. M. B
KANO/NIGERIA

In case of reply please quote Reference
No CP/69/125

1st May, 1978

To:

All Principals
Post Primary Institutions
Kano State.

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH
IN KANO STATE

This is to introduce Mr. S. A. Oladebo, a one-time Lecturer at Advanced Teachers College (ABU), Kano, and who is now a doctoral student at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, U.S.A., for the purpose of conducting a survey of all the Nigerian Teachers in your school. The permission for conducting the research has been granted.

Your co-operation to facilitate the study in distributing and collecting his questionnaire will be highly appreciated.

(YUNUSA YUSUFU)
Chief Education Officer (Teacher Trn.)
For: Permanent Secretary.

/YY/Funmi/

cc: S. A. Oladebo
Dept. of Educ. Administration
School of Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

APPENDIX C

TABLES 15, 16, 17, AND 18

TABLE 15[1]

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS FOR SIX VARIABLE CLASSIFICATIONS DEFINED BY THE 10 JOB SATISFACTION SCALES

Scales	Qualification	Sex	Age	Experience	Reason	Area
Recognition	-.71	.43	.17	.20	- .25	.06
Achievement & growth opportunity	-.50	-.39	-.48	-.05	- .14	.49
Work itself	-.22	.16	-.51	.87	.89	1.09
Advancement	.08	-.52	.64	-.13	.15	- .16
Responsibility	.14	.03	-.06	.21	- .31	.42
Salary	.04	.84	.26	-.50	1.11	.05
Administrative policies	-.15	.30	.76	-.79	- .46	.01
Supervision	.67	-.78	-.18	.20	.18	.64
Interpersonal relations	-.16	-.08	-.02	-.31	- .37	- .08
Working conditions	.01	-.10	-.37	.05	- .10	- .16

[1] $n = 71$

TABLE 16

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SATISFACTION DEFINED BY EACH OF THE 10 SCALES FOR 6 VARIABLE CLASSIFICATIONS AND FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE BY RANDOM GROUPS

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Recognition (1)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	14.19	3.09	26	14.25	2.60	36	14.55	1.67	32	14.01	2.27
Non-degree	46	13.78	2.54	45	13.07	2.05	35	13.27	2.05	39	13.39	2.62
Sex:												
Male	56	13.62	2.84	59	13.45	2.46	55	13.82	2.08	50	13.60	2.52
Female	15	15.07	1.97	12	13.76	1.48	16	14.25	1.51	21	13.84	2.38
Age:												
Under 30	44	13.76	2.31	52	13.47	2.50	49	14.10	2.00	49	13.91	2.37
Over 30	27	14.19	3.33	19	13.59	1.77	22	13.52	1.86	22	13.13	2.65
Experience:												
Under 5	44	13.80	2.58	51	13.32	2.45	54	14.00	1.97	55	13.54	2.38
Over 5	27	14.13	3.00	20	13.96	1.94	17	13.65	1.97	16	14.14	2.78
Reason:												
Interest	59	14.19	2.56	58	13.84	2.24	56	14.09	2.46	52	14.17	1.75
Economic	11	12.27	3.16	12	12.16	2.19	14	12.28	1.77	19	13.23	2.36
Area:												
Urban	41	14.35	2.60	44	13.91	2.44	40	13.95	2.08	45	13.94	2.60
Rural	30	13.35	2.84	27	12.84	1.94	31	13.88	1.83	26	13.20	2.19

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Achievement & Growth Opportunity												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	25.73	3.24	26	25.02	3.08	36	26.63	2.23	32	25.85	2.62
Non-degree	46	25.95	2.84	45	25.35	2.39	35	25.15	2.72	39	25.89	2.38
Sex:												
Male	56	25.71	2.94	59	25.25	2.57	55	25.96	2.72	50	25.84	2.63
Female	15	26.48	3.08	12	25.16	3.15	16	25.70	2.05	21	25.93	2.12
Age:												
Under 30	44	25.80	2.56	52	25.17	2.61	49	25.94	2.76	49	26.04	2.51
Over 30	27	25.99	3.58	19	25.41	2.82	22	25.82	2.16	22	25.49	2.41
Experience:												
Under 5	44	25.86	2.55	51	25.38	2.66	54	26.04	2.68	55	25.79	2.46
Over 5	27	25.89	3.61	20	24.86	2.67	17	25.46	2.44	16	26.14	2.60
Reason:												
Interest	59	26.06	2.59	58	25.31	2.57	56	26.33	2.79	52	26.28	2.45
Economic	11	25.46	2.56	12	25.44	2.53	14	23.43	2.97	19	24.29	2.01
Area:												
Urban	41	26.06	2.96	44	25.19	2.74	40	25.71	2.63	45	26.01	2.32
Rural	30	25.62	3.01	27	25.31	2.54	31	26.14	2.53	26	25.62	2.75

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Work Itself (3)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	38.91	4.21	26	38.58	3.84	36	39.28	3.02	32	38.88	3.54
Non-degree	46	39.45	2.78	45	38.59	3.07	35	38.24	3.19	39	38.78	3.65
Sex:												
Male	56	38.88	3.56	59	38.60	3.34	55	38.72	3.07	50	38.70	3.47
Female	15	40.68	1.79	12	38.54	3.53	16	38.90	3.41	21	39.12	3.88
Age:												
Under 30	44	38.67	3.62	52	38.37	3.39	49	38.56	3.42	49	39.10	3.63
Over 30	27	40.23	2.59	19	39.18	3.23	22	39.22	2.37	22	38.21	3.45
Experience:												
Under 5	44	38.76	3.60	51	38.39	3.42	54	38.50	3.34	55	38.84	3.55
Over 5	27	40.09	2.71	20	39.09	3.19	17	39.61	2.21	16	38.76	3.77
Reason:												
Interest	59	39.63	3.13	58	39.27	2.70	56	39.59	3.37	52	39.56	2.77
Economic	11	37.12	3.90	12	36.12	3.96	14	35.73	2.82	19	36.58	3.07
Area:												
Urban	41	39.64	2.90	44	38.59	3.47	40	39.30	2.63	45	39.61	3.23
Rural	30	38.75	3.85	27	38.58	3.20	31	38.06	3.60	26	37.47	3.78

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Advancement (4)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	12.95	4.27	26	11.85	2.97	36	13.13	2.86	32	12.47	3.12
Non-degree	46	12.13	3.33	45	11.56	2.76	35	11.99	2.96	39	12.16	3.14
Sex:												
Male	56	12.05	3.81	59	11.50	2.88	55	12.70	2.90	50	12.21	3.07
Female	15	13.80	2.86	12	12.47	2.45	16	12.10	3.12	21	12.52	3.28
Age:												
Under 30	44	12.29	3.26	52	12.01	2.84	49	12.97	3.00	49	12.52	3.07
Over 30	27	12.62	4.33	19	10.73	2.60	22	11.66	2.65	22	11.83	3.22
Experience:												
Under 5	44	12.31	3.27	51	11.81	2.86	54	12.97	3.00	55	12.23	3.01
Over 5	27	12.59	4.32	20	11.29	2.76	17	11.85	2.70	16	12.54	3.53
Reason:												
Interest	59	12.82	3.03	58	11.98	2.76	56	12.59	3.59	52	12.72	3.04
Economic	11	10.71	2.44	12	10.03	2.75	14	9.40	2.80	19	12.14	2.67
Area:												
Urban	41	12.59	3.92	44	11.95	2.91	40	12.56	3.05	45	12.45	3.27
Rural	30	12.19	3.37	27	11.20	2.65	31	12.57	2.84	26	12.05	2.87

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Responsibility (5)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	13.03	.67	26	12.80	.87	36	12.87	1.35	32	12.60	1.67
Non-degree	46	12.69	1.42	45	12.57	1.22	35	12.82	.89	39	13.12	.62
Sex:												
Male	56	12.73	1.45	59	12.64	1.16	55	12.78	1.24	50	12.79	1.39
Female	15	13.13	.44	12	12.47	.78	16	13.06	.65	21	13.10	.72
Age:												
Under 30	44	12.88	.94	52	12.71	.97	49	12.82	1.31	49	12.78	1.41
Over 30	27	12.71	1.59	19	12.51	1.42	22	12.92	.64	22	13.11	.67
Experience:												
Under 5	44	12.68	1.44	51	12.62	1.10	54	12.83	1.25	55	12.81	1.34
Over 5	27	13.02	.70	20	12.74	1.15	17	12.91	.66	16	13.12	.75
Reason:												
Interest	59	12.83	1.30	58	12.73	1.08	56	13.07	.60	56	12.91	1.33
Economic	11	12.74	.74	12	12.37	1.22	14	12.24	1.87	19	12.83	.76
Area:												
Urban	41	13.00	.70	44	12.81	1.01	40	12.76	1.42	45	13.00	1.30
Rural	30	12.55	1.67	27	12.41	1.22	31	12.95	.61	26	12.68	1.10

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Salary (6)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	15.02	4.07	26	14.49	3.04	36	15.88	3.13	32	15.18	3.95
Non-degree	46	15.34	3.37	45	14.03	3.29	35	14.59	3.00	39	15.18	3.28
Sex:												
Male	56	14.96	3.64	59	14.07	3.34	55	14.87	3.27	50	14.96	3.71
Female	15	16.26	3.41	12	14.82	2.34	16	16.53	2.13	21	15.71	3.24
Age:												
Under 30	44	14.89	3.36	52	14.74	3.22	49	15.46	3.23	49	15.51	3.53
Over 30	27	15.78	3.98	19	12.72	2.65	22	14.75	2.83	22	14.44	3.63
Experience:												
Under 5	44	15.15	3.46	51	14.38	3.28	54	15.49	3.15	55	14.98	3.56
Over 5	27	15.36	3.90	20	13.73	2.98	17	14.47	2.94	16	15.87	3.63
Reason:												
Interest	59	15.65	3.54	58	14.48	3.18	56	15.97	3.27	56	15.63	3.18
Economic	11	13.15	3.49	12	12.74	3.08	14	12.39	3.14	19	14.18	2.72
Area:												
Urban	41	15.55	3.62	44	14.40	3.38	40	15.25	3.27	45	15.40	3.69
Rural	30	14.79	3.61	27	13.87	2.88	31	15.24	2.94	26	14.79	3.39

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Administrative Policies (7)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	15.42	4.08	26	15.13	3.70	36	16.17	3.01	32	15.18	3.72
Non-degree	46	15.94	3.73	45	14.16	3.55	35	15.05	3.24	39	15.45	3.35
Sex:												
Male	56	15.44	3.75	59	14.46	3.83	55	15.63	3.32	50	15.34	3.45
Female	15	16.95	4.06	12	14.79	2.33	16	15.58	2.60	21	16.27	3.62
Age:												
Under 30	44	15.54	3.82	52	14.91	3.64	49	15.97	3.27	49	15.91	3.54
Over 30	27	16.10	3.91	19	13.43	3.40	22	14.84	2.78	22	14.96	3.41
Experience:												
Under 5	44	15.47	3.68	51	14.40	3.67	54	15.90	3.24	55	15.55	3.44
Over 5	27	16.22	4.12	20	14.79	3.54	17	14.73	2.76	16	15.83	3.82
Reason:												
Interest	59	16.33	3.69	58	14.86	3.62	56	15.60	3.15	56	15.96	3.52
Economic	11	12.71	3.47	12	13.01	3.41	14	15.67	3.26	19	14.54	3.22
Area:												
Urban	41	16.09	3.81	44	15.08	3.68	40	15.50	3.23	45	16.21	3.65
Rural	30	15.31	3.90	27	13.59	3.37	31	15.77	3.09	26	14.57	3.02

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Supervision (8)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	21.28	4.86	26	20.94	3.94	36	21.46	3.55	32	21.45	3.37
Non-degree	46	21.98	4.15	45	20.19	3.84	35	21.60	3.26	39	22.93	3.02
Sex:												
Male	56	21.35	4.47	59	20.48	3.92	55	21.91	3.31	50	22.43	3.05
Female	15	23.13	3.90	12	20.39	3.76	16	20.19	3.42	21	21.88	3.71
Age:												
Under 30	44	21.20	4.37	52	20.42	3.95	49	21.56	3.45	49	22.40	3.42
Over 30	27	22.59	4.37	19	20.59	3.73	22	21.44	3.32	22	21.96	2.86
Experience:												
Under 5	44	21.31	4.54	51	20.40	4.12	54	21.51	3.45	55	22.04	3.43
Over 5	27	22.41	4.13	20	20.62	3.23	17	21.58	3.27	16	23.04	2.44
Reason:												
Interest	59	22.19	4.27	58	21.01	3.81	56	21.52	3.58	56	22.60	3.52
Economic	11	19.10	4.47	12	18.46	3.00	14	21.53	2.86	19	21.21	2.98
Area:												
Urban	41	22.02	4.21	44	20.51	4.19	40	21.39	3.35	45	22.76	3.09
Rural	30	21.32	4.68	27	20.39	3.34	31	21.70	3.47	26	21.41	3.38

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Interpersonal Relations (9)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	17.21	2.17	26	16.83	2.00	36	17.47	1.39	32	16.87	2.10
Non-degree	46	17.29	2.37	45	16.87	2.02	35	16.98	1.90	39	17.73	1.14
Sex:												
Male	56	17.13	2.43	59	16.81	2.05	55	17.22	1.80	49	17.55	1.53
Female	15	17.74	1.65	12	17.11	1.76	16	17.25	1.68	21	17.53	1.36
Age:												
Under 30	44	17.38	1.80	52	16.73	2.07	49	17.22	1.80	49	17.55	1.53
Over 30	27	17.07	2.95	19	17.20	1.78	22	17.26	1.36	22	16.88	1.94
Experience:												
Under 5	44	17.22	2.30	51	16.56	2.11	54	17.27	1.76	55	17.44	1.66
Over 5	27	17.33	2.31	20	17.60	1.48	17	17.11	1.38	16	17.01	1.78
Reason:												
Interest	59	17.43	2.13	58	17.06	1.96	56	17.59	1.07	56	17.42	1.72
Economic	11	16.30	3.02	12	16.22	1.81	14	16.25	2.48	19	17.07	1.64
Area:												
Urban	41	17.55	1.85	44	16.74	2.24	40	17.33	1.38	45	17.61	1.47
Rural	30	16.87	2.76	27	17.05	1.54	31	17.10	1.99	26	16.89	1.95

TABLE 16--Continued

	Group I n = 71			Group II n = 71			Group III n = 71			Group IV n = 71		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
Working Conditions (10)												
Qualification:												
Degree	25	34.57	3.81	26	34.25	2.68	36	34.17	2.57	32	33.77	3.20
Non-degree	46	34.13	3.74	45	33.16	3.15	35	33.46	3.18	39	34.23	3.75
Sex:												
Male	56	34.02	4.04	59	33.48	3.08	55	33.84	3.02	50	34.01	3.54
Female	15	35.28	2.16	12	33.95	2.76	16	33.73	2.45	21	34.04	3.47
Age:												
Under 30	44	34.30	2.90	52	33.62	3.17	49	33.83	3.17	49	34.33	3.29
Over 30	27	34.27	4.88	19	33.40	2.62	22	33.80	2.20	22	33.34	3.91
Experience:												
Under 5	44	33.98	3.76	51	33.55	3.15	54	33.90	2.97	55	34.07	3.17
Over 5	27	34.79	3.72	20	33.58	2.69	17	33.57	2.68	16	33.85	4.56
Reason:												
Interest	59	34.53	3.74	58	33.79	2.88	56	34.12	2.65	56	34.38	3.64
Economic	11	33.58	3.44	12	32.83	3.43	14	33.00	3.39	19	32.58	2.64
Area:												
Urban	41	34.65	3.13	44	33.82	3.09	40	33.90	3.20	45	33.95	3.92
Rural	30	33.79	4.45	27	33.12	2.89	31	33.71	2.46	26	34.14	2.66

TABLE 17

RESPONSE FREQUENCY OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE BASED ON ITEMS

	Satisfied		Undecided	Dissatisfied	
Item No.	VS	S	U	D	VD
1	33	164	36	38	13
2	2	33	88	112	49
3	26	165	46	36	11
4	2	98	93	36	55
5	41	160	28	45	10
6	13	115	80	58	18
7	1	37	74	105	67
8	4	49	103	83	45
9	47	171	34	27	5
10	3	47	106	88	40
11	3	67	113	32	69
12	9	148	36	65	26
13	5	92	43	96	48
14	30	178	27	36	13
15	40	194	38	11	1
16	17	142	90	19	16
17	2	83	98	59	42
18	22	116	59	46	41
19	13	134	69	46	22
20	1	32	137	31	83
21	13	152	53	56	10
22	12	118	71	65	18
23	23	191	28	35	7
24	2	39	34	132	77
25	12	147	62	53	10
26	15	179	45	39	6
27	36	161	42	40	5
28	20	191	13	44	16
29	12	120	49	73	30
30	12	96	102	38	36
31	59	192	12	18	3
32	66	192	11	13	2
33	33	198	28	20	5
34	34	180	19	43	8
35	3	76	72	101	35
36	4	48	133	46	53
37	3	36	91	96	58
38	4	98	98	64	20

Table 17--Continued

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
Sub-Total	677	4,639	2,361	2,045	1,073
39	3	36	136	70	39
40	33	193	19	26	13
41	4	43	138	41	58
42	19	202	12	42	9
43	23	186	39	27	9
44	57	124	42	35	26
45	7	62	139	46	30
46	17	168	51	42	6
47	6	79	77	77	45
48	13	113	60	74	24
49	13	216	15	25	15
50	6	63	20	104	91
51	9	78	91	59	47
52	8	198	37	27	14
53	13	217	17	32	5
54	15	213	28	21	7
55	11	162	45	56	10
56	15	167	60	33	9
57	11	110	85	50	28
58	10	94	89	61	30
Total	970	7,363	3,561	2,993	1,585
Percentage	5.89	44.7	21.61	18.17	9.62
Total Average Percentage	50.59		21.61	27.79	

TABLE 18

RESPONSE FREQUENCY BASED ON THE TEN SCALES
N = 284

1. Recognition

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
14	30	178	27	36	13
20	1	32	137	31	83
30	12	96	102	38	36
37	3	36	91	96	58
47	6	79	77	77	45
Total	52	421	434	278	235
Percentage	3.66	29.65	30.56	19.58	16.55

2. Achievement and Growth Opportunity

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
19	13	134	69	46	22
25	12	147	62	53	10
29	12	120	49	73	30
33	33	198	28	20	5
43	23	186	39	27	9
46	17	168	51	42	6
51	9	78	91	59	47
Total	119	1,031	389	320	129
Percentage	6.22	53.86	20.32	16.09	6.49

TABLE 18--Continued

3. Work Itself

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
1	33	164	36	38	13
9	47	171	34	27	5
15	40	194	38	11	1
21	13	152	53	56	10
26	15	179	45	39	6
27	36	161	42	40	5
34	34	180	19	43	8
38	4	98	98	64	20
44	56	124	42	35	26
48	13	113	60	74	24
Total	292	1,536	467	427	118
Percentage	10.28	54.08	16.44	15.03	4.15

4. Advancement

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
7	1	37	74	105	67
13	5	92	43	96	48
24	2	39	34	132	77
45	7	62	139	46	30
Total	15	230	290	379	222
Percentage	1.32	20.25	25.53	33.36	19.54

TABLE 18--Continued

5. Responsibility

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
52	8	198	37	27	14
53	13	217	17	32	5
54	15	213	28	21	7
Total	36	628	82	80	26
Percentage	4.22	73.71	9.62	9.39	3.05

6. Salary

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
4	2	98	93	36	55
11	3	67	113	32	69
17	2	83	98	59	42
36	4	48	133	46	53
41	4	43	138	41	58
Total	15	339	575	214	277
Percentage	1.05	23.87	40.47	15.07	19.50

7. Administrative Policies

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
2	2	33	88	112	49
8	4	48	103	83	45
10	3	47	106	88	40
22	12	118	71	65	18
39	3	36	136	70	39
Total	24	283	504	418	191
Percentage	1.70	19.93	35.49	29.44	13.45

TABLE 18--Continued

8. Supervision

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
3	26	165	46	36	11
6	13	115	80	58	18
16	17	142	90	19	16
55	11	162	45	56	10
57	11	110	85	50	28
58	10	94	89	61	30
Total	88	788	435	280	113
Percentage	15.16	46.24	25.53	16.43	6.63

9. Interpersonal Relations

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
31	59	192	12	18	3
32	66	192	11	13	2
40	33	193	19	26	13
56	15	167	60	33	9
Total	173	744	102	90	27
Percentage	15.23	65.49	8.98	7.92	2.38

TABLE 18--Continued

10. Working Conditions

Item No.	Satisfied VS	Satisfied S	Undecided U	Dissatisfied D	Dissatisfied VD
5	41	160	28	45	10
12	9	148	36	65	26
18	22	116	59	46	41
23	23	191	28	35	7
28	20	191	13	44	16
35	3	76	72	101	32
42	19	202	12	42	9
49	13	216	15	25	15
50	6	63	20	104	91
Total	156	1,363	283	507	247
Percentage	6.10	53.26	11.06	19.81	9.66

APPENDIX D

LIST OF SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN KANO STATE, NIGERIA

POST PRIMARY INSTITUTIONS

No.	Name of School	Control	Year Estd.			Streams in Each Class 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Enrolment M	F	Trs.	Headmaster
Secondary Grammers Schools																	
1.	Govt. College	Govt.	1927	M	B	WASC	5	5	4	4	6	-	-	24	756	41	P.M.B. 3079 Kano	A. Imam A. Wali
2.	St.Louis S.Sch.	RCM	1951	F	B	WASC	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	10	337	20	P.O.Box 131, Kano.	Sister P. Maloney
3.	St.Thomas S.S.	RCM	1959	M	B	WASC	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	5	139	11	P.O.Box 669, Kano.	Rev. Fr. J. Gillick
4.	Govt.S.S.B/Kudu	Govt.	1960	M	B	WASC	4	2	2	2	2	-	-	12	440	20	P.M.B. 3062 Kano	Mr. E. Koledede
5.	Govt.G.Co. Dala	Govt.	1961	F	B	WASC	4	4	3	3	3	-	-	17	550	31	P.M.B. 3047 Kano.	Mrs. C.M. Ato
6.	Govt.S.S.Hadeji.	Govt.	1967	M	B	WASC	4	2	2	2	2	-	-	12	410	18	G.S.S. Hadejia	Umaru K/Kerofi
7.	Govt.S.S. Gwale	Govt.	1968	M	D	WASC	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	10	354	21	P.M.B. 3096 Kano.	M. U.F. Ladan
8.	G.S.S. Danbatta	Govt.	1968	M	B	WASC	4	2	2	2	2	-	-	12	420	19	P.M.B. 3039 Kano.	M. Aminu G. Bichi
9.	Govt.S.S. Rano	Govt.	1961	M	D	WASC	3	2	2	2	2	-	-	11	430	18	P.M.B. 3095 Kano.	Mr. R. Purdy
10.	G.S.S. Kazaure	Govt.	1970	M	B	WASC	4	3	2	2	2	-	-	13	465	21	G.S.S. Kazaure	M. Abdullahi Solu
11.	G.S.S. Gwarzo	Govt.	1970	M	B	WASC	2	4	2	2	2	-	-	12	400	19	G.S.S. Gwarzo	A. Abdulkadir Yusuf
12.	G.S.S. Bagauda	Govt.	1970	M	B	WASC	3	2	2	2	2	-	-	11	386	13	P.O. Box 868, Kano.	Fagge A. Mohammed
13.	Govt.S.S. Gaya	Govt.	1970	M	B	WASC	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	10	352	15	P.M.B. 3135, Kano.	John U. Nwosu
14.	Govt.S.S. Lautai	Govt.	1970	M	B	WASC	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	10	338	15	P.O. Box 492, Kano.	C.J. Joseph
15.	P.O.Ahmadi.S.S.	A.M.M.	1970	M	D	WASC	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	5	135	9	P.O. Box 188, Kano.	Mr. R.A. Sagib
16.	G.S.S. D/Tofa	Govt.	1971	M	B	WASC	4	3	2	2	2	-	-	13	470	17	P.M.B. 3158, Kano.	M. Imamu Deen Bello
17.	Fed.Govt.Col.	Govt.	1872	M/F	B	WASC	5	5	5	4	4	2	2	27	752	39	Fed. Govt. Col., Kano.	Mr. Bullock
18.	Fed.G.Girls Col.	Govt.	1973	F	B	WASC	3	3	3	2	-	-	-	11	322	18	P.M. 3198, Kano.	
19.	G.S.S. Ringim	Govt.	1974	M	B	WASC	5	4	4	-	-	-	-	16	526	17	P.M.B. 3341, Kano.	Mannir Mustapha
20.	G.S.S. D/Kudu	Govt.	1976	M	B	WASC	4	6	-	-	-	-	-	10	370	16	P.M.B. 3326, Kano.	M. Ibrahim Wada
21.	G.S.S. Karaye	Govt.	1976	M	B	WASC	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	360	15	G.S.S. Karaye	M. Abdullahi Ibrahim
22.	GGSS(Tran.)D/K.	Govt.	1976	F	B	WASC	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	8	288	10	GGSS(Tran.) D/Kudu	K. Krishan
23.	GSS(Tran.)Kaza.	Govt.	1976	M	B	WASC	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	191	7	GSS.(Tran.) Kazaure	M. Yahaya Alabura
24.	GSS(Tran.)D/T.	Govt.	1976	M	B	WASC	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	144	5	P.M.B. 3158, Kano.	M. Ahmed M. Gumel
Grade II Teachers Training Colleges																	
1.	Sch.for A. Stud.	Govt.	1934	M	D	G.II	6	6	6	5	8			31	1020	35	P.M.B. 3018, Kano.	Alh. Datti Anmed
2.	Women T.C.Kano	Govt.	1947	F	B	G.II	4	3	3	3	3			16	546	30	P.M.B. 3029, Kano.	Mrs. M.T. Bello
3.	Teach.Col.Wudil	Govt.	1958	M	B	G.II	6	6	4	4	4			24	884	29	P.M.B. 3004, Kano.	M. Lawan Isiyaku
4.	Tech.Col.Bichi	Govt.	1960	M	B	G.II	6	6	4	4	4			24	844	28	P.M.B. 3016, Kano.	M. Yah. Bin Mahmud
5.	Kano Tech.Col.	Govt.	1960	M	D	G.II	4	3	2	2	6			17	624	26	P.M.B. 3110, Kano.	M. Aminu Yahaya
6.	Arabic Teac.Col.	Govt.	1964	M	D	G.II	6	3	2	2	2			15	568	17	P.M.B. 3128, Kano.	M. Adamu Aminu
7.	Teac.Col.Gumel	Govt.	1971	M	B	G.II	6	6	4	4	4			24	820	23	P.M.B. 3120, Kano.	M. Mohammed Gana
8.	T. C. Hadejia	Govt.	1973	M	B	G.II	4	4	4					12	427	20	T.T.C. Hadejia	Mr. S.S. Bali
9.	T.C. Sumaila	Govt.	1973	M	B	G.II	4	4	4					12	416	21	T.T.C. Sumaila	M. Alhassan Dawaki
10.	T.C. T/Wada	Govt.	1973	M	B	G.II	4	4	4					12	432	12	Min. of Educ. Kano	Aminu Z. Chiranci
11.	W.T.C. Gezawa	Govt.	1974	F	B	G.II	4	2	2					8	257	15	P.M.B. 3273, Kano.	Mrs. G.L. Y. Joe
12.	P.T.C. Waje	Govt.	1975	M/F	D	G.II	9							9	186	19	P.M.B. 3218, Kano.	Mr. S.S. Srivastava
13.	P.T.C. G/Dutse	Govt.	1974	M/F	D	G.II	6							6	194	14	P.M.B. 3303, Kano.	
14.	Gerki T. Col.	Govt.	1974	M/F	D	G.II	11	3						14	512	21	UPE/KEDU Kano.	J.S. Sherland
15.	U.P.E./TC-(SAS)	Govt.	1974	M/F	D	G.II	10	2						12	718	21	P.M.B. 3018, Kano.	Mr. S.A. Street
16.	M/Madori T.C.	Govt.	1975	M/F	D	G.II	14	5	5	4				28	1005	21	P.M.B. 3361, Kano.	Mr. R.D. Bakere
17.	U.P.E./TC-Stad.	Govt.	1975	M/F	D	UPE.C.	6	5	1					12	398	16	U.P.E./TC.(Stadium).	M. Mohd. Bello D.
18.	Dutse T.C.	Govt.	1975	M/F	D	UPE.C.	8	8						16	576	18	U.P.E./TC.(Shahuci)	M. Ado Abdullahi
19.	UPE./TC -(Gwale	Govt.	1975	M	D	UPE.C.	4	17						21	693	21	P.M.B. 3311, Kano.	Aminu Ibrahim
20.	UPE./TC -(KTC)	Govt.	1974	M/F	D	G.II	10	8						18	589	6	P.M.B. 3308, Kano.	M. Sule Mohd. Dan.
21.	UPE./TC-(KCCC)	Govt.	1976	M/F	D	U.P.E.	8							8	235	10	U.P.E./TC.(KCCC)	Mr. Wolter Henderson
22.	UPE./TC-(Warura	Govt.	1976	M/F	D	UPE.C	17							17	675	51	U.P.E./TC.(Warura)	M. Tijani Badamasi
Technical/Vocational Institutions																	
1.	Govt.Tech.I.S.		1952	M	B	C.&G.	8	8	8					24	315	37	P.M.B. 3064, Kano	Mr. D.S. Ibrahim
2.	Govt.Sec. T.Sch.	Govt.	1975	M	B	WASC	2	2	2	1	2	1		10	330	20	P.M.B. 3009, Kano	M. Idris Ahmed
3.	Tech. &Voc.T.C.	Govt.	1972	M	D		4	4						8	288	21	P.M.B. 3081, Kano.	M. Baba Goni
4.	Kano Com.C.Col.	Comm.	1967	M/F	D	WASC	4	4	4	4	4			20	760	29	P.M.B. 3117, Kano.	M. Abdulkadir Mohd.
5.	Bagauda V.Cen.	Govt.	1977	M	B		16							16	320	21	P.M.B. 3350, Kano.	Idris N. Bashir
Post Secondary Colleges																	
1.	Adv. Teac. Col.	Govt.	1961	M/F	D	NCE								1160	80		Adv. Teach. Col. Kano	Mr. Timothy Afolayan
2.	Kano S.Adv.T.C	Govt.	1976	M/F	D	NEC								360	22		Kano State Adv. T.Col	M. Abdulwahab
3.	Kano Teçh. Col.	Govt.	1976	M/F	D	Dip.& C.G.								80	19		P.M.B. 3348, Kano.	A.T. Abdullahi
4.	Col of Adv. St.	Govt.	1973	M/F	D	GCE.O/A.								346	22		P.M.B. 3145, Kano.	Alh. A. Imam Galadanc
5.	Sch.of Isl.Leg.St.	Govt.	1977	M	D	Dipl.	1							18	4		Min. of Education	Alhaji K. Alkali

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S. "Toward an Understanding of Inequity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (November, 1963), 422-36.

Alderfer, C. P. Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. New York: Free Press, 1972.

Anderson, L. "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement." Journal of Educational Research, 46, No. 5 (1953), 693-98.

Andrew, I. R. "Wage Inequity and Job Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology (January, 1967), 39-45.

Ashby, E. (Chairman). "The Report of the Commission on Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria." Investment in Education. Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Education, 1960.

Attuwaybi, O. B. "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Elementary and Junior High School Teachers in the Libya Arab Republic." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1975. Dissertation Abstract (1975), 3253A.

Behrman, E. H. "Teacher-Student Relations as a Predictor of Teachers Job Satisfaction." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976. Dissertation Abstract (1976), 4684A.

Benson, R., Charles, S., and Dunn, L. A. "Employment Practices and Working Conditions." Review of Educational Research, 37 (1967), 272-79.

Biobaku, S. O. (Chairman). "Opening Address." Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training: A Report. Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Education & University of Lagos, July 15-19, 1969.

Blum, M. L. Industrial Psychology and Its Social Foundations. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

Call, R. "Faculty and Morale." Journal of Higher Education, 28 (May, 1969), 269.

Campbell, J. P. et al. Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970. P. 354.

Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan, 33 (November, 1951), 127-32.

Clarke, R. L. "Sources of Teachers Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Senior High School Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts (1976), 4670A.

Cole, D. W. "An Analysis of Job Satisfaction Among the Elementary, Middle and Senior High School Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1977. Dissertation Abstracts (1977), 24211A.

Cooley, W. W., and Lohnes, P. R. Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971. Pp. 243-44.

Cooper, J. F. "Job Satisfaction of Mississippi Hunds Junior College Teachers as Related to Teaching Effectiveness." Ph.D. dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1974. Dissertation Abstract (1974), 4604-05A.

Cramer, E. M. and Bock, R. D. "Multivariate Analysis." Review of Educational Research, 36, no. 5 (December, 1966), 607.

Dun, J. D. and Stephen, E. C. Management of Personnel. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1972. P. 19.

Evans, M. G. "Conceptual and Operational Problems in the Measurement of Various Aspects of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 53 (1969), 93-101.

Fafunwa, A. B. "The Overall Aims and Objectives of Teacher Education in Nigeria." Proceedings of the Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training. University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 15-19, 1969.

Federal Republic of Nigeria. Third National Development Plan, 1975-80. Lagos, Nigeria, 1975. P. 244.

Finlay, W. W., Sortain, A. Q., and Tate, W. M. Human Behavior in Industry. New York: McGraw Hill Inc., 1954. Pp. 229-30.

Frankel, J. Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearing House for Junior College, 1973. P. 1.

Goodman, P. S. and Freedman, A. "An Examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity." Administrative Science Quarterly (December, 1971), 1.

Graen, G. B. and Hulin, C. L. "Addendum to an Empirical Investigation of Two Implications of the Two-factor Theory of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 52 (1968), 341-42.

Griffiths, D. E. "Toward a Theory of Administrative Behavior." In R. F. Campbell and R. T. Gregg, eds., Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1957. P. 357.

Hanson, J. W., Project Director. Secondary Level Teachers: Supply and Demand in Nigeria. East Lansing, Mich.: Institute of International Studies in Education and African Affairs Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1973. P. 104.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The Motivation to Work. 2d ed. New York: Wiley, 1959. P. 111.

Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper & Row, 1935. Pp. 25-40.

House, R. J. and Wigdor, L. A. "Herzberg's Dual-factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism." In Readings in Organizations Behavior and Human Performance. Edited by L. L. Cummings and W. E. Scott. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1969.

Huck, S. W. et al. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. P. 174.

Imphong, R. M. "An Investigation of the Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Beginning and Experienced Industrial Art Teachers in the State of Maryland." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1974. P. 17.

Ivancevich, J. M., Szilagyi, Jr., A. D. and Wallace, Jr., M. J. Organizational Behavior and Performance. California: Goodyear Publishers, 1977. Pp. 103-4.

Kano State. Kano State Handbook. Kano, Nigeria: Ministry of Home Affairs and Information Publications, 1976.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. The Social Psychology of Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966. Pp. 40-42.

Keffer, W. M. "Job Satisfaction of Field Staff of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1976. Dissertation Abstract (1976), 4781A.

Knezevich, S. J. Administration of Public Education. 2d ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.

Korman, A. K. Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971. P. 302.

Lawler, E. E. "Satisfaction and Behavior." In Hackman, Lawler and Porter. Perspective on Behavior in Organization. McGraw Hill Inc., 1977. Pp. 39-40.

_____. "A Causal Correlation Test of the Need Hierarchy Concept." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance (1973), 483.

_____. "Expectancy Theory and Job Behavior." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance (1973), 483.

Likert, R. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1961.

Locke, E. A. "What is Job Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 4 (1969), 316.

_____. "The Nature and Cause of Job Satisfaction." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Edited by M. D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976. P. 1309.

Majasan, J. A. "The Qualifications, Recruitment and Training of Staff for Teacher Education in Nigeria." Proceedings of the Conference on Higher Level Teacher Training. University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 15-19, 1969.

McConnell, J. MCTEST: A Test and Questionnaire Analysis Program. Evanston, Ill.: Vogelback Computing Center, Northwestern University, 1976.

Ministry of Education, Kano. Education Statistics for Kano State, (1976-1977). Kano, Nigeria: Government Printers, 1976.

Mitchell, T. R. "Expectancy Models of Job Satisfaction, Occupational Preference and Effort: A Theoretical Methodological, and Empirical Appraisal." Psychological Bulletin (1974), 1053-77.

Moxley, L. S. "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching Higher Education: An Examination of Herzberg's Two-factor Theory and Porter's Need Satisfaction Research." Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Reports, 1977.

Mumford, E. Job Satisfaction. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972. P. 5.

Murname, R. J. and Phillips, B. R. "The School as a Work Place: What Matters to Teachers." Mathematical Policy Research. Seattle, Wash., Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University, 1977.

Napier, T. G. "Teacher Morale." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1966. Dissertation Abstracts, 27 (1966), 1228A.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Science. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Education. Statistics of Education in Nigeria. Lagos, Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Information Printing Division, 1971. Pp. 3-4.

Nigerian Union of Teachers. "The Civic Rights of Teachers and Educational Administration with the New Local Government Councils." Daily Times Publications, Nigeria (May 7, 1977), p. 28.

Porter, L. W. Organizational Pattern of Managerial Job Attitudes. New York: American Foundation for Management Research, 1964.

Rada, Alex. "A Study of Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Community College Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pacific, 1975. Dissertation Abstracts (1975), 2670A.

Redefer, F. L. "What Some 5,000 Teachers Say About Factors that Affect Teacher Morale." Nation School, 63, (1959), 59-62.

Redefer, F. L. "The School Board and Teacher Morale." American School Board Journal, No. 145 (July, 1962), 6.

Savage, R. M. "A Study of Teacher Satisfaction and Attitudes: Causes and Effects." Ph.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts (1967).

Schneider, C. P. and Alderfer, C. P. "Three Studies of Measures of Need Satisfaction in Organization." Administrative Science Quarterly (December, 1973), 489-505.

Schmidt, F. "Implication of Measurement Problem for Expectancy Theory Research." Organizational and Human Performance (1973), 243-51.

Schmidt, G. L. "Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators." Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, no. 2 (Spring 1976), 68-86.

Sergiovanni, T. J. "Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1965. Dissertation Abstracts (1965).

_____. "Factors which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (1967), 66-82.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Carver, F. D. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1973. Pp. 69-70.

Sheldon, R. C. "Some Observations on Theory in Social Science." In Toward A General Theory of Action. Edited by T. Parson and E. A. Shils. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. 37-38.

Smith, B. O., et al. "Science for Education." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by W. S. Monroe. New York: McMillan Co., 1969. P. 12.

Strickland, B. F. "A Study of Factors Affecting Teacher Morale in Selected Administrative Units of North Carolina." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1963. Dissertation Abstracts (1963), 4598-9A.

Tesar, C. J. "Job Satisfaction Among Selected Community College Faculty." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1974. Dissertation Abstracts (1974), 4953A.

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

Wernimont, P. F. "A System View of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, no. 2 (1972), 173-76.

_____. "Comparison of Sources of Personal Satisfaction and of Work Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 54 (1970), 95-102.

Whitsett, D. A. and Winslow, E. K. "An Analysis of Studies Critical of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory." Personnel Psychology (1967), 391-416.

Wickstrom, R. A. "An Investigation into Job Satisfaction Among Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts (1971).

Wofford, J. C. "The Motivation Bases of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance." Personnel Psychology, 24 (1971), 501-18.

Wolf, M. G. "Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Reformulation of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, no. 3 (1970), 87-94.

Yeager, W. A. Administration of Non-Instructional Personnel and Services. New York: Harper & Row, 1959. P. 99.

VITA

Name: SAMSON ADEBAYO OLADEBO

Place of Birth: IGBETI, OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Date of Birth: NOVEMBER 24, 1933

EDUCATION:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
Ph.D., Education (Educational Administration)
September, 1978

Cognate (Minor): Management

Graduate Certificate in African Studies,
June, 1978

WESTERN MIGHIGAN UNIVERSITY, KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
M.A. (Teaching of Business Education)
August, 1973

B. Sc. (Business Education)
December, 1972

Minor: General Business

OLUNLOYO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, IBADAN, NIGERIA
Nigeria Certificate in Education (NCE)--Business Education, December, 1966.

Major: Accounting and Secretarial Studies
Minor: Guidance & Counseling

TECHNICAL COLLEGE, IBADAN, NIGERIA
Diploma in Commerce (Business Education)
December, 1965

GOVERNMENT TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE, ILORIN, NIGERIA
Teachers' Grade Two Certificate
December, 1958

GRADE THREE TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE, IGBETI, NIGERIA
Teachers' Grade Three Certificate
December, 1953

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Teaching/Headmaster:	Primary Schools, Nigeria 1954-1956; 1959-1963
Teaching:	Government College, Kaduna, Nigeria, 1967-August, 1971
Lecturer:	Ahmadu Bello University, Institute of Education (Advanced Teachers College, Kano, Nigeria, 1974-Date

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS: (Unpublished Manuscripts)

"An Investigation of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Secondary Institution Teachers in Kano State, Nigeria." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, September, 1978.

"Toward Greater Integration of Employment in Nigeria's Economic Development: An Essay." Unpublished manuscript, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, Winter, 1978.

"The Problems of Financing Education and the Developing Country: The Case of Nigeria." Unpublished manuscript, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, Winter, 1978.

"Leadership Behavior Among School Principals Compared with that of Bank Managers in Oyo State of Nigeria." Unpublished research proposal, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, March, 1977.

"Legal Aspects of Education in Nigeria with Reference to Teachers' Employment, Tenure and Dismissal: A Comparison with United States with Reference to Illinois." Unpublished manuscript, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, March, 1977.

"Integration of Consumer Education in the Business Education Program in Nigerian Secondary Schools." Unpublished research paper, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, Winter, 1973.

"The Impact of Western Education in the Development of Education in Nigeria." Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, December, 1972.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP:

Delta Pi Epsilon (DPE): Beta Rho Chapter, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Phi Delta Kappan (PDK): Northwestern University Chapter, Evanston, Illinois.

Nigerian Business Teachers Association (Member).

Associate Member, Nigerian Institute of Management (ANIM).

AWARDS:

Federal Government of Nigeria Scholarship (for Ph.D.) 1976/77-1977/78.

Gwendolen M. Carter Awards--Northwestern University First Year African Graduate Student for Academic Excellence; December, 1977.