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"I would like to know that whenever I or some other colleague of mine says something about a child or about education that we will be heard. Too often this is not the case. The higher-ups on the board of education or in the superintendent's offices or in positions of government too often have an agenda which has little relevance to the situation that exists. Teachers do their best to ignore this interference and teach the way they know how. We see the children every day. We are the experts. We should be listened to. I would like to know that when a child is told something by us that we will be supported at home. I would like to know that when a parent is advised about a certain problem that these parents listen and support us. We know what we are talking about and have their child's best interests in mind."

--From a teacher responding to the survey
PREFACE

Any attempt at reform within the educational system must take account of the problems of its most crucial actor—the classroom teacher. Reformers must closely examine the needs, values, and levels of job satisfaction of teachers in order to respond to those within the framework of making changes. If teachers do not perceive that they are directly benefitting from these changes in their workplace, they will certainly hesitate to implement reforms being required of them. Without the full and unhesitating cooperation of teachers during the process, attempts at change will surely fail.

This thesis undertakes a first-hand look at teachers and what their needs, values, and levels of job satisfaction are, and asks them what they are most frustrated by within the education system, and what they would most like to change. The survey designed to obtain these responses is juxtaposed against the reform ideas that have been suggested in this decade during the virtual onslaught of reports on education.

All of the reports emphasize the importance of the teacher—as the actor most in need of reform, and as the actor most capable of implementing changes. However, on the whole the reports tend to ignore the realities of the situation within the classrooms. Yet the teachers
themselves are well aware of the problems, and have many ideas for improvements. This thesis aims to discover what teachers really want from their jobs and from the education system, and to examine reform ideas that might work within this framework.
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CHAPTER 1

AN ERA OF REFORM
Our Nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world.... We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.1

Thus begins this decade’s first report on education, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform."

This report began a virtual tidal wave of reports in the past five years chronicling the decline of the American educational system, and suggesting many avenues to improvement. Why the sudden reemergence of education as an issue of national importance, especially five years after the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education, and a scant three years after the election of Ronald Reagan, a man whose platform on education spoke most vociferously about the abolishment of the newest Department?

The cry for more Federal control and nationalization of standards in curriculum, funding, and teacher certification is extremely recent. The growth of

technology in transportation and communications, coupled with increased mobility among recent generations, has only recently made it possible to even conceive of an expanded Federal role in education. Additionally, only recently have true comparisons been available that show the discrepancy in salaries, per pupil expenditures, and achievement test scores among the 50 states. The concept of education as a national responsibility has emerged as the focus of the ongoing debate; the Reagan Administration represents the traditional opinion of local control with governmental intervention only in the form of minimal financing, and the reports argue that it is time for, at the very least, increased Federal funding to implement direly needed reforms.

"A Nation at Risk" appeared in April, 1983, and was soon followed by a deluge of reports suggesting similar reforms. "A Nation at Risk" contained recommendations regarding four areas in education. The first recommendation scrutinizes the content of educational curricula. The National Commission on Excellence in Education recommends that "State and local high school graduation requirements be strengthened and that, at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the Five New Basics," including courses in English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science. Coursework in a foreign language is
strongly recommended for those students continuing on to higher education. The second area is "Standards and Expectations." Here the Commission suggests that "schools, colleges, and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations, for academic performance and student conduct, and that 4-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission." The third recommendation is simple in concept, but considerably more difficult to implement. The Commission suggests that "significantly more time be devoted to learning the New Basics. This will require more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year." The fourth and final area of recommendation by the Commission regards teaching. "Each [specific recommendation] is intended to improve the preparation of teachers or to make teaching a more rewarding and respected profession."\(^2\)

Three decades earlier education had first assumed a position as an issue of national importance. When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, an uproar ensued in America. Obviously it was the fault of the educational system that we were unable to duplicate this feat, or indeed, to accomplish it first. Education became a national focus for the first real time. The community as

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 24-31.
a whole perceived that new methods of education were necessary to bring America back on par with the rest of the world. The time was again ripe for the philosophies of Progressivism, open classrooms, and new math. The 1960's and 1970's represented the widespread implementation of Progressive philosophies on education. The rising educators of the 1960's and 1970's tried to implement these ideas in the classrooms.

With the onset of the late 1970's and early 1980's, these philosophical trends were seen as too open, and too accommodating. Suddenly, the realization struck that this method of education was not working. Achievement test scores, traditionally the measurement of academic achievement, were lower than ever before, dropout figures were on the rise, illiteracy had dramatically increased, and the blame was placed on the permissiveness of the educational system. Whereas the 1960's had introduced education as something which should be financially supported at the Federal level through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the 1980's ushered in the concept that the content of education should become a national concern. As President Reagan stated in his State of the Union address January 25, 1988,

We all know the sorry story of the 60's and 70's--soaring spending, plummeting test scores--and that hopeful trend of the 80's, when we replaced an obsession with dollars with a commitment to quality, and test scores starting going [sic] back up. There
is a lesson here that we should all write up on the blackboard a hundred times—in a child's education, money can never take the place of basics like discipline, hard work, and, yes, homework.  

This "Back to Basics" approach is the overriding concern in the current decade's wave of reports on reform in education. The major difference among the reports emanates from the concept of the Federal role in education. Reagan and his Administration believe wholeheartedly that "the most important thing we can do is to reaffirm that control of our schools belongs to the states, local communities and, most of all, to the parents and teachers." Conversely, many of the reports from this decade call for a renewed Federal commitment to education, including such ideas as a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, a nationalized curriculum to insure interstate equality of education, and increased funding to poorer States from the Federal government.

Nonetheless, it is universally acknowledged that a strong tradition of local control of the schools exists. This tradition began when this country began to expand its frontiers. With a country this vast, the diversity of

---


4 Ibid.

immigrants, and the poor and untimely communication systems that existed 250 years ago, it was only natural that each community would devise its own educational system. Moreover, as pioneers began farming in the wilderness, schools could only be in session when planting and harvesting were finished, and students could only attend until they were old enough to farm on their own or to be married off.

The first wave of reports, from 1983 to 1985, dealt primarily with general precepts about American education, and the need for general reform. These reports address the economic aspects of quality education and the need for greater accountability and leadership within the school systems. The second wave of reform reports, beginning in 1986 and continuing into the present, focuses on the teaching profession. The reason for this change in focus is clear. As The Holmes Group states, "Until this is addressed, we will continue to attempt educational reform by telling teachers what to do, rather than empowering them to do what is necessary."\(^6\)

Over the next few years, regardless of the various ideas and suggestions about what areas need reform and how to accomplish it, the deluge of reports all mention the teaching profession. By 1986, virtually all of the

---

reports coming forth from such major research groups as The Holmes Group, Inc. (a group composed mainly of Deans of Education at various institutions of higher education), the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the Education Commission of the States, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis focus on the need to improve the quality of the teaching profession. Basically, these improvements focus on three aspects of teaching: restructuring the career and establishing rigorous professional standards, redesigning the school to be more productive, and recruiting capable men and women to the profession.

The U.S. Department of Education is reaffirming Reagan's ideals about maintaining string local and state control of the schools, and keeping the federal government out as much as possible. Hence, the Department of Education is taking the most distant approach to government intervention in reforms. Its 1986 report entitled What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning supports the proposition that the American people will be the ones to improve education, not the federal government. This report is directed at a mass audience, anyone with a child in school or about to enter. As U.S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett states in the preface, "Armed with good information, the American people can be trusted
to fix their own schools.\textsuperscript{7} The National Governors' Association report simply states that teachers need a professional work environment, "reasonable" salaries, and "a real voice in decision."\textsuperscript{8} The Education Commission of the States goes slightly further in its publication \textit{What Next? More Leverage for Teachers}. This publication is a collection of interviews with renowned education experts. Although they all have slightly different views on what reforms are necessary and how to accomplish them, they all do agree on several major points.

First, all agree that "Redefining the teaching profession includes restructuring how teachers learn to be teachers, improving working conditions and making teaching more like a profession."\textsuperscript{9} Second, there is unanimous accord that "Other things, such as giving teachers control over time and materials, are more important than money in reforming education."\textsuperscript{10} \textit{A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century}, published by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, again specifically addresses the concerns within the teaching profession. This report


\textsuperscript{8} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 17-18.

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 15-16.

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Ibid.}
mandates sweeping reforms including providing teacher education and certification only at the level of a Master's degree, creating a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, creating several levels of teachers including the introduction of "lead teachers" who would monitor their colleagues and help first-year teachers, increasing the percentage of minority teachers, and making the teaching profession as a whole competitive with other professions requiring similar amounts of training and preparation.\textsuperscript{11} The Holmes Group's report, \textit{Tomorrow's Teachers}, also suggests widespread reform of the profession, along similar lines with the Carnegie Forum. Their five goals are 1) to make the education of teachers intellectually more solid, 2) to recognize differences in knowledge, skill and commitment among teachers, 3) to create relevant and defensible standards of entry into the profession of teaching, 4) to connect schools of education with schools, and 5) to make schools better places for practicing teachers to work and learn.\textsuperscript{12}

A focus on teachers is crucial for another reason examined in the Carnegie Forum report. "After years of teacher surplus, in 1985 jobs and job seekers were roughly in balance. For at least the next 10 years, however,

\textsuperscript{11} Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, pp. 35-41.

\textsuperscript{12} The Holmes Group, p.4.
there will be more jobs than applicants.... There is another reason for increasing demand for teachers. The children of the children of the 'baby boom' are now entering school."\(^\text{13}\)

But the most important reason to focus on teachers to implement needed educational reform is their control over the classroom. In the words of Theodore Sizer,

The visitor to schools repeatedly looks for signs of good quality and patterns that promise success. Inescapably they point to the teachers....An imaginative, appropriate curriculum placed in an attractive setting can be unwittingly smothered by journeyman instructors. It will be eviscerated by incompetents. On the other hand, good teachers can inspire powerful learning in adolescents, even under the most difficult circumstances....Improving American...education absolutely depends on improving the conditions of work and the respect for teachers. No new technology, training scheme, licensure revision, or new curriculum will suffice.\(^\text{14}\)

When a teacher walks into his or her classroom and closes that door, the curriculum, the lesson plans, the textbook, and the administration have no control over what takes place. For reform to occur, teachers must be motivated to implement changes, and, more importantly, must believe in those changes they are being asked to put into place.


CHAPTER 2

THE TEACHER AS FOCUS
Those who value public education should be worried about the discouragement and stunted growth of teachers. Teacher growth is closely related to pupil growth. Probably nothing within a school has more impact upon students in terms of skills development, self-confidence, or classroom behavior than the personal and professional growth of their teachers. When teachers examine, question, reflect on their ideals, students are alive. When teachers stop growing, so do their students.¹

According to the national reports and the works of education experts, however, it appears that teachers are not accomplishing much growth either personally or professionally. The experts argue that teachers are overwhelmingly burdened with tasks that only frustrate their attempts to grow, and that they need and want more autonomy and responsibility. The reports call for improved teacher education and improved working conditions for teachers. They point to the problems in all three aspects of teaching: recruitment of capable students to teaching as a career, professionalism in the schools, and retention of capable teachers. The reports are supported by the views of people long involved with education. Says Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, "We will not get the good teachers we need unless teachers are treated very differently than they are

today."2 Susan Moore-Johnson from Harvard University agrees. "Unless schools become places where teachers can teach, those who can leave, will."3

The experts, as well as the various commissions who issued the national reports, clearly believe that the great majority of teachers are dedicated and competent, but too often find themselves frustrated by events beyond their control. Nonetheless, the feelings, the needs, and the concerns of teachers themselves must be taken into account before any real change will take place. "It is hardly likely that teachers will have the motivation, or even the energy, to respond to demands for updating their knowledge and skills unless their own needs are clearly addressed."4 Linda Darling-Hammond sums up much of the frustration of the teaching profession when she writes.

Ironically, what makes many teachers leave the classroom is the sense that teaching work is not important in school. In a variety of ways teachers receive signals that filling out forms, meeting schedules, policing hallways, and enforcing rules are more essential to school life than is teaching. When preparation time is chewed up with nonteaching duties, when staff meetings are limited to conveying

---


administrative directives, when classes are interrupted by announcements and record-keeping tasks, when innovative teaching ideas take a back seat to attendance and test reports, teachers find their work devalued and their effectiveness diminished.  

Thus, teachers' attempts to grow and to initiate change within their schools are met by an increase in frustration and time commitment involved with requirements other than teaching itself.

Hence, it seems clear that any serious attempts at reform must begin with conclusions about teachers' needs and frustrations that are leading to dissatisfaction within the workplace. Any important endeavors to reform the education system must obtain the complete cooperation of the classroom teachers, or fail miserably.

The frustrations inherent within the teaching profession have been noted by experts in fields other than education. In a comparison of teaching and other professions requiring similar training and effort, Dan Lortie, a sociologist, has a different perspective on teachers, resulting in very similar conclusions. He finds that

[T]he reward system in classroom teaching puts a premium on psychic rewards [rather than extrinsic rewards, such as salary and prestige level, or ancillary rewards, such as the long summer break, which may be perceived as rewards by some people]; achievement and the gratification which attends it are consistent with the traditions of the occupation and, unlike other kinds of benefits, are neither fixed nor

---

automatic...[T]eachers' psychic earnings are not abundant; they take solace in less-than-ideal outcomes, and their daily routine requires them to cope with intangible goals and fragile relationships. Their quest for psychic rewards is taxing—benefits flow erratically. Teachers experience periods of genuine distress, and the occupation provides little regular reassurance to allay such feelings.\(^6\)

Thus, extrinsic rewards such as salary, prestige level, or status are often forced sacrifices by teachers since, on the whole, they gain the most satisfaction from the psychic rewards. "[I]t is the satisfaction that teachers experience in their daily work that, more than anything else, defines their professionalism."\(^7\) However, when most of the opportunities for teachers to reap psychic rewards are replaced by excessive nonteaching requirements, the motivation of teachers to continue their work in the classroom must diminish accordingly.

Lortie also discusses in greater detail the motivations of teachers. He states that teachers experience "tension between autonomy and dependency. The wish to control the workplace is combined with the wish for support from influential others..."\(^8\) These conflicting desires—the wish for complete control and the perceived need for


\(^7\) Roland Barth, "The Principal and the Profession of Teaching," \textit{The Elementary School Journal}, Volume 86, Number 4, March 1986, p.472.

\(^8\) Lortie, p. 191.
outside support—may also be viewed from the perspective of the discipline of psychology.

Motivation Theory

The theories of psychological motivation to be discussed here were first devised by David McClelland around 1950, at Wesleyan University. McClelland developed a way to measure the achievement, affiliation, and power motives in individuals through the completion of a Thematic Apperception Test—a series of pictures about which subjects create stories that are scored for the presence or absence of the motives. David Winter, after extensive work with McClelland, devised a way to score running text for the same motive imagery, thus enabling researchers to score historical works, and even to score films or video tapes. The need for Achievement (n Ach) is typically described as the need for status or level of prestige. The need for Affiliation (n Aff) is described as the need for intimacy or support from others. The need for Power (n Pow) is typically described as the need for responsibility, control over others, and leadership roles.

Motivation theory can be used to make arguments about and assessments of groups of people as well as to generate individual scores as individual motive profiles. Thus, the limited literature on the motive profile of the typical teacher may be examined. Winter conducted a study
with students from Wesleyan University in which he compared their scores on the Power motive with their designated career choice. Students high in \( n \) Power reported that they were seeking occupations in teaching, and their choice was significantly different from the overall mean that would have resulted from a random relationship to \( n \) Power \((p < .01)\).\(^9\) Winter explains that teachers have power and influence, although the ideology of the teaching profession usually stresses that this influence should be tempered with concerns for affiliation and for the autonomy of the student, so that the result of the teaching process is an independent student who educates himself in those things he wishes to know."\(^10\)

Moreover, "In teaching...a person has considerable scope to define his role, select his actions, and advise, help, control, and evaluate the behavior of his clients or subordinates. Such characteristics seem to explain why high \( n \) Power people are drawn to such positions."\(^11\) Furthermore, Winter concludes that \( n \) Power is associated with movements that "emphasize norms but do not attempt to change values," and that this is in concurrence with the high \( n \) Power occupations, especially the teaching profession.\(^12\) As the "ideology of the teaching profession

---


10 Ibid., p. 110.

11 Ibid., p. 111.

12 Ibid., p. 211.
usually stresses that this influence should be tempered with concerns for affiliation," it may also be expected that teachers in the aggregate will exhibit a moderate to high \( n \) Affiliation.\(^{13}\) Since Richard Boyatzis reports that "Persons with moderate amounts of affiliation motivation are more effective managers and helpers than those persons with high or low affiliative needs,"\(^{14}\) and teaching is generally considered a "helping profession," it would be anticipated that teachers on the whole will exhibit moderate \( n \) Affiliation.

Since the majority of teachers are women--68 per cent overall, and over 85 per cent in the elementary schools\(^{15}\)--it would also be helpful to assess any gender differences in motive scores. McClelland concluded that "The male high in \( n \) Power has an emotionally assertive approach to life, whereas the female high in \( n \) Power focuses on building up the self which may be the object of that assertiveness. He finds strength in action, she in being

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 110.


a strong resource."16 Clearly, one of the most important functions for a teacher is to be a strong resource for his or her students.

Regarding the need for Achievement, gender differences certainly exist since "studies of achievement motivation in female subjects have shown neither consistency with the findings for men nor internal consistency with each other."17 Lesser reviews several studies which support the conclusion that "the achievement responses of college women increased under experimental arousal conditions when arousal was created by reference to social acceptance, but not under the usual experimental conditions referring to intelligence and leadership ability."18 Hence, $nAch$ for women is more coherently described as social acceptance than the traditional definitions for $nAch$, although Lesser states that these results could be attributed to socialization differences, rather than actual motive differences in men and women. Nonetheless, if women respond to achievement as social acceptance, and most


18 Ibid., p. 213.
teachers are women, teachers might be expected to exhibit high \( n_{Ach} \) in relation to their perception of their position within the school system in which they are currently teaching.

Exline reported in a 1960 study that "women have higher affiliative motivation than do men."\(^{19}\) Stewart and Chester, by contrast, found that "those sex differences in behavioral correlates that have been found appear to be more a function of differing peer group norms than of gender differences."\(^{20}\) Here again, the socialization factor may account for many of these supposed gender differences.

Several studies indicate that "a significant relationship does exist between job satisfaction and needs fulfillment."\(^{21}\) It seems self-evident that if teachers' needs and expectations for their occupation are not fulfilled, they will be comparatively dissatisfied with their work.


\(^{21}\) Kreis and Milstein, p. 76.
Human values and value systems have also been found to be representative of needs. In 1971 Rokeach and Berman found that "values and needs were indeed significantly related to one another..." 22 Although they suggest that the relationship between needs and values is a complex one, Rokeach and Berman maintain that the value measures they developed could indeed be taken as measures of needs, even though the strongest correlations between motives and values often occurred in surprising manifestations. Rokeach found that:

Need for achievement was most positively correlated with (higher rankings of) the instrumental values independent \( (r = .35) \) and intellectual \( (r = .25) \) and the most negatively correlated with the instrumental values honest \( (r = -.35) \) and obedient \( (r = -.25) \).... The values that showed the largest positive correlation with n Affiliation were true friendship \( (r = .32) \) and a world at peace \( (r = .23) \), and the value showing the largest negative correlation with n Affiliation was mature love \( (r = -.24) \). As for n Power, freedom was found to be the value that was the most positively associated with it \( (r = .25) \) and obedient was the one that was the most negatively associated with it \( (r = -.30) \). 23

McClelland makes an important distinction between values, or "conscious intentions", and "out of awareness" motives. In his words,

People carry around with them cognitive schemas which organize their feelings, attitudes, and choices in a particular area such as affiliation or achievement. When people are asked whether they like doing

23 Ibid., pp. 48-49.
something 'with friends', the question taps a value associated with liking for people which determines how they answer the question.... On the other hand, the frequency with which people converse with someone else is determined primarily by the pleasure they more or less unconsciously get from such interactions, as reflected in the strength of the affiliative motive, and by the perceived probability of success, given a high level of affiliation. 24

It is important to keep this distinction in mind as the statistical relationships of teachers' responses are examined in depth, yet each of these components of personality is crucial to understanding the overall motivation of teachers.

Any attempt at reform within the educational system must take account of the problems of its most crucial actor—the classroom teacher. Reformers must closely examine the needs, values, and levels of job satisfaction of teachers in order to respond to those within the framework of making changes. If teachers do not perceive that they are directly benefitting from these changes in their workplace, they will certainly hesitate to implement the reforms being required of them. Without the full and unhesitating cooperation of teachers during the process, attempts at change will surely fail.

---

CHAPTER 3

A PRELIMINARY STUDY
As the research discussed above indicates, a direct study of what motivates teachers in inherent to the reform process. Such a study was undertaken on a small scale by this researcher using surveys taken directly from the psychological work on teachers. The results of the study will be examined and compared to other results from literature in the field of education. The statistical analyses which follow will serve to confirm what the education and psychology experts have been saying about teachers' satisfactions, frustrations, motives, and values.

A survey was devised from the works of McClelland and Winter on motives, Rokeach on values, and Veroff on job satisfaction (see Appendix A) in order to determine precisely what motivates teachers to teach, to remain in the classroom, and to perform to the best of their abilities. By examining their values, motives, and satisfactions and dissatisfactions with their work, I will determine what education reforms will address the concerns of current teachers and hope to increase their professionalism and satisfaction within their chosen occupation.

The first part of the survey consists of Rokeach's values survey. There are 18 terminal values and 18

instrumental values that are ranked 1 to 18, in order of importance to the subject, as guiding principles in his or her life. Terminal values are defined as "desirable end-states of existence" and instrumental values are defined as "desirable modes of conduct." These are then ranked by the means to determine a "typical teachers' ranking."

The next portion of the survey is a series of open-ended and closed-ended questions relating to work and job satisfaction taken directly from Veroff's study, The Inner American. The open-ended questions will be used to assist in scoring motive profiles, as well as providing comments for discussion. The closed-ended questions will be coded and correlations run to determine possible relationships with motive scores, values, and elements of job satisfaction.

The final section of the survey consists of four open-ended questions designed to encourage the subject to write running text that may be scored to determine a motive profile for each individual and for participating teachers as an aggregate. Coding for the motives was done by an expert coder whose agreement is above the .85 reliability

\[2 \text{ Ibid., p. 7.}\]

level, using all responses to open-ended questions that contained enough information to be coded.

Subjects

110 surveys were distributed to all of the elementary school teachers in four of the Middletown, Connecticut elementary schools. Ten completed surveys were returned, and were scored for motives, values, and job satisfaction.

This study is designed to be a pilot study in order to begin developing a theoretical model for understanding what teachers find satisfying and frustrating about their jobs and why. Although the sample size is small, the data are informative as a first step in understanding the psychodynamics of teaching. It is crucial to the education reform movement that the ideas and ideals of teachers currently teaching in schools be taken into consideration before reforms are put into place. Thus, further studies are required, and this study represents an initial effort to begin to acknowledge the problems teachers themselves face and would like resolved.

Procedure

The office of the Superintendent of the Middletown schools was contacted regarding the distribution of the surveys. After the office made the initial contact with
the principals of four elementary schools, a date was established for distribution of the surveys. The average completion time was 45 minutes, and subjects were given anywhere from three to ten days to complete the surveys and return them to the offices in each elementary school. Reminders were sent out by the principals midway through the time allotted for completion.

The surveys were collected and coded. For ease of manipulation, a "perceptions" index was created from the closed-ended questions, numbers 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 20. These questions measure how teachers perceive their ability and opportunity on the job in relation to what they may perceive as their requirements from the job. Coding for the closed-ended questions was done by the researcher, by assigning numerical answers to the responses provided. The open-ended questions taken from Veroff's survey, question numbers four, five, ten, 11, 18, and 19, were coded by two coders with agreement above the .85 level according to Veroff's measures. These questions were coded for "intrinsic" or "extrinsic" factors affecting motivation.4

Winter's method for coding the motives was used. The three motives are scored as follows:

Achievement Imagery is scored for any indication of a standard of excellence. Affiliation-Intimacy Imagery

4 Ibid.
is scored for any indication of establishing, maintaining or restoring friendship or friendly relations among persons, groups, nations, and so forth. Mere connection, association, or even common activities are not enough; there must also be a warm, friendly quality about the relationship. Power Imagery is scored for indications of one person, group, institution, country, or other person-like entity having impact, control, or influence on another person, group, institution, country, or the world at large.5

Results

Mean ranks for each value were determined. The average "teachers' values ranking" is in Table 1. For the sample as a whole, each of these values was correlated with the teachers' ratings of job satisfaction, on a 100-point scale. The only significant correlations were both negative. Those teachers high in job satisfaction rated the terminal value "salvation" correspondingly low (r = -.74, p < .01), and the instrumental value "obedient" also low (r = -.60, p < .05). Thus, these two values had relatively little meaning in the lives of teachers who expressed job satisfaction.

The average job satisfaction rating was 74.9, out of 100. It may be assumed that this score translates into Veroff's measures of "satisfying" or "very satisfying". In 1976 Veroff had an average of 76% of his sample rank

5 David C. Winter, Manual for Scoring Motive Imagery in Running Text, Wesleyan University, 1987, pp. 6-13 [emphasis mine].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERMINAL</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. family security</td>
<td>1. honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. self-respect</td>
<td>2. responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. inner harmony</td>
<td>3. broadminded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. freedom</td>
<td>4. independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. true friendship</td>
<td>5. loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. happiness</td>
<td>6. capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. wisdom</td>
<td>7. intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. mature love</td>
<td>8. ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>9. forgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. equality</td>
<td>10. courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. a world at peace</td>
<td>11. helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. an exciting life</td>
<td>12. imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. national security</td>
<td>13. self-controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a comfortable life</td>
<td>14. logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a world of beauty</td>
<td>15. cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. pleasure</td>
<td>16. polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. social recognition</td>
<td>17. clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. salvation</td>
<td>18. obedient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their jobs in one of these two categories. Hence, teachers are, for the most part, satisfied with their jobs. Nonetheless, they did express dissatisfactions.

Veroff scored satisfaction and dissatisfactions as intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic satisfactions are "those gratifications or frustrations which are directly derived from the activities that the worker performs at work."\(^6\) Extrinsic refers to "something quite external to the person, a factor that does not directly implicate his or her ongoing work activity."\(^7\) The survey questions that were scored in this manner were questions four and five, those asking teachers to list their particular likes and dislikes about their work. These were then coded and correlated with job satisfaction, and with each other, listed as intrinsic satisfactions, extrinsic satisfactions, intrinsic dissatisfactions, and extrinsic dissatisfactions.

The correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic dissatisfactions was significant \(r = -.66, p < .05\), but the chi square test distinguishing among intrinsic dissatisfactions, extrinsic dissatisfactions, or both was not significant. Hence, teachers' dissatisfactions were evenly distributed among intrinsic or extrinsic factors.

---

\(^6\) Veroff, p. 272.

\(^7\) Ibid.
but not both very often. A chi square was run on the satisfactions to determine any significance of either intrinsic or extrinsic factors. The chi square was highly significant ($x^2 = 10.5, p < .01$), indicating that teachers' satisfactions are overwhelmingly intrinsic, confirmed by the insignificant correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic factors of satisfaction.

The measure of job satisfaction was also correlated with the responses to the questions numbered 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 20. These questions are designed to measure teachers' perceptions of their work. The responses were scored and added together to create a "perceptions" index. This index was then correlated with job satisfaction, and was found to be significant ($r = .59, p < .05$). Thus, teachers with higher job satisfaction felt that their jobs allowed them more control, to make decisions, to talk with colleagues, and to perform at or near their potential. These results fit nicely with the fact that teachers overwhelmingly derive satisfaction from intrinsic factors, such as those discussed above.

Motives were scored from subjects' responses to questions four, five, ten, and 24. Questions 21 through 24 were originally designed to elicit running text to be scored for motive imagery; unfortunately, teachers' responses to questions 21 through 23 were lists or short descriptions that did not contain enough information to be
successfully scored. Instead, the responses to questions four, five, and ten were substituted since these responses were more easily scored.

Achievement imagery was first correlated with the total "perceptions" index, and this was significant ($r = .63$, $p < .05$). Those teachers high in achievement also perceived themselves as having many advantages on the job. Confirming this response, teachers' achievement imagery in response to question 24, regarding changes they would make about their jobs, correlated significantly with the "perceptions" index ($r = .59$, $p < .05$). Achievement imagery was also significantly correlated in responses to two questions with subjects' perceptions of how often the job interfered with the demands of their families (question 12). Achievement imagery in question 24 also correlated significantly with question 12, as did the total achievement score for all four questions (for both, $r = .60$, $p < .05$).

Affiliation imagery only produced two significant correlations, both of them negative. The affiliative responses to question five, "What things don't you like about your job?", were highly negatively correlated with the responses to questions 13 and 14. Those teachers who scored high in affiliative imagery regarding their dislikes about their job felt they had little chance to make decisions ($r = -.89$, $p < .01$) and little control over
what happens on their job ($r = -.71$, $p < .01$). However, when expressing their likes regarding their jobs (question four), there was a strong positive correlation ($r = .60$, $p < .05$) with how much control they felt they had. Power imagery also produced significant correlations with several survey questions. The total motive scores for power were significantly negatively correlated with question 17, "I am given the chance to do the things I do best" ($r = -.65$, $p < .05$). Teachers high in Power felt that they were not given enough opportunities to work to their full potential. Power responses to question five, dislikes about teaching, were negatively correlated with several questions. The correlation between power responses to question five and the total "perceptions" index indicates that those teachers expressing strong power imagery in their dislikes about the job felt powerless on the job ($r = -.60$, $p < .05$). Moreover, these teachers also felt they did not have a chance to do their best (question 17) ($r = -.82$, $p < .01$), and, on the whole, felt they were less capable at their jobs (question 20) ($r = -.66$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

Clearly, those people high in Power find teaching to be a frustrating career. They feel they have little opportunity to work to their full capabilities. Somewhat
surprisingly, n Power did not correlate highly with the question "How much control do you have over what happens on your job?" (question 14). Perhaps teachers high in n Power do not feel powerless within the classroom, which is clearly their domain, but rather in the larger scheme of the education system. Significant correlations did not appear with regards to power imagery and job satisfaction. Possibly teachers with high n Power do not regard their jobs as inherently dissatisfying, but they do feel that they are lacking in opportunities to expand and grow within their occupation, and especially to exercise their influence and knowledge, or gain status, recognition, and prestige outside of the classroom.

Teachers high in n Affiliation seem to express the most dissatisfaction with items that might be considered to represent achievement (chances to make decisions) or power (control over what happens). Since overall satisfaction is relatively high, about 75%, teachers with affiliation imagery may be seen as needing to satisfy other components of their motive profiles. Teachers were only predicted to be moderate in n Affiliation, so no outstanding correlations would be expected here.

Achievement imagery responses indicate that teachers are again for the most part satisfied with their jobs. Their responses to question 24, regarding changes in their work, show that they are happy, and would like to make changes
to make their jobs even better. Nonetheless, these responses exhibited the most problems with family demands. Their specific demands for change address this issue, and will be further discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

THE PRIMARY ACTORS
Veroff stated that "Reporting lack of achievement at work seems to be the only factor consistently related to how much men and women would prefer another job. In summary, achievement concerns appear to be dominant in responses about job commitment and job satisfaction...."¹ According to my research, of the four teachers rated high in Achievement, three responded that if they did not have to work to make a living, they would not work anyway at their current jobs (question ten).

Moreover, Veroff reported that "women's job satisfaction in particular seems to be...strongly related to achievement issues.... On the other hand, men's satisfaction seems to be more highly related to affiliative issues."² The one male respondent in my study was scored for two instances of affiliative response, whereas five women were scored for one affiliative response and four for no affiliation imagery at all. This result also supports Winter's and Boyatzis' hypotheses that teachers would exhibit moderate affiliation motive imagery overall. Furthermore, the one male subject had a comparatively low achievement score, with only one scored image, whereas the female subjects averaged 1.4 scored images.

¹ Veroff, p. 278.
² Veroff, pp. 277-278.
Teachers were also predicted to be high in n Power. The total number of power images scored for all subjects was 17, compared to 12 for achievement motivation and seven for affiliation imagery. McClelland (1975) noted that, regardless of gender, "individuals high in n Power and low in affiliative needs...[as are the teachers in this sample] are more likely to be involved in organizations, ...to respect institutional authority, and to be concerned with discipline and self-respect than those not characterized by this motive pattern."\(^3\) In my sample's mean ranking of Rokeach's values, the terminal value of "self-respect" was ranked second. Moreover, McClelland's description certainly reflects much of the experience of teachers within the education system. 83% of teachers belong to one of the two major teachers' unions\(^4\), and the current format of the schools is such that teachers must respect the administration, and submit to the authority of principals, superintendents, and school boards.

The education literature provided interesting discussion regarding the results of this survey. Kreis found that

\[\text{in many educational settings teachers find it difficult to attain intrinsic satisfaction from working with and educating young people. Instead, they often are preoccupied with disciplinary activity,} \]

\(^3\) McClelland, cited in Stewart, p. 200.

with having to cope with complex and seemingly unsympathetic bureaucratic structures, and with being cut out of participation in these bureaucracies. In short, working conditions have changed dramatically and in ways that offer few opportunities for needs satisfaction. Given these conditions, it is not surprising that teachers turn outward to meet their needs.5

My study found that intrinsic satisfactions were highly significant. Furthermore, the satisfactions specifically mentioned by the teachers included: "contact with children", "satisfaction from watching children grow emotionally, socially, intellectually", "love working with young children", "grants...to have fun for myself and for the students", "inspiring them, helping them, listening to them", "helping to develop good self-images in children", and the like. In fact, nine out of ten teachers mentioned working with children as being one of the things—or the only thing in several cases—they particularly liked about the job. Teachers undoubtedly have all the frustrations Kreis mentioned, especially dealing with the bureaucracies and the lack of opportunity to participate; however teachers' satisfactions come mostly from the children and from assisting in the maturity process.

Several different studies invalidate Kreis' conclusions. Duttweiler cited a study by Morris (1978) in which it was found that "In 'more satisfying' schools, teachers were far more likely to perceive themselves as having a part in

5 Kreis, p. 76.
the decision-making process than were teachers in the 'less satisfying' schools." The response to my survey yielded a significant correlation between job satisfaction and the "perceptions index" which measured teachers' perceptions of their opportunities for participation in the workplace, indicating that those teachers who were more satisfied did indeed feel they had more control over their work and more opportunities for communicating their ideas.

Duttweiler discussed another study by Herzberg (1959) that was repeated and expanded by Sergiovanni (1967). They found that:

the factors that accounted for teacher satisfaction were related to aspects of their performance of the work itself, while those factors that accounted for dissatisfaction were related to the conditions of the work environment.... Teachers' motivations focused directly on conditions that could be considered intrinsic to the work itself or that are a form of feedback on the quality of teacher performance. These factors constitute rewards that come as a result of doing a good job.

My research also showed that teachers' intrinsic satisfactions were significantly more important than either extrinsic satisfactions or a combination of the two.

---


7 Ibid., pp. 371-372.
Teachers' dissatisfactions also are related more to the work conditions than to intrinsic factors such as feeling they are capable teachers or being able to help children. In recording their dislikes about their jobs, six subjects mentioned "tedious paperwork" and "inability to cut red tape when trying to help children". The other most common responses were "never enough time to teach a lesson", and lack of "support, appreciation, and respect...by those outside the school."

Five of the teachers responding to the survey indicated that if they did not have to work to make a living, they would not teach. These were the subjects who listed the most frustrations with an overabundance of "unnecessary" paperwork and meetings and lack of respect and help from administrators and the community. One teacher stated, "We need to deal with...paperwork in a less labor intensive way." Another said "After 3 degrees...I would like to feel that I am talented and educated enough to handle my job...."

Other teachers offered more indictments of the education system and the lack of respect given to teachers. "I would like to know that whenever I or some other colleague of mine says something about a child or about education that we will be heard." Moreover, one teacher stated quite vehemently that:
the higher ups on the board of education or in the superintendent's office or in positions of government too often have an agenda which has little relevance to the situation that exists. Teachers do their best to ignore this interference and teach the way they know how. We see the children every day. We are the experts. We should be listened to.

Thus teachers are well aware of the frustrations inherent in their work, and have sound ideas for what needs to be changed, for what "reforms" need to be instituted. They are calling for smaller class sizes, for greater opportunities to participate in making decisions, for more recognition and respect from the community, for less paperwork. In the words of our oft-quoted teacher, "We see the children every day. We are the experts. We should be listened to." A survey by Chase affirms this study, stating that teachers "report that they are quite well satisfied with their jobs as teachers", however, "teachers want more to say about their own inservice training and want to be more involved in policy matters", and they "would also like a better relationship with the community." 8

Other Actors

The teacher, although undeniably the most important actor in effecting change, cannot reform the educational system alone. Teachers are calling for more respect from

8 Clinton I. Chase, "How 2,000 Teachers View Their Profession," The Education Digest, April, 1986, pp. 41-42.
the community, for larger budgets for more teachers and higher salaries, and for administrative help when they need it. America still has a strong tradition of local control of the schools, but the localities seem to have lost the community feeling whereby the school is the center of all activity and everyone in the community rallies around the school in times of crisis. With more homes with single parents or both parents working, the schools have become the dumping ground for issues that used to be dealt with in the home. Schools are now expected to teach personal hygiene, to cater to the gifted, the physically and mentally disabled, and the average student, to teach values, and to watch for any signs of child abuse or neglect. All of these problems again fall on the teacher, who feels she or he is getting little or no support from the administration. Teachers cannot, and should not be expected to, reform the schools alone. Reform requires the full cooperation of all the parties involved: the principals, the superintendents, the parents, the school board, and the state legislative bodies.

Roland Barth, of the Harvard Principals' Center, has closely examined the role of the principal in the midst of education reform. He stresses the need for "collegiality" in the school atmosphere. Collegiality is the presence of four specific behaviors.
First, adults in schools talk about the practice of teaching and learning frequently, continuously, and in concrete and precise terms. Second, they observe each other teaching and administrating. Third, they work on the curriculum together by planning, designing, researching, and evaluating. Finally, they teach each other what they know about teaching, learning, and leading.  

His contention is that "principals who hold collegiality as a goal can help schools move toward it." Since "the principal of a school occupies a position of central influence over the professionalization of teaching," by developing collegiality, engaging teachers in important decisions affecting their classrooms and schools, developing personal visions, becoming active adult learners, serving as mentors to other teachers and prospective teachers, and maintaining quality in their own and others' performances...principals can make good use of their extraordinary influence.

Other reports reaffirm the importance of the principal. "A Nation Prepared" states that "No organization can function well without strong and effective leadership and schools are no exception." Patricia Duttwiler also emphasizes the essential role played by principals. "It is clear that the role played by the principal is crucial for educational excellence....Educational excellence

---

10 Ibid., p. 474.
11 Ibid., pp. 483-484.
requires a leader who has the ability to motivate others to change or improve—the ability to gain the commitment of others to organizational goals.¹³ She continues, stating,

In general, the effective schools literature indicates principals of effective schools establish a decision-making partnership with their staffs. They use a participatory style of leadership...; respect teachers and collaborate in making rules...; facilitate collegiality among teachers...; encourage in their staffs a strong sense of participation and control over important educational decisions and activities in the school...; and exhibit an open, professional, and collegial style that fosters joint discussion, evaluation, and improvement... Once shared decision-making processes are in place, principals will find they have less work, fewer staff problems, a smoother running school, and, if the studies are right, a school that is more effective—maybe even excellent.¹⁴

Canady and Hotchkiss identify the two important roles principals in effective elementary schools play: "¹) developing and implementing policies to guide instructional programs and 2) scheduling the school day to emphasize instruction in reading and mathematics."¹⁵ Both of these roles involve the full cooperation of the teaching staff, and will only be effective if the teachers are included in the decision-making process.

¹³ Duttweiler, p. 371.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 373.

Although many effective reforms can be implemented with virtually no additional cost, and virtually no assistance from outside the school, the school's community does play a significant part in the politics of the schools. The parents of children in the community's schools represent the most influential component of the community. Lortie analyzes the ambivalent relationship teachers and parents share. Teachers want parents to support their decisions about the children and to assist at home in inculcating the values teachers try to teach in school, but parents are unwelcome in schools and their visits construed as "interruptions" if contact is not initiated by the teacher.¹⁷ "[T]eachers, then, seek to ensure both independence and support, and the mechanisms they invoke are physical separation and teacher control over parents' access to the school."¹⁸

There is often valid concern on the part of the teacher regarding the power of the parent. Wirt and Kirst discuss this possibility: "The power of one parent with a complaint raised against a perceived injustice is enough to agitate administrators and can, if not met, escalate

---

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 183-184.


¹⁸ Ibid., p. 191.
into a flash flood from the community."\(^{19}\) Lortie reaffirms this point when he says, "Teachers do not possess the status resources to make parents comply or to withstand their attacks; their vulnerability is genuine."\(^{20}\) If true reform is to take place in a community's schools, the parents must be at the least active supporters. They are the taxpayers who financially help support the schools, and as Wirt and Kirst note, "voters' dissatisfaction rises as the gap between their values and demands and those of board members and superintendent increases."\(^{21}\) Without school tax levies, community schools cannot survive.

The school board is the next crucial component in any attempts at educational reform. In a national study of school boards, the Institute for Educational Leadership found that "Board members are seriously concerned about the growing intrusiveness of the states as the reform movement evolves....They would like to become recognized and effective partners in state dialogues."\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{19}\) Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, *Schools in Conflict*, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1982, p. 120.

\(^{20}\) Lortie, p.192.

\(^{21}\) Wirt and Kirst, p. 132.

boards are well entitled to this recognition and respect. They have become the major policy-making bodies for each community's schools. "School boards filter, interpret and translate the education goals of the people into a mission for the school district."23 These local governing bodies are concerned with the same issues as all the other actors in the system. Among their chief concerns were: "the challenge to insure high teacher quality," "the need for stronger building-level input and leadership in the development of educational programs," "the need to improve staff development," and "career ladders and merit pay as a way to make education financially attractive and more competitive with business and industry."24 School boards have a legitimate right and a legitimate need to be included in any discussion of school reform. School boards are also responsible for selecting the superintendent of a school district, and if their choice of chief administrator, or the board itself, is not sympathetic to teachers' attempts to make the schools better places to learn, then all attempts at change will fail.

This decade has ushered in an era of failed funding at the local level, as well as a national concern for

23 Ibid., p. 14.
24 Ibid., p. 33.
promoting educational excellence. The National Governors' Association released their report in 1986, which contained a Task Force on Teaching. The Task Force's recommendations include making teachers' "work environment professional, including 'reasonable' salaries and 'a real voice in decision'," and getting "cooperation from parents and other citizens in doing things that support a child's education."\(^{25}\) Since "in the 1980's, state involvement in education increased with federal deregulation and block grants, and school reform...[g]overnors and state legislators, taking their cues from national leaders, declared that improved schools would cure the states' economic problems."\(^{26}\) The states have begun to take an active role in reforming education well beyond their traditional role of providing funding for the localities and leaving the local educational agencies to spend as they deem appropriate. This increased involvement is intruding on the school boards' authority, as evidenced above, yet without the extremely important financial support from the state level, particularly the state legislature who passes the education budget, localities cannot afford to implement changes.


The federal government issued "A Nation At Risk" five years ago, and since then, has taken the leading role in discussing education reform. However, the policies of the national government, by virtue of its increased distance from the local education agencies, tend to be ruled more by politics than the needs of the children within the education system. Although federal support for education and for reform is crucial in terms of enlisting public support and federal financial aid, change cannot possibly effectively emanate from the national levels of government. The two major political parties in this country have vastly differing views on education and on what the educational currently needs, as does each individual seeking national office at any given time. A good example of this tendency is the creation and seemingly immediate abolishment of the Department of Education. President Carter was elected in 1976 by a margin smaller than the total membership of the National Education Association (NEA), who had endorsed him as their first ever presidential candidate, based on his platform including the creation of the Department. Four years later, President Reagan was elected on a platform including the elimination of government waste, especially the Department of Education. Had Reagan succeeded, the Department would have had an existence shorter than two years. The Department was not eliminated, mostly due to
the efforts of Terrel H. Bell, Reagan's first Secretary of Education. Bell formed the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) which successfully completed its report, "A Nation At Risk," and brought the issue of education to the forefront of national concerns.

"A Nation At Risk" first introduces the concept of a federal role in education. The NCEE recommends that:

The Federal Government, in cooperation with States and localities, should help meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students, and the handicapped. In addition, we believe the Federal Government's role includes several functions of national consequence that States and localities alone are unlikely to be able to meet: ... collecting data, statistics, and information about education generally; supporting curriculum improvement and research on teaching, learning, and the management of schools; supporting teacher training in areas of critical shortage or key national needs; and providing student financial assistance and research and graduate training. We believe the assistance of the Federal Government should be provided with a minimum of administrative burden and intrusiveness. ... The Federal Government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest. 27

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy also advocates some federal intervention in its report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century." The Forum's approach is that education is and should be a national concern due to increased economic competition

from foreign nations, especially the Far East. "The American mass education system, designed in the early part of the century for a mass-production economy, will not succeed unless it not only raises but redefines the essential standards of excellence and strives to make quality and equality of opportunity compatible with each other."28

The Forum's major recommendation is the creation of a "National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet that standard."29 Participation in this certification process is completely voluntary, and states still would retain the privilege of licensing their teachers. Their other recommendations directly involving the federal government discuss the problem of recruitment and retention of minority students in institutions of higher education.30 The remainder of the Forum's recommendations are directed to the states and localities, whereby the Forum recognizes the importance of local control of education.

28 Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, p. 21.
29 Ibid., p. 55.
30 Ibid., p. 80.
Control over education from the national level is both infeasible and unwieldy. Undeniably federal control would help create equity among the states—equity of funding, resources, and quality of personnel. However, much more can be accomplished at the state level with financial support from the federal government. In the past five years the states have recognized the need to equalize resources across the state, and many states have boosted their minimum salary schedules for teachers, and their minimum per capita expenditures for students. 31 If the federal government only provides additional funding for the poorer states, the states are capable of efficiently allocating their resources and have clearly recognized the need to improve education.

Moreover, teachers and the other important actors are rarely included among the "experts" consulted by the federal government. In the words of a teacher, "Once again, we are in the midst of a national reform effort aimed at teachers but guided by well-intentioned and highly motivated nonteachers." 32 Another teacher returns to the crux of the education system, and the elements that


ought to be the center of education reform. "The best judges of what needs to be done are communities, teachers, families, and kids themselves... Schools should be humane, caring institutions, not to achieve some quantifiable result, but because the children attending them deserve that kind of support and respect." Reform within the educational system must occur at the local level with unencumbered support from the state and federal levels.

---

CHAPTER 5

EFFECTIVE REFORMS
Education reform must rely on reducing teachers' frustrations and dissatisfactions with their work in order to be effective. Changes must benefit teachers by increasing their feelings of power and achievement within the education system. Roland Barth reports from a study that teachers feel:

1. a sense of discontent and malaise. They feel unappreciated, overworked, not respected as professionals, undersupported, undervalued, and unrewarded.

2. a low sense of trust toward the administration, the public, and even among themselves. Conversely, they feel as if they are not trusted by their superiors or the public.

3. separated from one another—compartmentalized. They express a sense of competition among departments for resources and for students, the latter meaning competition for jobs as well.

4. helpless and trapped in their jobs, powerless to effect change. They see the causes of the situation as beyond their control. They do not feel in charge of their work lives.

5. a sense of frustration at the "non-teaching" demands placed on them. They feel it is increasingly difficult to be effective as teachers and to fulfill the requirements of the job.¹

These feelings of lack of achievement and power are reaffirmed in the literature as well as my own study. These feelings of helplessness and impotence are not an effective prescription for change, and the reports of this decade have suggested many reform ideas to try and

compensate for teachers' perceptions that their work is not valued. However, as was discussed in the last chapter, effective reform must originate within the schools. "Most changes from the schools may be initiated from without, but the most lasting changes will come from within."\(^2\) The teaching profession and the other actors in the education system are well aware of the problems.

Indeed, most of the disputes and persistent tensions between or among teachers, administrators, and parents are really struggles over differing conceptions of good education and effective schools. The visions of education preferred by the national commissions and task forces have not landed in a vacuum; they must compete with fiercely held conceptions that are already in place.\(^3\)

Nonetheless, the national reports have called for many reforms in the compensation plans in school systems, assuming that increases in monetary rewards will make teachers happier and motivate them to perform better. These recommendations fall into three categories: across-the-board changes, merit pay programs, and career ladder proposals. The advantages and disadvantages of each of these categories will be discussed in turn.

Across-the-board changes refer to those reforms that affect every teacher in the school system. One prime example is the raise in minimum state starting salaries. C. Emily Feistritzer reports that since 1983 every state


\(^3\) Ibid., p. 357.
has legislated higher starting salaries, with state subsidies provided to those district that cannot afford the minimum salary.\textsuperscript{4} Another example is a tightening of the requirements for state certification. Certification requirements are being tightened in the state of Connecticut by requiring all cooperating teachers (teachers who sponsor Student Teachers during their student teaching internship) to undertake a certain number of hours of training before they host a Student Teacher.\textsuperscript{5} Additional requirements have been added to teacher education as well. In Connecticut, students seeking certification must now complete a course studying the "exceptional child," including the specific needs of the gifted and talented, the mentally disabled, the physically disabled, and the learning disabled child.

Incentive pay, or pay for "different kinds or amounts of work,"\textsuperscript{6} is also considered an across-the-board reform since any teacher may do extra work to receive extra pay. There is no cut-off point, except perhaps available funding, but the easy accountability of these types of plans usually justifies the extra compensation.


\textsuperscript{5} Education Studies Program, Wesleyan University.

One of the advantages of across-the-board reforms is that, with the increase in salaries, teaching becomes more attractive to college students choosing from a variety of professions. If salaries are competitive with the other options all graduating seniors have, then more will consider teaching. The tightened requirements for certification insure a better qualified applicant pool of prospective teachers. The major disadvantage, usually associated with incentive pay, is that the quality of work is not differentiated. Teacher A may be a less capable teacher than Teacher B, but may make more money by doing additional work in the school office. While there is inherently nothing wrong with paying extra money for extra work, a system of incentive pay also does nothing to promote the professionalism of teachers.

Merit pay is the most common system of extra compensation for quality work. There are certain basic assumptions that underlie a system of merit pay. These implicit assumptions include:

1) Merit pay rewards the best teachers for their past exemplary performance, and the teachers, both those who receive it, and those who do not, recognize the increased pay as a reward for outstanding performance, 2) merit pay will motivate teachers who receive it to continue to improve their performance, 3) merit pay is an incentive for excellent teachers to remain in teaching when they might otherwise be induced to leave for higher pay in business and industry, and 4) for the majority of teachers who will not initially receive merit pay, the expectation that they will
receive it in the future serves as a continuing motivation for improvement.  

Unfortunately, these assumptions have rarely been proven true in the reality of merit pay experiences.

Merit pay is not a new concept. The idea has recurred frequently throughout this century, especially after the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, and questions were raised about the effectiveness of American schools. However, virtually none of these merit pay plans survived more than a few years. Richard Murnane and David Cohen believe that the primary reason most merit pay plans fail is that "much of the important work in schools must be done by teachers working together." A system of merit pay discourages collegiality because teachers perceive themselves as being in direct competition with one another for a limited number of rewards. "[M]erit pay plans foster dissension, rivalry, and jealousy among teachers." Nonetheless, there are merit pay plans that have endured. Susan Moore-Johnson examines the one district in the

---

7 Ibid., p.1.


9 Ibid., p. 6.

country "where merit pay has endured over the long haul—thirty years," Ladue, Missouri. This district's circumstances are fairly unusual: "wealth, continuity of leadership, stability of staff, community support for schools, and small size." Murnane and Cohen also examine six districts where merit pay survived more than five years. Again they pinpoint qualities of the districts, other than merit pay, that serve to attract capable teachers.

All of the six districts are considered to be among the best in their geographical areas—places where teachers like to work and where high housing prices reflect, in part, the desirability of the public schools.... All of the districts have salary schedules, to which merit pay is added, that are above average for their geographical areas. The high salaries and good working conditions permit these districts to be selective in choosing applicants for teaching positions.... None of these districts use merit pay as a strategy to give negative signals to teachers perceived to be ineffective.

They conclude that "attractive working conditions may be a prerequisite for the survival of merit pay."

Murnane and Cohen argue further that the compensation plans in these districts "changed one or more crucial

---


12 Ibid.

13 Murnane and Cohen, p. 12.

14 Ibid.
aspects of the merit pay idea."

15 Perhaps these plans have endured not only because the districts are prime working locations, but also because the compensation plans are not true merit pay systems. The strategies of these districts consist of various combinations of four themes: "extra pay for extra work, making everyone feel special, making the program inconspicuous, and legitimating through participation." 16 Murnane and Cohen explain that each of these plans has a low profile and that "this stems from the perception that merit pay is something almost every teacher could earn but that the financial rewards do not justify the extra work." 17

Hence, merit pay plans tend to disappear quickly, usually due to the problem of evaluation. Traditionally, principals make yearly evaluations, and retention and merit pay are based on these evaluations that often consist of one or two visits for short periods of time. Murnane and Cohen conclude that "merit pay in the districts we studied does not appear to have affected the quality of teaching; neither administrators nor teachers offered any evidence that merit pay had a significant impact on the way teachers teach." 18 In fact, Bacharach,

15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
18 Ibid., p. 15.
et al. argue, "If intrinsic motivation is driven out by an emphasis on pay-for-performance, the incentive to achieve high teacher performance will decline.... [T]hose who do not receive the merit increment will experience a relative decline in their rewards, and commensurately lower their performance."19 Thus, merit pay will not address our primary concern of elevating teachers' feelings of achievement and power.

A relatively new category of reform is the career ladder. Bacharach, et al. offer this definition of career ladders:

Career ladder proposals, like merit pay proposals, link salary determination in part to assessments of a teacher's competence or performance but unlike merit pay proposals they are not premised on the assumption that all teachers know—or should know—exactly how to perform from the moment they first enter teaching.... Promotions in a career ladder are made when a person is ready for them and are not limited by a fixed number of positions, by turnover in those positions, or by peer competition.20

Career ladders include an internship, followed by several steps up the ladder. The first year of teaching is a closely monitored teaching internship, during which the new teacher is assigned a "mentor teacher" and evaluated frequently. Movement up the ladder is usually determined by the satisfactory completion of various tasks including continuing education credits, curriculum development.

19 Bacharach, Lipsky, and Shedd, p. 20.

20 Ibid., pp. 50-52.
textbook selection, and other specific tasks, as well as years in the system. Each new level is accompanied by a significant increase in salary, as well as additional responsibilities.

Again problems occur both with the realistic implementation of career ladders and with the evaluation process. Albert Shanker remarks, "Most of the teacher career ladder proposals I've seen are merely devices to give a handful of people more money than others. Many, perhaps most, are a kind of cover-up for merit pay." 21 Shanker continues, saying that the career ladder is perhaps the best solution available, but it must be implemented by and for the teachers. He cites the program developed in Toledo, Ohio, which will be discussed in great detail below, as being the most effective alternative. 22

Every proposed reform idea faces the same challenge: the evaluation process. All of the reports and literature agree that "If evaluation is to contribute to the goal of helping teachers improve, it must be carried out by skilled and knowledgeable supervisors in an atmosphere that rewards honesty and cooperation." 23 Unfortunately,


22 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

23 Murnane and Cohen, p. 16.
within the last five years traditional evaluations were
made by the principal, once a year, after perhaps two
short visits to the classroom. It was unusual for teacher
and principal to sit down together and discuss strengths,
weaknesses, and possible change. Some of that has changed
since the reports were issued, but the traditional
evaluations are still in place in a majority of districts.
In one study, "52 percent of the respondents said their
evaluations have had either a negative effect or no effect
on their teaching." 24

Yet teachers know what a good evaluator is:

The evaluator (usually the principal) is genuinely
interested and concerned. He's a common sight in the
classroom, making many formal and informal visits
throughout the year. He spends plenty of time
observing, knows the classroom and students well, and
is on hand to point out the teacher's strengths and
weaknesses. He talks with the teacher before and
after each evaluation, gives specific suggestions, and
welcomes teacher's input. The situation is relaxed
and comfortable; the evaluation, non-threatening and
fair. The principal's purpose is to help the teacher
improve her teaching, period. 25

Mary Hatwood Futrell, president of the NEA, echoes this
when she says, "Evaluating teachers effectively takes

24 Rebecca R. Turner, "What Teachers Think about
Their Evaluations," The Education Digest, February, 1987,
p. 40.

25 Ibid.
careful and repeated classroom observation by trained evaluators." 26

One Career Development Plan (CDP) that consistently receives high ratings in all aspects of effective reform is the program recently developed in Toledo, Ohio. The concepts behind the creation of Toledo's career ladder include:

1. Teachers need to be given the discretion and autonomy that invariably mark professional status.
2. Most teachers need to be provided with support so they can be more effective and productive.
3. New approaches to school leadership need to be tried, especially those that put teachers at the center of the instructional program.
4. Districts should foster collegial styles of decision-making with "Lead Teachers" playing a central role.
5. The range of teachers' salaries should be increased to those of other professions with comparable education, training, and experience. 27

Toledo's CDP was jointly designed by the Toledo Public Schools and the Toledo Federation of Teachers, thereby insuring union and administrative support for every step of the process. Another crucial component of the plan is that it is completely voluntary, "to avoid the severe


27 A Career Ladder for Teachers, a joint effort of the Toledo Federation of Teachers, American Federation of Teachers, and the Toledo Public Schools, Toledo, Ohio, July, 1987, p. 4.
resistance American teachers have shown to mandatory career ladders or merit pay schemes."²⁸

The CDP contains six separate phases. The first phase is the Qualification Year, during which "each applicant to the program will earn a 'ranking score' based on an interview, references, a written submission, a test, and peer observations."²⁹ The next year, accepted teachers move into the Induction Year. During this period the candidates will attempt to qualify for the Green Level, or they may choose to qualify for the Commendation Level. To reach the Commendation Level a teacher must complete successful peer reviews. At this stage the teacher has the option of selecting permanent commendation level status. The only requirement for this level is successful performance in the classroom, as determined by peer reviews consisting of six observations by three different peers for a total of 18 observed classroom hours.

The second option under this plan is to progress to the Green Level. To achieve this distinction, teachers must successfully complete a project assigned by the CDP governing board, based on each candidate's interests, in addition to successful peer reviews.

The Blue and Red Levels follow the Green Level. These successive levels are attained through the completion of

²⁸ Ibid., p. 5.
²⁹ Ibid., p. 7.
enough projects of varying difficulty to achieve a predetermined number of units. Three years must be completed at the Green Level before moving to Blue, then another three years at the Blue Level before progressing to the highest level, the Red Level. The Blue Level also requires a master's degree in any field or area of professional interest, and the Red Level requires 20 graduate hours beyond a master's degree.

The Toledo CDP builds on an effective evaluation system that has been in place for several years. The evaluation process is not targeted to evaluate every teacher every year. Rather, skilled consulting teachers evaluate new teachers and experienced teachers having difficulty. This intern/intervention program has been extraordinarily successful in providing remedial help for less capable and beginning teachers. The consulting teachers observe and confer with these teachers every two weeks for the period of the internship or the intervention. This evaluation system is adapted somewhat to the CDP, but it still retains its key features of repeated observations by expert teachers.

The Toledo Career Development Program effectively remedies many of the problems with the schools encountered above. Teachers are given power through their roles as consulting teachers or members of the Board of Governors, whose body is 50 percent teachers from the school system.
Their achievement needs are met through the attainment of established and documented levels of competence. The entire community can easily label the Red, Blue, or Green Level teachers; thus teachers are awarded recognition and praise.

As they reach higher levels, the teachers take on more tasks related to the improvement of their school and their own teaching ability. The five main areas of projects are: Professional Development, Curriculum, Community Leadership, Educational Technology, and Performance. Hence, there is a wide variety of activities available, and teachers may pick and choose what interests them. Teachers participating in the Toledo program have a real chance to impact upon the school’s procedures. Hence, there are valuable psychic rewards available to participating teachers. In addition, the monetary compensation is well worth the extra work involved. A Red Level teacher will add $15,000 to his or her regular pay schedule each year, a bonus that will surely help recruit college students into the profession.

The Toledo Career Development Plan is a superb example of what a single educational community can accomplish with the assistance of all of the primary actors. With the full support of the teachers, the administrators, the union, the community, and funding provided by the state legislature, the Toledo Public Schools have created a
voluntary CDP that truly meets the power and achievement needs of its teachers. Most importantly, any needs that are not met immediately are resolved because teachers are given the power to govern themselves. In Toledo, teaching has become a profession in every sense of the word.
Consent Form

Survey of Teacher Satisfaction

I am a senior at Wesleyan University, currently involved with my senior thesis on the teaching profession. This survey asks some questions regarding your job and your level of satisfaction with it. All responses will be kept strictly confidential. Please do not sign your name anywhere on the survey except on the consent form below. Your form has been assigned a number that will be used to preserve your privacy. Furthermore, all data will be expressed in the form of group data, so that personal identification of any individual will not be possible.

I will be glad to share my findings with you at the end of the study as well as answer any questions you might later have about the project.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

I have read the above statement and agree to be part of the study.

(Signature) (Date)

Principal Researcher: Julie N. Schwarzwald
Wesleyan Station
Box 5380
Middletown, CT 06457
(203) 347-2416
TEACHER SURVEY

Birth Date ________________________ Sex: Male ____ Female ____
INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is for research purposes only. All responses will be kept strictly confidential. Please respond honestly and carefully. Do not sign your name anywhere on the survey.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which is most important to YOU, place a 2 next to the value which is second most important, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

When you have completed ranking all the values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents YOUR values.
a comfortable life
   (a prosperous life)

an exciting life
   (a stimulating, active life)

a sense of accomplishment
   (lasting contribution)

a world at peace
   (free of war and conflict)

a world of beauty
   (beauty of nature and the arts)

equality
   (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)

family security
   (taking care of loved ones)

freedom
   (independence, free choice)

happiness
   (contentedness)

inner harmony
   (freedom from inner conflict)

mature love
   (sexual and spiritual intimacy)

national security
   (protection from attack)

pleasure
   (an enjoyable, leisurely life)

salvation
   (saved, eternal life)

self-respect
   (self-esteem)

social recognition
   (respect, admiration)

true friendship
   (close companionship)

wisdom
   (a mature understanding of life)
Following is another list of 18 values. Arrange them in order of importance, again with the number 1 indicating the most important value to YOU, 2 the next most important, and so on, with the least important value being ranked 18.
ambitious
  (hard-working, aspiring)

broadminded
  (open-minded)

capable
  (competent, effective)

cheerful
  (lighthearted, joyful)

clean
  (neat, tidy)

courageous
  (standing up for your beliefs)

forgiving
  (willing to pardon others)

helpful
  (working for the welfare of others)

honest
  (sincere, truthful)

imaginative
  (daring, creative)

independent
  (self-reliant, self-sufficient)

intellectual
  (intelligent, reflective)

logical
  (consistent, rational)

loving
  (affectionate, tender)

obedient
  (dutiful, respectful)

polite
  (courteous, well-mannered)

responsible
  (dependable, reliable)

self-controlled
  (restrained, self-disciplined)
Review those values you rated first on each list, and circle one correct answer.

1. How much has work at your job led fulfillment of your most important values?
   
   very little                  a little
   some                        a lot
   a great deal

2. How much satisfaction have you gotten out of work at your job?
   Please rate on a 100-point scale how much satisfaction you get from your current job (0=no satisfaction, 100=completely satisfying).

   __________________________

Please answer the following questions completely and honestly. All your answers are strictly confidential.

3. How long have you been a teacher?    _________ years

4. What things do you particularly like about your job?
5. What things don't you like about your job?

6. Regardless of how much you like your job, is there any other kind of work you'd rather be doing? yes_______ no_______
   If yes, what is that?

7. Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job within the next year?
   very likely somewhat likely not at all likely

8. Within the next 2 years?
   very likely somewhat likely not at all likely

9. If you didn't have to work to make a living, do you think you would work anyway?
   yes maybe/probably no don't know

10. If you didn't have to work to make a living, do you think you would work anyway at your current job?
    yes maybe/probably no don't know
If yes/maybe/probably, what would be your reasons for going on working?

If no, why would you not continue to work?

11. Have you ever had any problems with your work—times when you couldn't work or weren't getting along on the job? If yes, what was that about? (Please describe in as much detail as possible).

12. How often do the demands of your work interfere with the demands of your family?
   never  once a year  once a month
   once a week  daily

13. How much does your job allow you to make decisions on your own?
   a lot  somewhat  a little  not at all

14. How much control do you have over what happens on your job?
   a lot  some  a little  none
Please circle the response that best indicates how true each statement that follows is in your work.

15. The work is interesting.
   very true           somewhat true
   not very true      not at all true

16. I am given a lot of chances to talk with the people I work with.
   very true           somewhat true
   not very true      not at all true

17. I am given a chance to do the things I do best.
   very true           somewhat true
   not very true      not at all true

18. What does it take to do a really good job at the kind of work you do?

19. How much ability do you think it takes to do a really good job at the kind of work you do? (Please include the reasons for your answer).

20. How good would you say you are at doing this kind of work?
   very good           a little better than average
   average            not very good
21. Describe a typical day at work.
22. What things do you think about during the day?
23. What are your thoughts about work while away from school?
24. If you could change any one thing about your job, what would that be? Please describe the changes you would make and your reasons for them. Be as specific as you can.
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