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The purpose of this study was to determine the relative
effectiveness of a participatory intervention process on the
level of satisfaction for an employee benefits package. The
main hypotheses attempted to determine if the treatment
improved:

1. Posttest satisfaction scores of the combined
groups.

2. Posttest scores for the direct treatment (delegate)
indirect treatment and the control groups as
compared to their pretest scores.

A randomized sample of ten per cent of the employees
were selected and divided into a control group and an
indirect treatment group. A ten per cent sample of the
indirect treatment group was selected to form a direct treatment group (delegate). A questionnaire was administered to all groups to obtain pretest scores on old fringe benefits. The direct treatment group (delegate) was given a benefits package and after dialogue with researcher was charged with the options of altering, modifying or creating a new benefits package. Subsequently, the direct treatment group (delegate) informed the indirect treatment group of changes. All groups were then readministered a new benefits package questionnaire to determine their posttest scores.

The results show no difference in pretest scores among groups, the posttest scores indicate significant differences. A comparison of pretest/posttest scores for each of the groups indicate significant differences. The main implication is that participants involved in decision-making obtain greater satisfaction and hence, should be used for socialization by school systems.

The study indicated that the new fringe benefits were designed to improve the quality of life yet maintain ones income at some parity level and hence, accounted for the improved posttest ratings.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

During the preparation of school budgets each year, most members of school boards and superintendents consider "fringe benefits" for public school employees. Greene (1971) related that before the advent of the twentieth century, compensation was generally arrived at by individual bargaining. School system employees rarely had the same pay scale regardless of similarities in their qualifications. Marital status, sex, and number of children were factors used in determining compensation. In addition, teachers lived with certain families within communities. Greene (1971) noted that such "board and room" obviously became a part of their compensation. To provide adequate benefit programs for school employees, it was important to determine their satisfaction with their benefits. School systems with preferable fringe-benefit programs were usually in a better position to recruit and to retain employees than were those systems in which little consideration had been given to fringe benefits. Greene (1971) maintained that they were also better able to compete for personnel with business,
industry and government, which offered better salaries and more diversified inducements in the form of benefits.

According to Wilson and Moon (1972), employee benefits has been an important factor in recruiting and retaining employees for approximately thirty years. Wilson and Moon (1972) claimed it had been only within the last decade that educational organizations have placed emphasis on the benefit program as a major component of employee compensation.

Fringe benefits were forced upon industry because of the economic conditions during World War II. Wages were frozen and unions were unable to negotiate increases in salaries. Levin (1973) reported negotiations was allowed for fringe benefits and, thus, pension and welfare plans were extended greatly during this period. Levin (1973) explained that during the mid-1930's, the acceleration in the development of fringe benefits was encouraged by the growth in unionization. He stated that, "court decisions after World War II held that employers must negotiate on pensions, welfare plans, and profit-sharing schemes as subjects of mandatory bargaining."

The development of fringe benefits in education was influenced directly by programs of benefits provided to employees in government, business and industry. Greene (1971) asserted that before 1960 fringe benefits for school
employees were limited. When collective bargaining in industry was expanded, the male, family-oriented teachers were attracted to business and industry because of their dissatisfactions with their salaries and fringe benefits provided in school systems.

Members of school boards reacted slowly to the trend of providing fringe benefits for school employees. The supply of trained teachers appeared to be adequate to meet the needs of school districts. When a shortage of fully trained teachers was apparent, members of school boards began to add fringe benefits as incentives to recruit and to retain the best teachers available. Castetter (1971) maintained that because the society in which we live had come to recognize the benefit concept as an essential part of the occupational structure, boards were forced to compete for personnel under existing occupational mores.

Some writers viewed fringe benefits as incentives to achieve both institutional and personal goals. They recognized that the value of fringe benefits is based on the needs of the individual or group. The author's assumption was that benefits were useless unless the needs of the employees were met. Locke (1969) stated the following:

It is recognized that certain benefits do not meet the needs or desires of some employee groups to whom they are provided; in some instances they may even produce negative results, such as encouraging, malingering and absenteeism or the early retirement of skilled employees who are in
short supply and are badly needed.

Other authors have directed criticism toward the nature of the benefits program, relatedness of the program to the needs of the individual and satisfaction of individuals relative to the allocation of salaries and benefits.

Evolution of the Problem

There was common agreement among administrators that fringe benefits have become a very important form of compensation for employees and a major labor cost of most organizations. It was not as clear what procedures for establishing benefits programs provided higher levels of employee satisfaction.

The major problem areas of fringe benefits programs were: (1) the lack of agreement on what should be included, (2) the purposes to be served, (3) responsibility for the program, (4) the costs and values of each fringe benefit item, and (5) the criteria by which decisions were to be made.

Generally, priorities for fringe benefits were determined by the central office administrators and/or school board members in public education without adequate input from employees.
This research focused on critical questions (satisfied/dissatisfied) addressing some issues examined previously by Dr. Frederick Herzberg (1966).

The Problem

The problem addressed in this study was to determine the relative effectiveness of a planned intervention process on the level of satisfaction for an employee benefits package.

Purpose of the Study

This was an experimental study designed to examine some factors which have been shown in Frederick Herzberg's (1966) research studies to have some relationship to satisfaction or dissatisfaction levels of employees. There were two specific purposes for this study. The first purpose was to determine the satisfaction/dissatisfaction level of school employees for the present fringe benefits package, related to security and status. The second purpose was to examine the satisfaction/dissatisfaction level of school employees, related to employee participation in the development of the fringe benefits package. Specifically, the purposes of this study were:

1. To determine if there were any significant differences in the level of satisfaction among the eight
categories of employees.

2. To determine if there were any significant differences in the level of satisfaction category and sex.

3. To determine if there were any significant differences in the level of satisfaction by category and years of service in the system.

4. To determine if there were any significant differences in the level of satisfaction for the benefits package for employees who participate in the intervention process (Indirect Treatment group) or those who do not (Direct Treatment (Delegate) group).

Hypotheses

1. There was no significant difference between the Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups on the total pretest scores.

2. There was no significant difference between the total scores made by the overall groups (Indirect Treatment, control, Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups, combined) on the pretest and those made on the posttest.

3. There was no significant difference between the total scores made by each of the three groups
(Indirect Treatment, control, and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups) on the pretest and those made on the posttest.

4. There was no significant difference between the Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups on the total scores made on the posttest.

Justification for the Study

Fringe benefits were developed in periods during which salaries were frozen. Additional benefits were granted in periods during which there was a scarcity of persons in the labor pool. As changes occurred in the economy and labor force, there was a need to review fringe benefits programs. Castetter (1971) stated that, "organizations should be constantly on the alert for inequities that may have been built into the plan unwittingly or that may develop operationally, because of changes of one sort or another."

The compensation of employees was affected by several factors, including legislation, prevailing salary, collective negotiation (when applicable), supply and demand in the labor market, ability to pay, and standard of living. Fringe benefits were important parts of the total compensation program. They were more important than were salaries
to some individuals, depending upon their circumstances, because benefits were related to the satisfaction of both the economic and the social needs of individuals.

Greene (1971) asserted that it was common practice for applicants to compare salaries and benefits of various school systems and to accept the most attractive offers. School systems in which it was possible to include attractive fringe benefits in employment offers had a recruiting advantage over school systems in which such was not possible.

There was very little information in the literature concerning the participation of employees in fringe benefits decisions. Information on the participation of employees in fringe benefits decisions could be important in recruiting and in retaining employees; therefore, the justifications of this study were as follow:

1. Since 1980, fringe benefits had been expanded rapidly in large metropolitan and urban school systems. From this study, members of school boards in small school systems who have not expanded their benefits might be able to determine what school system employees expect in an expanding benefit program.

2. There were differences of opinions between some school boards and employee organizations with
respect to employee satisfaction with fringe benefit programs. Members of school boards and organizations of employees may use information from this study to help resolve conflicts by examining employee attitudes for fringe benefits.

3. Little information was available on satisfaction/dissatisfaction of employees in Georgia for fringe benefits. The results of this study provided current information on employee satisfaction/dissatisfaction of school employees for selected benefits.

The results of this study may be used to provide information about the satisfaction/dissatisfaction of school employees for selected fringe benefits to those who determine programs or influence decisions on benefit programs. Included in this group would be members of school boards, teachers, administrators, other school employees, officials of the State Department of Education, and officials of teacher and other employee organizations.

**Limitations of the Study**

One of the serious limitations of this study was the inability to determine the satisfaction/dissatisfaction level of school employees based on all of Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene factors. Herzberg (1966)
maintained that all human beings have two basic types of needs that they seek to fulfill at work and in other settings: the need to avoid pain and the need for psychological growth. He found that both types of needs were gratified to a greater degree in different work settings by virtue of various aspects of the tasks and the work environment. More specifically, certain facets of the job can fulfill psychological growth needs and thereby generate both feelings of satisfaction and motivation to invest effort in the work. Other facets of the job on the other hand, can fulfill pain avoidance needs but do not generate either feelings of satisfaction or motivation to work harder. Herzberg (1966) called the growth-enhancing facets motivation factors and the pain-avoidance facets hygiene factors.

The motivation factors tend to be intrinsic to the work itself; they render tasks more enjoyable, interesting and psychologically rewarding. These factors include achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, advancement and possibility of growth. The hygiene factors were generally extrinsic to task; they were associated with the context or setting in which the work was performed. These factors include: organization and administration policy, technical supervision, salary, working conditions, status, job security, effects on personal life, and interpersonal
relations with supervisors, peers and subordinates. The study, therefore, was limited for two reasons. First, some fringe benefits included on the questionnaire were unavailable for school employees. Second, there was no attempt to relate reason for satisfaction/dissatisfaction to importance of selection.

Another limitation of the study was that the school employee sample included only public school employees employed in Atlanta, Georgia; therefore, the results may not be applicable to employees in other states.

Definition of Terms

There was no uniform definition of the term "fringe benefits". Some authors claimed that the term was inadequate to describe the various forms of extra compensation usually extended to employees. Sibson (1974) contended that the substantial cost of benefits was so that they could no longer be called "fringes". It was concluded that fringe benefits were a total part of compensation packages.

Other authors defined the term "fringe benefits" as "supplemental benefits" such as retirement plans, insurance, professional growth support, travel pay, disability pay, and sick leave received by employees in addition to regular
salaries. Other terms used to define fringe benefits were "nonwage labor costs", "wage extras", "indirect compensation", "nonwage payments", and "supplementary wage practices". For the purpose of surveys, the term "fringe benefits" was defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as selected supplementary compensation or remuneration practices. In this study the term "fringe benefits" was defined as need satisfactor compensations to employees other than salary.

Organization of the Study

The statement of the problem, purposes of the study, justification for the study, limitations of the study, and definitions of terms were presented in Chapter I. A review of related literature was presented in Chapter II. The procedures used in the study were presented and discussed in Chapter III. Analyses of the data and the findings were discussed in Chapter IV. In Chapter V, the summary and conclusions were presented.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Related Literature

The writings of educational and industrial authorities and researchers were reviewed for information pertaining to fringe benefits. In addition, a search of the files of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) was secured through the Atlanta University Research Center in an effort to identify relevant sources of information. Most of the literature was found in the area of industry and business. In the area of education, information on fringe benefits was limited.

The review of the literature was confined to the following four areas: (1) development of fringe benefits in business, industry, government, and education; (2) importance of fringe benefits to employers and to employees; (3) determination of individual preferences for fringe benefits by employees and (4) the Motivation Hygiene theory.

Development of Fringe-Benefit Program

Meggison's (1967) writings indicated that fringe-
benefit programs initially were designed to protect an employee and his dependents against the basic hazards of life such as old age, disability, illness, accidents, unemployment, and death. Included in some of the fringe-benefit programs were pension plans, death and disability benefit plans, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, and Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance.

Industry and government officials were responsible for developing fringe-benefit programs. Pension plans were established directly by the employers in industry. Other programs were initiated by the federal or state legislators, but they were financed largely by the employers in industry. For example, Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance programs were established by the Congress of the United States but were financed equally by the employers and the employees.

Levin (1973) investigated the beginning of fringe benefits which were introduced in the United States in 1875 as a management pension plan. Before fringe-benefit programs were introduced, the immediate families of individuals or charitable agencies such as churches provided help for those who were unable to help themselves. Guion (1958) stated that, "in the early 1900's, both government and
business began to develop non-cash benefits to assist needy workers." Retirement and death benefit plans were established by employers in industry. Ewen (1967) reported that, "some states provided for old-age pensions that were payable on proof of need but, apart from this, only general poor relief and private charity were available to deal with poverty caused by old-age, illness or unemployment."

Allen (1964) claimed that the first fringe-benefit movement was initiated, generally, with those workers in high-productivity jobs and in highly-organized industries. These workers enjoyed a relatively high standard of living. Even without fringe benefits this group of workers was prepared for unemployment, displacement, ill health, and retirement. In the second dimension of the movement, fringe benefits were extended to workers in industries of low productivity.

During 1911, workmen's compensation was established in Wisconsin and New York as a state-sponsored benefit for employees injured on the job. Legislators had begun to exercise their responsibility toward the protection of employees when workmen's compensation was required to be added to the programs of industry.

During 1912, the employees of Montgomery Ward were provided one of the first group insurance plans ever written for businesses. Employees were provided life insurance,
survivorship annuity, medical care, and short-term disability benefits.

Belcher (1974) examined the fundamental changes in the development of fringe-benefit programs which were caused by a number of factors. During the early 1920's, fringe-benefit programs were affected by the growth of industrialization, heavy urbanization, and a capitalistic economy. Belcher (1974) asserts that new risks to employees were caused by industrialization and changes in modes of living. As a result of increased risks, benefit programs were initiated to provide security against these risks. Megginson (1967) claimed that changes in fringe-benefit programs were caused by public and political opinions of people. The opinions of the public and political leaders had direct effects on the scope of protection provided and on the method by which fringe benefits were provided.

Ewen (1967) fringe-benefit programs were affected by the depression of the 1930's. Fringe benefits were curtailed by employers in industry during the depression years. State and local governments were impoverished because of the decreases in tax revenues. State and local officials were unable to meet the needs of the unemployed. The federal government was the source of relief.

During 1935, the Social Security Act was passed to keep individuals from becoming destitute. Retirement income,
widow's income, death benefits, and limited medical benefits were provided by the passage of this act. Ewen (1967) said that, "the Social Security Act was passed to provide permanently against destitution from specific causes."

Megginson (1967) intimated, during the decade of the 1930's, federal officials drastically expanded their interests in the economic security employers provided their employees. The greatest expansion of benefit programs, however, occurred during World War II. The expansion of benefit programs was largely the result of wage controls authorized in the Wage Stabilization Act of 1942. Wages and salaries were frozen, but most employee benefits were increased in amounts that were not subject to controls.

The purposes of the Wage Stabilization Act were to discourage employees from changing jobs for increased pay and to prevent inflation because of wages. Employers were in desperate need for laborers. They began to compete for scarce workers by expanding employee benefits. Employers were allowed to pay employees for vacation time, sick leave, retirement, jury duty, transportation time, and insurance protection.

Allen (1964) indicated labor union officials and management also were partly responsible for the expansion of fringe-benefit programs during World War II. Union leaders petitioned the War Labor Board for fringe benefits because
wages were frozen. Employers adopted fringe benefits to increase productivity and to take advantage of certain taxes or tax benefits.

After World War II, many employers wanted to withdraw benefits that had been granted during that period. From 1945 to 1950, most of the work stoppages in the United States were caused by requests for increased fringe benefits and wages. Fringe benefits, such as pension and retirement plans, vacations and holidays, and insurance provisions were the major requests. Ewen (1967) stated, "in 1949 there was a shift of emphasis towards the negotiation of pension rights and health insurance benefits, caused partly by the cessation in mid-1948 of rise in prices, which made wage increases less urgent."

During the 1950's, some form of guaranteed employment or income was emphasized. The guaranteed employment or income was a supplemental benefit provided to alleviate suffering caused by unemployment.

Megginson (1967) explained that during the 1960's the emphasis was upon working fewer than 40 hours per week. The request of employers for a forty-hour work week was based upon the need to share work among other people because of automation.
Importance of Fringe-Benefit Programs

Research by Kleinman (1962) centered on members of boards of education, government administrators, and managers who recognized the importance of fringe benefits for several reasons. Competition for competent personnel was cited as one of the important reasons for extending fringe benefits. Employers for federal civil service, for example, were competing for college-trained personnel. When federal employers recruited, they emphasized to potential employees the many benefits in addition to salaries that were accrued by the civil servant.

Municipal administrators also had recognized the need for recruiting high-caliber personnel by means other than offering attractive salaries. Traditional benefits of vacation, sick leave, and holidays with pay were offered in personnel recruitment and in retention programs. Some of the additional benefits were: liberal vacation time, additional sick leave allowances, incentive awards programs, low-cost group life insurance, retirement plans, and paid military leave.

McCaffery (1972) indicated that employers in industry had placed importance on fringe benefits because they were interested in the following:

1. Minimizing employee concern about loss of wages due to poor health, layoff or
It was assumed that increased benefits were important to recruiting and to retaining well-trained personnel. Kleinmann (1962) concluded that fringe benefits had been important not only as integral aspects of remuneration and significant elements of personnel costs in both industry and government but also as indispensable means to attract and to retain persons who otherwise might have found employment elsewhere.

According to Kleinmann (1962), in his study of fringe benefits, little attention had been given in educational circles to the level of benefits provided for teaching personnel. The information he found on the subject was sketchy, but he concluded that benefits available to public school personnel had not kept pace with those found in other segments of the economy.

The importance of fringe benefits for school personnel was to, "reduce economic problems resulting from illness, disability, retirement, death, absences, and professional improvement." Castetter (1971) claimed that if personal problems were minimized through the use of fringe benefits,
the chances for the development of an efficient, stable, and cooperative staff would be increased. He concluded that the fringe-benefit program was, "a tool for securing competent performance in the interests of children and youth."

Kindred and Woodard (1963) claimed that little research had been conducted in the public schools to determine the relationship between provisions for fringe benefits and staff effectiveness. They, however, reported several generalizations which may have validity. One generalization was that if members of boards of education and heads of school systems indicated a constructive interest in the welfare of the personnel, they would have received excellent cooperation and maximum performance from teachers and professional workers. Another generalization was that there "appeared to be a relationship between provisions for welfare and the mental and physical health of teachers as well as their loyalty to the school system." The most important generalization was that the quality of instruction was improved when fringe benefit provisions for teachers were adopted by the board of education. Kindred and Woodard (1963) concluded that instructional efficiency could not be conceived apart from the physical, intellectual, and emotional capabilities of teachers who direct the learning process.
Levin (1973) cited two reasons why fringe benefits were important to employees. First, he claimed that as a practical matter, a person who works hard and faithfully for a lifetime was entitled to dignity and security in old age and to freedom from fear that an illness affecting him or his family would bankrupt him. Second, there was a social obligation to insure that employees would be fed, housed and clothed during work and retirement, cared for medically, and given adequate compensatory time. Levin (1973) concluded that this was nothing more or less than simple humanity and recognition of employees as fellow human beings.

Allen (1964) reiterated Levin's (1973) claim that a fringe-benefit program was important as a social obligation placed upon employees. Prior to World War II, fringe benefits were thought of as gratuities of employers to the pressing need of workers for an increased monetary wage for the essentials of life, food, rent and clothing. After the war, workers began seeking ways to secure social benefit and security. Social security on a shared basis for workers had already been legislated. Workmen's compensation also had become a responsibility of the employer for protecting his employees from the economic hazard of job-connected injuries or illnesses. Pension plans were negotiated to keep former employees financially secure in their old age. Health and welfare plans were established as social obligations of an
employer to pay part of the costs of the illnesses for individual workers and their families. Other supplementary benefits were established to impose a social responsibility upon the employer.

Allen (1964) classified three general types of fringe benefits which were established to provide workers certain social benefits. The benefits were: penalty-premiums, time-off, and economic hazard protections. The penalty-premiums benefits were established for the purpose of enforcing a given social standard of working habits. Minimum standards of working habits were established through laws, private negotiations or contracts. Employers were penalized if they caused their employees to deviate from the minimum standard of working habits.

Time-off without loss of customary income for certain activities was considered social in nature. Time-off benefits were established to provide vacations, to recover from illness, to celebrate religious and historical holidays and to provide personal leave.

Economic-hazard protection benefits were established to alleviate the hardships of illness, unemployment, old age, and death. The provisions of these benefits were extended to cover a worker's dependents.

Allen (1964) concluded that fringe benefits were not forms of wages in payments for actual personal services, but
they were represented as new, non-wage, social obligations. She contended that the employer had two obligations attendant upon his use of employee services: the first was to compensate employees adequately for the actual service they rendered; and the second was to assume certain obligations essentially unrelated to production of a social nature for employees.

Friedlander (1964) reported that fringe benefits also were important in helping employees escape from tax burdens. Employees were allowed to defer a portion of their incomes until after retirement when presumably taxes would be low. Employers offered the employees many fringe benefits that the individual formally paid after taxes were deducted.

In addition to tax advantages, Castetter (1971) cited other advantages attributed to the importance of fringe benefits. He maintained that fringe benefits contributed to staff security and caused school systems to be in a competitive position to attract new college graduates. Fringe benefits were assumed to be economical because they could be purchased in quantity. Another advantage was that efforts to incorporate fringe benefits into total compensation packages encountered less resistance than did proposals for salary increases.

Dunn and Rachel (1971) claimed that, theoretically, fringe-benefit programs were designed to attract, hold, and
motivate workers needed by organizations. Carvell (1975) maintained that a fringe-benefit program was an important part of job incentives used to motivate and satisfy human needs. He asserted that the most powerful motivation included a combination of material and psychological rewards.

Dubrin (1972) indicated that Maslow's (1970) hierarchy and Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory were two of the major works concerning needs, motivation, and satisfaction of employees. Maslow (1970) explained that human needs were ordered in a hierarchy, with physiological needs the lowest and most basic, followed in ascending order, by safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization needs.

Strauss and Sayles (1967) described Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs theory as it was related to personnel administration. They asserted that once employees' physical needs, food, clothing, and shelter, were satisfied reasonably well, they became concerned with other needs. The needs for safety or security for protection against danger, threats, and deprivations were next to be satisfied. Physical and safety needs were satisfied usually through pay, seniority, and fringe benefits.

Strauss and Sayles (1967) concluded that when the standard of living was raised so that security was assumed,
social needs were of priority, followed by egotistic needs. The ultimate form of accomplishment, self-actualization, was sought only when most of the less pressing needs were satisfied. In addition, Maslow (1970) stated the following:

Needs must be understood not to be exclusive or single determiners of certain kinds of behavior. Most behavior is multimotivated. ... Within the sphere of motivational determinants any behavior tends to be determined by several or all of the basic needs simultaneously rather than by only one of them.

Dubrin (1972) claimed that Herzberg's (1966) theory was an extension of Maslow's (1970) theory of motivation. He described the motivation-hygiene theory of work as a dichotomy between job satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Satisfiers were described as job content factors which caused positive feelings resulting in personal satisfaction. Dissatisfiers were explained as job content factors which caused negative feelings toward the job resulting in personal dissatisfaction. Satisfiers were called motivators and dissatisfiers were called hygiene factors. Herzberg (1966) stated the following:

Five factors stand out as strong determiners of job satisfaction-achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement— the last three being of greater importance for lasting change of attitudes.... The major dissatisfiers were company policy and administration, supervisions, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.... The principal result of the analysis of this data was to suggest that the hygiene of maintenance events led to job dissatisfaction because of a need to avoid unpleasantness; the motivator events, led to job
satisfaction because of a need for growth or self-actualization....The factors that led to satisfaction (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement) are mainly unipolar, that is, they contribute very little to job dissatisfaction. Conversely, the dissatisfiers (company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary) contribute very little to job satisfaction.

Dubrin (1972) stated that employees, "may be dissatisfied if fringe benefits were missing or inadequate, but their existence does not elicit real motivation from people. Fringe benefits and other dissatisfiers appeal to deficit, not growth needs."

Although the satisfaction or lack of satisfaction of maintenance factors had relatively little influence upon motivation, Megginson (1967) stated that, "up to the subsistence level, which differs with different individuals, the material incentives are very adequate for stimulating employees." It was concluded that some needs were more important than others for certain categories of employees.

Measurement of Individual Preferences for Fringe Benefits

Polacheck's (1970) research showed that serious problems of benefit plans were caused by an increasing number of fringe benefits. During 1930, less than 5% of the total compensation package was in terms of fringe benefits.
During 1970, fringe benefits were approximately 25% of the total compensation packages represented by noncash benefits. It was reported in the National Underwriter (1981) that negotiated employee benefits improved substantially in 1981 with no indication that unions were trading fringe benefits for increased wages or job security.

Locke (1975) stated the problems of benefit plans were attributed, to a considerable degree, to practices which were followed in establishing fringe-benefit programs. Many of the fringe benefits were negotiated for union-represented employees and other non-union groups without serious consideration being given to their appropriateness and possible impact. Locke (1975) stated the following:

During the 1950's, as a result of the experience of World War II and the Korean War, when wages and salaries were subject to governmental controls, it was generally accepted that the latter group should receive compensation improvements equal at least to those that were negotiated for the company's union-represented employees.... Salaried employees thereupon became subject to collective, mass treatment, with little room for recognition of their different needs and expectations....

Jones (1974) researched the dramatic change in employee benefits. He asserted that management had to provide diverse kinds of benefits to keep pace with a changing society. He claimed that management also had to involve the work force in its benefit planning decisions. He stated
that, "a younger, better-educated work force will demand what they want in the way of benefits."

Frost (1973) asserted that in a changing society, there should be an acceptance of the role an individual could play in the decision-making process. He suggested that management also had to involve the work force in its benefit planning decisions.

Efforts to improve the planning of benefit packages were described by Locke (1975). He stated that, "companies today are recognizing that, for effective results, separate total-compensation packages are needed for different groups of employees." Total-compensation packages were made up of cash and non-cash elements which specifically met the needs and desires of employees in the group. A compensation package was based on the philosophy of the company and was integrated effectively with statutory benefit programs. Each compensation package was to include logically integrated elements to satisfy the needs and expectations of the employees.

Methods for Determining Employee Benefits

McCaffery (1972) described three methods for determining employee satisfaction/dissatisfaction preferences for
benefits and grouped them as follows: emotional, rational, and empirical.

**Emotional Methods**

The emotional method was described as including traditional, reactive, and unplanned approaches which were used prior to the 1960's. McCaffery (1972) said that, "they often reflect irrational assumptions by top executives who believe that they have special insights into what employees really need or want." Locke (1975) stated that, "in some companies, the program has 'just grown' with additions and changes being made piecemeal."

The typical emotional method was based upon isolated experiences. Long-term disability plans were adopted when popular employees had long-term illnesses. A sympathetic reaction was created which resulted in a decent and considerate action. McCaffery (1972) maintained, however, that unless a plan was evaluated against the collective needs of all employees, and funds were available for benefits, critical needs such as temporary disability pay, major medical insurance, and adequate pensions could have been neglected.

The emotional method was thought to have played a legitimate role in decisions about employee benefits. In
view of other methods, however, the use of the emotional method was minimized.

Rational Methods

The rational methods were described as, "attempts to collect information for the purpose of planning benefit programs." The rational methods were used, in one form or another, to ask employees their views on benefits. An informal approach was one of the ways of applying a rational method to collect data from employees. Employers and personnel representatives frequently used the informal approach to collect information during their regular contacts with employees. Another technique was to hold interviews with a selected sample of employees to elicit their ideas and criticisms.

The opinion survey was used as the most formal and thorough method of the rational methods. The survey often was conducted by outside specialists. Employees, therefore, were likely to give their opinions on many aspects of the benefit program without fear of reprisal or embarrassment. The opinion surveys were systematic methods of collecting data, but they reflected only the feelings of employees.
Rational methods were different from empirical methods in that the approaches were often unsystematic. McCaffery (1972) said that, "rational methods provide valuable background for determining needs, but they should be used in conjunction with empirical data for optimum results."

**Empirical Methods**

The empirical methods were described as systematic efforts to collect objective data on which judgments of employee needs could be based. Employee information systems, facilitated by modern computers, were used to provide a wealth of information for assessing employee benefit needs. It was assumed that employees had different needs, concerns, and interests.

It was recognized that benefit needs and preferences of employees varied. Some employers provided options in their benefit plans. One option was provided by using a "cafeteria" approach. The "cafeteria" approach was a program in which an employee had an opportunity to select benefits based upon his individual needs. The employee was assigned a certain amount of compensation that could be divided between benefits and cash. Belcher (1974) claimed that the cafeteria approach was based on research evidence.
that there were individual differences among persons in the values they attached to various benefits.

Although the cafeteria approach was advantageous for choices of benefits, there were some disadvantages. One of the disadvantages of the cafeteria approach was that payroll accounting was complicated. The problem, however, was minor because of computerized accounting. Another disadvantage was that of employees choosing benefits which did not protect them during their illnesses.

One of the most important items among fringe benefits were insurance coverage. The cost of insurance coverage was considered a disadvantage when employees selected benefits through the cafeteria approach. The cost of insurance was assumed to have been in proportion to the number of employees enrolled. Unless most employees had need for insurance protection, the cost advantage would be reduced.

To overcome some of the disadvantages of the cafeteria approach, it was suggested that a limited number of benefit packages be developed to fit varying needs of employees. Employees might be given a choice of two or three packages within an equal-costing program. It was suggested also that basic items, such as insurance, should be placed in each package to eliminate the possibility of insecurity of employees.
The cafeteria approach was used to bring to the attention of employees that money was spent on benefits they wanted. Before any package or individual benefit was offered, a survey of needs and preferences of employees would be conducted. The major advantage was that employees were permitted to make decisions on needs and preferences.

Using an empirical method to determine employee preferences, Nealey (1964) reported the following:

The paired comparison method was applied to measure the preferences of 1,133 members of a trade union among a pay raise, a union shop proposal, a vacation, a shorter work week, hospital insurance, and a pension increase. Hospital insurance was most preferred while the shorter work week was least preferred. Differences in preferences were markedly related to age and seniority, moderately related to physical—clerical type job, marital status, and number of dependent children. Preference for the pay raise was scarcely related to the demographic variables. The preference judgments were highly transitive and allowed the six (6) compensation options to be ranked in an ordinal scale. Nealey (1964) asserted that this type of research, "may be a step toward securing valid preference information in a usable form, as a step toward the identification and measurement of the determinants of satisfaction/dissatisfaction preference."

As a result of using empirical research methods for determining the preferences of employees, an individual selected the coverages in a total compensation package which he believed relevant to his situation. McCaffery (1972)
stated that, "the advent of the computer has made the program possible, yet because of the burden on communication processes only a few organizations have ventured into this area."

Factors Used in Determining Employee Benefits

Belcher's (1974) research showed that during the 1970's, the benefit structure in the United States was based on competition among organizations to attract and to retain employees rather than on careful analysis of employee needs and preferences. The practice of providing particular benefit programs because they existed in other organizations was considered unimportant in determining the needs and preferences of employees. Megginson (1967) stated the following:

For fringe benefits to be most effective they must be geared to the preferences of employees....In general, as employees' income, age, and length of service increase, their attitude toward the fringes become more favorable. Also, workers with favorable job attitudes favor sick leave, vacations, and pensions, while those with unfavorable attitudes prefer pay raises.

Frost (1973) asserted that relatively few managers had taken advantage of recent findings in motivational research to balance the elements of direct and indirect compensation. He claimed that studies on age and education as satisfaction/dissatisfaction factors indicated that young,
educated managers tended strongly to prefer merit-based compensation and current cash rather than security-oriented elements. As managers advanced in age, they changed their preferences to secured forms of income such as pensions, profit sharing, and deferrals.

Other factors used to determine employee benefits were reported by Belcher (1974). He confirmed that employee needs depended on the composition of the work force of the organizations: age, sex, family status, labor market commitment, and length of company service. The need to protect middle-aged, married, and experienced workers from loss of income is much greater than the need to protect the young, unmarried, and inexperienced workers. Middle-aged, married, and experienced workers, generally, signify their long-term commitments to the organization.

It was assumed that women teachers had less need for high salaries and fringe benefits because their salaries often were supplementing the wages of their husbands. The roles of men and women, however, have changed. These changes had an impact on both men and women in relation to needs for fringe benefits.

The number of years of teaching experience would be expected to affect the values teachers placed on fringe benefits. Teachers who were beginning their careers might be concerned with obtaining professional benefits, such as
paid tuition, while teachers with several years of experience may be concerned with obtaining insurance benefits or time-off-with-pay benefits.

Teachers with a spouse or children to support may be expected to attach great value to insurance benefits, such as hospitalization and life. Single individuals, who do not provide support to dependents may attach less value to insurance benefits. Similarly, teachers who are sole wage-earners for a family may be expected to have different preferences for fringe benefits than those whose incomes are supplemental.

The type of fringe-benefit programs for employees was influenced often by the size of an organization. In large firms or metropolitan areas, employees received more benefits than did employees of small firms or rural areas.

Edwards (1970) determined that many factors such as age, size of organization and sex, were considered in determining fringe-benefit programs. Edwards (1970) selected age, sex, degree status, years of teaching experience, marital status, and number of dependent children for classroom teachers in the City of Richmond, Virginia. He concluded that age, sex, and years of teaching experience were related significantly to teacher satisfaction/dissatisfaction for fringe benefits. The biographical factors of degree status, marital status, and number of
dependents were found to be of little significance when compared with age, sex, and years of teaching experience.

Wilson and Moon (1972) conducted a study to determine the importance of selected categories of employee benefits to teachers. Wilson and Moon (1972) categorized fifty-one employee benefits under the following headings: security benefits; fringe benefits; working conditions; and professional benefits. Size of school systems, sex, tenured status, and level of instruction were used as factors to determine the satisfaction/dissatisfaction of teachers for selected categories of employee benefits. Wilson and Moon (1972) reported the following results:

1. Teachers of different sex, teaching levels, and tenure status differed significantly in the importance placed on the security benefits category.

2. There was a significant difference in the importance placed on the fringe benefits category by teachers employed in school systems of different size classifications.

3. The importance placed upon the working condition benefits category was significantly different for teachers of different sex, varying school system size, and different tenure status across the levels of teaching.
4. The importance of the professional benefits category was significantly different between tenured and nontenured male teachers at the secondary level of teaching.

**Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation/Hygiene Theory**

The two-factor theory of job satisfaction proposed by Herzberg, Mousner and Snyderman (1959) has produced considerable controversy. It not only contradicts the traditionally dimensional model of job satisfaction but also was at variance with the earlier findings of Herzberg, Mousner, Peterson and Capwell (1957) which were based on an extensive review of the literature. In compiling data from fifteen (15) studies involving over 28,000 employees in which factors related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were ranked. Herzberg, et.al. (1957) found "wages" (an extrinsic factor) and "opportunity for advancement" (an intrinsic factor) ranked first and second, respectively, in contributing to job dissatisfaction, while "security" and "company policy and administration" (both extrinsic factors) were rated first and second, respectively, in contributing to job satisfaction.

This researcher reviewed studies in the field of education in which Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory was
tested. These studies are presented below in chronological order.

E. D. Johnson (1967) investigated factors related to teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction were examined utilizing a questionnaire on job attitudes and critical incidents. The sample included 415 teachers selected from 9 elementary schools and 8 high schools in the DeKalb County, Georgia, School System. Four of Herzberg's (1966) motivaters (achievement, recognition, work itself and responsibility) and one hygiene factor (interpersonal relations) had statistical significance in affecting teacher satisfaction. Four of Herzberg's hygiene factors (policy and administration, working conditions, status and personal life) had statistical significance in affecting teacher dissatisfaction. The factor advancement, which had contributed to the satisfaction of accountants and engineers in the Herzberg (1966) study failed to contribute to satisfaction of teachers.

In Thomas J. Sergiovanni's (1967) replication of Herzberg's study, using teachers in a county in New York state, Herzberg's (1966) theory was supported. Contributors to job satisfaction were achievement, recognition and responsibility. Factors contributing to teacher dissatisfaction were interpersonal relations with students, teachers and peers, technical supervision, school policies and
administration, and personal life. The contributors of all but one of Herzberg's (1966) 16 factors were in the direction predicted by the two-factor theory. Only the motivator work itself contributed to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. There was not significant difference in the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction according to teacher's sex, tenure status or type of school (elementary or secondary).

Allen (1964) investigated the generality of Herzberg's (1966) motivation-maintenance theory with another occupation group—commercial bank employees. The 1,014 employees responding to the questionnaire were at all levels within the three largest banks in a western state. Respondents were asked to: (1) describe a time when they were particularly satisfied (strongly motivated) and (2) describe a time when they felt particularly dissatisfied (lack of motivation), in any job they held in the bank. Responses were analyzed for content and coded into six motivation and ten maintenance categories which were developed by Herzberg (1966).

The four hypotheses tested were strongly supported by the data. Motivation factors were statistically significant as primarily related to job satisfaction and maintenance factors were statistically significant as primarily related to job dissatisfaction for all respondents tested. The
results give further validity to the Herzberg (1966) theory. Medved (1971) determined the applicability of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory to public school educators.

Two questionnaires were constructed for the investigation. The first (the "satisfier" questionnaire) pair compared fourteen job factors, listed by Myers (1972) in a report of a test which supported Herzberg's (1966) theory, in order to determine which of them provided for the satisfaction of teachers in their work. The second (the "dissatisfier") pair compared the same fourteen factors in order to determine which of them provided for the dissatisfaction of teachers.

The results of the investigation rejected the hypothesis that job factors that provide for the satisfaction of teachers in their work are those job factors identified by Herzberg. Yet the results tend to support the hypothesis that principals perceive the job satisfaction factors identified by Herzberg (1966) to be valid factors and those factors that cause dissatisfaction to be the one identified by Herzberg (1966).

The overall results of the study suggests that the Herzberg (1966) theory itself does not appear to generally apply to public school teachers. Chung (1977) investigated Herzberg's (1966) Motivation-Hygiene Theory using employees of the Panama Canal Company. In order to determine the
generality of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, questionnaires were administered to 408 employees of the Maintenance Division of the Panama Canal Company. Analysis of the data revealed that 185 employees responded in an acceptable manner to the job satisfaction question and 144 employees responded to the job dissatisfaction question.

The overall findings of the study rejected the null hypothesis which stated that no difference exists between motivator and hygiene facts in their relationship to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction; and confirmed the alternative hypothesis, and strongly supported the Motivation/Hygiene Theory.

Julio S. Leon (1973) investigated Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory among two samples, each composed of 250 professors from selected state colleges and universities in the states of Oklahoma, Kansas, Arkansas and Missouri. Two data collection instruments were used, one with each sample, on utilizing the Herzberg methodology and the other using an alternative technique. Both studies supported the two-factor theory. However, the alternative methodology produced three hygiene factors (interpersonal relations with students, status and interpersonal relations with peers) which acted as motivators.

Gene L. Schmidt (1976) research of Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory was tested on 74 suburban Chicago school
administrators, employing the critical incident method of inquiry. The results indicated strong support for the Herzberg (1966) theory. School administrators appeared to be most highly motivated by achievement, recognition and advancement. Salary, good interpersonal relations, effective policy and administration, and supervision contributed little to job satisfaction, but when not effectively present were highly dissatisfying to the administrator. One motivator factor, responsibility, was reported as being a dissatisfier.

**Summary**

The present literature suggest that our conceptualization of the job satisfaction determinant model was grossly oversimplified. Nonetheless, a number of conclusions can be drawn from the existing research. In the reviewed studies of worker satisfaction/dissatisfaction, no single factor was found to be a key to explaining worker satisfaction/dissatisfaction. The four facets found to be most influential in determining workers' level of satisfaction, in their work order, include challenges, resources, comfort and financial rewards (Barnowe, 1971). Also, Herzberg's (1966) motivators and hygienes account for most of the variance in worker satisfaction and motivators were more
important to worker satisfaction than were hygiene factors (Lindsay, Marks and Gorlaw, 1967).
CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose of this Chapter was to describe the research design population and sampling procedures, the instrument used to collect the data, the data collection procedures and data treatment procedures.

Research Design, Population and Sampling Procedures

The design of the study was the pretest/posttest control group design based on a stratified random sampling. The initial population for this study included all full-time employees of the Atlanta Public Schools. As of the beginning of the 1983-84 school year, there was a total of 7,520 full-time teachers, administrators, clerical, environmental service and food service employees in the Atlanta Public Schools. For this study a proportional stratified sampling procedure was used. According to Paul D. Leedy (1974) a population contains definite strata with differing characteristics and each strata had a proportionate ratio in terms of numbers of members to every other
strata. The sampling plan used divided the employees of the Atlanta Public Schools into the eight (8) accounting categories used by the Georgia State Department of Education. These eight (8) categories were used by the state to fund (economically) public education in Georgia.

The procedures used in drawing the sample of employees were as follows:

1. The employees of the Atlanta Public Schools (APS) were stratified by member of the accounting unit of the State Audit Department as indicated in Table 3.1.

2. A ten per cent (10%) random sample was drawn from a list of all employees in the APS System. The sample was prepared by the Statistical Unit of the Atlanta Public Schools from a computer data bank.

3. From the ten per cent (10%) random sample, employees were drawn at random and initially assigned to one of two groups: (1) control group and (2) Indirect Treatment group. This procedure was used until the required number was reached for each group shown in Table 3.2. A further random sampling of ten per cent (10%) of the indirect treatment group was used to select the members of the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group.
TABLE 3.1

STATE OF GEORGIA AUDIT DEPARTMENT CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Classification</th>
<th>Member of Accounting Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>4,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration Services</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Service</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Support Services</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Food and Nutrition Services</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.2

**Total Number of Employees, Number of Employees Selected in Study Sample, and Sampling Ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees</th>
<th>Sampling Ratios</th>
<th>Number of Employees in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Services</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Staff</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration Services</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Support Services</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Food and Nutrition Services</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7,520 749
Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was developed by Dr. Alfred P. Wilson and Dr. Edward F. Moon. The instrument was designed by the two professors to be completed by school employees. Items on the Employee Benefits Questionnaire (EBQ) were revised to improve the scope of terms used. The reliability of a measuring instrument was its ability to yield similar values of each successive application to an unchanged situation. The authors of the Employee Benefits Questionnaire reported internal consistency reliabilities of the EBQ based on the responses of 12,319 public school employees employed in the State of New Mexico (Wilson, Moon, 1972).

Wilson and Moon (1972) conducted a study testing the importance and priority of employee benefits to public school employees. The underlying goal was to provide information to those persons responsible for obtaining effective employee benefits decisions within the education profession. Included in the decision-making group were administrators, teacher organizations, school board members and state legislators. Working either individually or jointly, these groups attempted to provide or acquire those benefits believed to best serve the needs of their organi-
zations. The instrument was proved reliable by its use in many studies. Validity was determined by what the instrument measured in reference to what this research intended to measure.

The questionnaire, Employee Benefits Questionnaire, developed by Dr. Wilson and Dr. Moon (1972) was constructed in two sections. On Section A the following seven (7) categories of biographical data are requested: (1) enrollment of school district, (2) grade of present assignment, (3) administrative responsibilities, (4) sex, (5) age in years, (6) tenure status, (7) working experience and (8) certification level. In Section B, fifty-one (51) fringe benefits were listed. Respondents were asked to rate their degree of satisfaction on each of the benefits. A seven-point Likert scale ranging from one (not satisfied) to seven (very satisfied) was used to obtain the responses. A copy of the instrument appeared in the Appendix.

Treatment

The Direct Treatment (Delegate) group was the initial treatment group which received detailed information consisting of why benefits packages were undertaken, the cost of benefits packages, examination of how benefits were grouped for pooled insurance results, and a comparison of
the fringe benefits packages of the other metro sister school systems. During their three-day workshop they received detailed information from the researcher on the implication of each item in the benefits questionnaire to the budget of the Atlanta Public Schools with particular information on what implication the items had on the taxing capacity of the school system. It was the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group's duty to design or modify the existing fringe benefits package of the Atlanta Public Schools, to present and test the Indirect Treatment group with the new benefits package. The Direct Treatment (Delegate) group administered the posttest to the Indirect Treatment group during a one-day workshop, the new benefits package, but not in the same detail as the researcher had explained it to them.

The Intervention Socialization Process

1. Individuals were randomly assigned to the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group. Members selected for this group were notified by mail of their selection and were asked to participate in the study. Included in the letter was the time, date and place of the three (3) workshops to be held for this group.
2. During the groups first meeting an explanation of the purpose and selection process was given. The group was given an overview of employee benefits with specific emphasis placed upon the historical and present employee benefits package of APS.

3. The group was introduced to the existing employee benefits packages of the surrounding metropolitan school systems: Cobb County, Fulton County, DeKalb County and Gwinnett County. The benefits packages was examined in relation to their cost both to the individual and the school system, to the number of students and employees as it compared to the employee benefits package of APS. The comparison was made on the kinds of benefits offered, the uniformity of the benefits structure, and the apparent universality of the benefits.

4. The group was asked to study the material given and have prepared for the next meeting their reaction to the employee benefits packages.

5. During the next meeting of the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group, the group was polled for their research on the benefits package. During this meeting and the subsequent one the group went through the consultative process draft a new employee benefits package for the employees of APS.
Data Collection

To collect the data for the study, a questionnaire and an accompanying letter was mailed to each employee in the sample. In order to facilitate later data analysis, employees were asked to record their responses on optical scan forms.

Data Analyses

The researcher administered the pretest which was in the form of a questionnaire electing opinions on items pertaining to the existing fringe benefits package of the Atlanta Public School System. This pretest was administered to the control, Indirect Treatment and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups with no explanation as to its purpose. It was portrayed simply as a request by the respondent to give their opinions on a seven-point (7) scale for each of the fifty-one (51) fringe benefits items listed.

After responses were recorded on optical scan forms, these forms were processed by an optical scanning device and a data set created which was readily accessible to the computer system of the Atlanta Public Schools. Hypothesis testing and related statistical information was done by
procedures outlined in a updated version of the Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences called SPSS-X.

The first step in the statistical tabulation of the
data consisted of obtaining a total score for each question-
aire. This was done by totaling the fifty-one (51)
responses, each of which was in the form of a numerical
response. Since the numerical value of each response ranged
from one, indicating a very low degree of satisfaction, to
seven indicating a very high degree of satisfaction, the
lowest possible total score was 51 and the highest possible
total score was 357. Thus, the total scores obtained formed
a continuum ranging from low to high in regard to the degree
of satisfaction as related to the fringe benefits package
being examined. This total score obtained for each
questionnaire was the dependent variable in the study and
was the primary variable of interest in the testing of the
various hypothesis.

The variable to be examined or the dependent variables
in the study were the total score made by each respondent on
the EBQ. This total score is the sum obtained by adding the
fifty-one (51) different responses. The total score formed
the basis for the testing of the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:** There was no significant difference between
the Indirect Treatment, control and Direct
Treatment (Delegate) groups on the total pretest scores.

Hypothesis 2: There was no significant difference between the total scores made by the overall groups (Indirect Treatment, control, Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups, combined) on the pretest and those made on the posttest.

Hypothesis 3: There was no significant difference between the total scores made by each of the three groups (Indirect Treatment, control, and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups) on the pretest and those made on the posttest.

Hypothesis 4: There was no significant difference between the Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups on the total scores made on the posttest.

These hypothesis were tested first to the .05 level of significance. Cases in which a hypothesis was significant to the more stringent .01 level were rated. The .05 level was apparently first chosen by Sir R. A. Fisher in 1950. Kerlinger (1965) pointed out that the .05 level and the .01
level were the most widely advocated and used. Significance at the .05 level meant that an obtained result could occur by chance not more than five times in 100 trials. A similar interpretation was attached to the .01 level.
CHAPTER IV

The intent of this chapter was to present and analyze data to determine the relative effectiveness of a participation intervention (socialization) process on the level of satisfaction for an employee benefits package.

Data Analysis

This section presented descriptive data as well as information pertaining to the various hypothesis. Tables were presented along with narrative explanation. Responses on the questionnaire used on the pretest which consisted of items pertaining to the old fringe benefits package were referred to as "Old Fringe Benefits" while the posttest which consisted of items pertaining to to the new fringe benefits package were referred to as "New Fringe Benefits".

Table 1 presented descriptive statistics on the total scores attained on the pretest (Old Fringe Benefits) and the posttest (New Fringe Benefits). Given in this table were the number of employees, mean, and standard deviation for each of the groups. An explanation of this table indicated that not all members of the Indirect Treatment group who
took the pretest also took the posttest. The same was true for the control group. Conversely, the number of Direct Treatment (Delegate) group members who took the posttest was more than the number who took the pretest.

The data was reported first in the order of the hypotheses and then further analysis was conducted and relationships discerned.

Hypothesis one states that there was no significant difference between the three groups (Indirect Treatment, control, and Direct Treatment (Delegate) in the pretest condition.

The data with respect to the analysis of variance (ANOVA) used to test this hypothesis were stated in Table 4.1. In the table, the means for the three groups were about the same. The f-value was significant at .2343 level, hence the hypothesis was accepted, there being no difference in the perception of fifty-one (51) items (old fringe benefits) by the three (3) groups.

Discussion

The hypothesis assumed that since the groups were randomly determined they would have the same experience, views, etc. irrespective of biographic data on the fifty-one (51) old fringe benefits. Hence, there will be no signifi-
TABLE 4.1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR INDIRECT TREATMENT, CONTROL, AND DIRECT TREATMENT (DELEGATE) GROUPS ON THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Total Score (Old Fringe Benefits)</th>
<th>Posttest Total Score (New Fringe Benefits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Treatment</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>214.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>213.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Treatment</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>208.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Delegate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>213.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2069.6757</td>
<td>1034.8378</td>
<td>.2343</td>
<td>.7912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>2967571.2870</td>
<td>4416.0287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>2969640.9627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cant differences in the perception of the fifty-one (51) items in the pretest condition.

Due to the mobility of the participants, it was not possible to maintain a one-to-one correspondence between each participant's pretest and posttest scores. Thus, the groups taking the pretest score and those taking the posttest had to be considered as two independent groups. Thus, the independent T-test was the statistical test of significance used for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis two states there was no significant difference between the entire pretest group and the entire posttest group on their perceptions of the new fringe benefits fifty-one (51) items test.

The results with respect to the hypothesis were stated in Table 4.2. In the table the means (228) of the posttest group were higher than that of the pretest group (213). The t-value was significant at the .05 level, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative —— there was a difference.

Discussion

The entire fringe benefits pretest group was equal to the control group, the Indirect Treatment group and the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group (before treatment). The posttest fringe benefits group was equal to the control
TABLE 4.2

COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST TOTAL SCORES
FOR THE ENTIRE GROUP OF PARTICIPANTS

T-TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>T-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>213.39</td>
<td>66.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>228.76</td>
<td>63.27</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Two: States there will be no significant difference between the entire pretest group and the entire posttest group on their perceptions of the new fringe benefits fifty-one items test.
group, the Indirect Treatment group and the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group (after treatment).

It can be assumed that this difference was due to the treatment. However, the breakdown cannot be established by the global data for each group. Hence, the difference could also be explained by exposure to the content of the items as well as the levels of exposure in the workshop and the delegates explanation of the new benefits items. In the next section of a matching of the pretest and posttest score for each group were analyzed to determine where the difference(s) lay.

Hypothesis 3 compares the total pretest scores and the total posttest scores for each of the groups. Since the pretest and posttest results could not be matched for each individual participant, the posttest results had to be considered as being independent of the pretest results for each of the Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups.

Hypothesis three states there were no significant difference between each pretest and posttest scores for each group.

The data with respect to this hypothesis were stated in Tables 4.3.1, 4.3.2, and 4.3.3. In Table 4.3.1 the mean score (224) for the posttest was higher than the pretest score (213) and this was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.
TABLE 4.3.1

COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST TOTAL SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>T-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>213.50</td>
<td>63.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>224.90</td>
<td>63.51</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Three: States there will be no significant difference between each pretest and posttest scores for each group.
Discussion

This means that the new fringe items alone were sufficient to cause the control group in the posttest condition to value the new package, hence increase their mean sums. Since they had not been exposed to the "socialization" (as per workshop) then it means that the perceived new benefits were of value alone to change their opinion, independent of socialization.

In Table 4.3.2 the mean scores of the posttest score (227) were higher than the pretest score (214) and hence the t-value was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

DISCUSSION

This means that the new items as well as socialization could be at work. However, the mean gain in score seems to be the same as for the control group. This would suggest that the socialization by Direct Treatment (Delegate) was not so strong and that it was the item that appealed to the respondents, hence causing the change in pretest and posttest conditions.
TABLE 4.3.2

COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST TOTAL SCORES FOR THE INDIRECT TREATMENT GROUP

T-TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>T-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>214.53</td>
<td>72.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>227.33</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Three: States there will be no significant difference between each pretest and posttest scores for each group.
In Table 4.3.3 the mean scores were substantially and significantly different in the pretest score (208) and the posttest score (251), hence the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Discussion**

This means that the socialization was very strong for this group. This was because the gain in score was higher than for the other two groups. The reason that they approved was because they liked the item but, in addition socialization also probably influenced them. However, it should be observed that this group was cultivated and hence probably why the socialization was an effective tool for small groups.

Hypothesis 4 pertains to the mean total posttest (new fringe benefits) scores made by the respective groups.

Hypothesis four states that there was no significant difference between the three groups in the posttest scores.

The data with respect to this hypothesis were stated in Table 4.4. The means were significantly different at the .05 level and beyond the level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4.4 presented information pertaining to the analysis of variance procedure used to compare the mean
### Table 4.3.3

**Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Total Scores for the Direct Treatment (Delegate) Group**

#### T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>T-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>208.37</td>
<td>58.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>251.62</td>
<td>64.44</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hyposthesis Three:** States there will be no significant difference between each pretest and posttest scores for each group.
TABLE 4.4

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR INDIRECT TREATMENT, CONTROL AND DIRECT TREATMENT (DELEGATE) GROUPS ON THE POSTTEST

POSTTEST TOTAL SCORES (NEW FRINGE BENEFITS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>F-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Treatment</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>63.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Treatment (Delegate)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>64.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Four: States that there will be no significant difference between the three groups in the posttest scores.
total scores for the three groups. A f-ratio of 5.38 was obtained. This was statistically significant beyond the .01 level. This indicated that the three groups differed significantly on the mean total posttest (new fringe benefits) score. The highest mean total posttest score was 251.62 made by the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group. The next highest score was the 227.33 average by the Indirect Treatment group. The lowest score was the 224.90 average by the control group.

In Table 4.4 the mean posttest score for the experimental socialized Direct Treatment (Delegate) group (workshop participants) were substantially higher (251) than the other group indicated that socialization more than the items themselves influenced the group.

Discussion

Overall, the table indicated that direct training made a greater independent contribution over and above the mere exposure to content benefits. Indirect training was not as effective as direct, and mere exposure to the benefit content serves only a slightly if not better chance of changing opinions.
Overall, the data indicated that the workshop experience as well as the new fringe benefits items changed the view of the participants.

In summary the testing of the four hypothesis in this study verified statistically the following conclusions:

1. The Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups under the pretest conditions prior to the treatment had equal perception of the old fringe benefits package.

2. The Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups, both individually and collectively in the posttest condition after the treatment, perceived the new fringe benefits package more favorably than the old fringe benefits package.

3. The Indirect Treatment, control and Direct Treatment (Delegate) groups perceived the new fringe benefits package differently, overall the Direct Treatment (Delegate) group had the highest perception of the new fringe benefits package while the Direct Treatment and control groups were almost equal.
CHAPTER V

This chapter summarized the study and offered conclusions, implications and recommendations.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the relative effectiveness of a planned intervention (socialization) process on the level of satisfaction for an employee fringe benefits package.

The study attempted to answer the following hypothesis related to the problem:

1. There was no significant difference between the Direct Treatment (Delegate), Indirect Treatment and control groups on the total pretest scores.

2. There was no significant difference between the total scores made by the overall groups (Direct Treatment (Delegate), Indirect Treatment and control groups, combined) or the pretest and those made on the posttest.

3. There was no significant difference between the total scores made by each of the three groups
(Direct Treatment (Delegate), Indirect Treatment and control) on the pretest and those made on the posttest.

4. There was no significant difference between the Direct Treatment (Delegate), Indirect Treatment and control groups on the total scores made on the posttest.

The design of the study was a pretest/posttest control group design based on a stratified random sampling. The initial population for this study included all full-time employees of the Atlanta Public Schools. As of the beginning of the 1983-84 school year there was a total of 7,520 full-time teachers, administrators, clerical, environmental service and food service employees in the Atlanta Public Schools. For this study a proportional stratified sampling procedure was used.

The data analyzed indicated that there was no significant difference in the pretest scores among the groups tested. The posttest scores of the group tested, however, indicated significant differences. A comparison of the pretest scores and the posttest scores for each of the groups tested indicated significant differences.

The statistical techniques used in making an analysis of the data presented in this study were: (1) the t-test which was appropriate for determining differences between effects
rather than the effects themselves. (2) The anova which was appropriate for explaining the significance between the means of two or more independent samples.

The data collected were processed through the computer at the Atlanta Public Schools Data Processing Center using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences X (SPSSX). The main fram computer for the Atlanta Public School System was an IBM 3033 and utilizes the normal channel configuration. The statistical treatment of the data provided very valuable information concerning the predictor variables in analyzing the old and new fringe benefits package.

**Findings**

The findings of this study suggested that when presenting an alternative or highly new product, service or condition to employees an approach should be used that utilizes the most involved process possible by the person or persons most responsible for implementing the alternative. The findings further point out that the alternative may be so persuasive that by mere exposure to the alternative it causes an alteration in opinion or possibly behavior. Yet conclusively, the findings indicate where possible the person with the authority for implementation and direction should be the one to address and explain the alternative.
Conclusions

From the findings obtained in this study, the following conclusions were presented:

1. Employees were as different as any other group yet their needs appear, in respect to this study to show a remarkable adaptness to conformity toward the end of being satisfied with like items.

2. Public education had the earned or unearned reputation of being dominated by women. This study showed that a larger percentage of women than men did perform services within the ranks of the employees of the Atlanta Public Schools. Yet the study did not reveal that women preferred or were satisfied any less than men with the item available.

3. The employees of the Atlanta Public Schools as a result of the findings of this study appeared to be more mature (age wise) than one might imagine working with an urban population. Yet the results of the study revealed that there appeared to be no significant difference in satisfaction for the item presented. Consistently, the research indicated that as a group the employees were satisfied with the items presented.

4. The findings of the study indicated that those
persons who were allowed the opportunity to receive instruction and explanation of the new fringe benefits items directly from the administrator responsible for administering and implementing the new fringe benefits package showed a higher satisfaction with the item introduced. It appeared the further away from the direct administrator axis you went the more the theory of negative rumor emphasized by Dr. C. Kirkpatrick (1968) seemed evident. There was less satisfaction by those persons not participating in the socialization (workshop) process than those who participated.

**Implications**

Direct training more than any other effect had remarkable results on the outcome of a given endeavor. Training should be done in small groups and as much as possible the training should be conducted by the administration responsible for the administration and implementation of the exercise. It appeared that the content of the material introduced by itself was a source of change and not only some organized socialization process.

This study raised implication for all other studies where there was a treatment in methodology of groups, teacher
aides, carpenters, etc., as well as a content used in the interface process. Too often treatment was described as the technology for altering the groups' opinions. Other times, the Democratic method was the catalyst for opinion altering while ignoring the content of the material. Thus, raising the issue that experimenters must break down the effects when reporting their findings.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings, as well as a review of the research and the related literature concerning this study, the researcher believed the following recommendations were appropriate.

1. Pertinent information regarding the scope of current fringe benefits programs and their cost to the school system should be effectively communicated to employees. All parties concerned may realize the ultimate benefits from existing programs based upon identified needs through the communication of information regarding all aspects of the fringe benefits programs.

2. An indepth study of fringe benefits should be conducted every two years to determine if there is a greater professional competency on the part of
the employee as it relates to the learning process and if the cost of providing these benefits is related to the quality of the education being received by the pupils.

3. Fringe benefits programs in a school system should be continuously evaluated with emphasis placed on the goals to be achieved by these benefits. In order to acquire the desired results from the fringe benefits being offered, the cost of those benefits and alternative programs must be taken into consideration.

4. This study listed fifty-one (51) fringe benefits items. A study should be conducted with a less extensive list of benefits.

5. Consideration should be given to discussion of fringe benefits in small informal groups, to further explain the value of property using one fringe benefits package.

6. The researcher further recommended that possibly at each work location (school site) a person can be identified, trained and used as a benefits resource person. That person must demonstrate that he/she has the complete confidence and encouragement from the administrator in charge of fringe benefits.
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APPENDIX
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A

This section is designed to acquire professional and biographical data. Please check the blanks where appropriate; in other cases, please fill in the blanks with the necessary information.

PROFESSIONAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. The approximate enrollment of your school district: (Check one)
   _____ less than 1,000
   _____ 1,000 to 2,500
   _____ 2,501 to 5,000
   _____ 5,001 to 10,000
   _____ 10,001 to 20,000
   _____ 20,000 or more

2. Present level of assignment teaching and others: (Check one)
   _____ K - 6
   _____ 7 - 8
   _____ 9 - 12
   _____ other (please specify) __________________________

3. If you have administrative responsibilities, please indicate the percent of time spent on these duties: ______

4. Sex: (Check one)
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

5. Age group: (Check one)
   _____ less than 30
   _____ 30 - 39
   _____ 40 - 49
   _____ 50 - 60
   _____ 60 - plus

6. Present tenure status: (Check one)
   _____ tenured
   _____ non-tenured

7. Working experience: Count this year as a full year of experience. ______ years of experience

8. Present classification level: (Check one)
   _____ Certified
   _____ Non-Certified
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section B

The purpose of this section is to identify which benefits are of the most importance to you. The items listed below have been identified as employee benefits. The (7) point scale to the right of each item ranges from 1 (not satisfied) through 7 (very satisfied). Please circle the number which best expresses the satisfaction of the item to you. Please respond to every item -- it is understood that your school district may or may not provide each of the benefits.

1. Sabbatical leave with pay
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

2. Liability insurance
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

3. Secretarial assistance
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

4. Tax sheltered annuity program
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

5. Latest teaching materials (software)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

6. Paid tuition for professional training
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

7. Extra pay for extra duties
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

8. Full pay while at professional meetings
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

9. Group major medical insurance
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

10. Teacher aide assistance
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

11. Severance pay
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

12. Military training leave (without pay)
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

13. Length of the work day
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

14. Latest teaching equipment (hardware)
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

15. Personal leave days (with pay)
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

16. Group dental insurance
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

17. Faculty dining room
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide

18. Salary schedule advancement credit for additional training
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide

19. Modern teaching facilities
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
SECTION B

20. Leave for jury duty (with pay)  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
21. Leaves of absence (without pay)  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
22. Professional library for faculty  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
23. District provided inservice training programs  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
24. Retirement program  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
25. Teaching supplies  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
26. Duty free lunch  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
27. Tenure  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
28. Freedom to determine teaching methods  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Not Provide
29. Participation in curriculum decisions  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
30. Group health and accident insurance  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
31. Few non-teaching duties  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
32. Paid expenses for professional meetings  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
33. Small student-teacher ratio  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Not Provide
34. School library  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
35. Participation in administrative decisions  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Not Provide
36. Worker's compensation insurance  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
37. Group income protection insurance  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
38. Group life insurance  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
39. Daily preparation period  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
40. Faculty work room  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Not Provide
41. Accumulative sick leave  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
42. Faculty lounge  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  District Does Provide
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Bereavement leave (with pay)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Freedom to discipline students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Not Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Grievance procedure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Legal protection in court actions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Not Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Maternity leave (without pay)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Opportunity to teach summer school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Salary schedule advancement credit for travel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Not Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Freedom to select texts and materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Not Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Release time to attend professional meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District Does Provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section A

This section is designed to acquire professional and biographical data. Please check the blanks where appropriate; in other cases, please fill in the blanks with the necessary information.

PROFESSIONAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. The approximate enrollment of your school district: (Check one)
   - less than 1,000
   - 1,000 to 2,500
   - 2,501 to 5,000
   - 5,001 to 10,000
   - 10,001 to 20,000
   - 20,001 or more

2. Present level of assignment teaching and others: (Check one)
   - K - 6
   - 7 - 8
   - 9 - 12
   - other (please specify) ____________________________

3. If you have administrative responsibilities, please indicate the percent of time spent on these duties: ______%

4. Sex: (Check one)
   - Male
   - Female

5. Age group: (Check one)
   - less than 30
   - 30 - 39
   - 40 - 49
   - 50 - 60
   - 60 - plus

6. Present tenure status: (Check one)
   - tenured
   - non-tenured

7. Working experience: Count this year as a full year of experience. ______ years of experience

8. Present classification level: (Check one)
   - Certified
   - Non-Certified
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS QUESTIONNAIRE

Section B

The purpose of this section is to identify which benefits are of the most importance to you. The items listed below have been identified as employee benefits. The (7) point scale to the right of each item ranges from 1 (not satisfied) through 7 (very satisfied). Please circle the number which best expresses the satisfaction of the item to you. Please respond to every item -- it is understood that your school district may or may not provide each of the benefits.

1. Sabbatical leave with pay 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
2. Liability insurance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
3. Secretarial assistance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
4. Tax sheltered annuity program 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
5. Latest teaching materials (software) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
6. Paid tuition for professional training 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
7. Extra pay for extra duties 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
8. Full pay while at professional meetings 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
9. Group major medical insurance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
10. Teacher aide assistance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
11. Severance pay 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
12. Military training leave (without pay) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
13. Length of the work day 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
14. Latest teaching equipment (hardware) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
15. Personal leave days (with pay) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
16. Group dental insurance 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
17. Faculty dining room 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Not Provide
18. Salary schedule advancement credit for additional training 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
19. Modern teaching facilities 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 District Does Provide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Does Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Leave for jury duty (with pay)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Leaves of absence (without pay)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Professional library for faculty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>District provided inservice training programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Retirement program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Teaching supplies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Duty free lunch</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Freedom to determine teaching methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Not Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Participation in curriculum decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Group health and accident insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Few non-teaching duties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Paid expenses for professional meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Small student-teacher ratio</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Not Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>School library</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Participation in administrative decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Not Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Worker's compensation insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Group income protection insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Group life insurance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Daily preparation period</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Faculty work room</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Not Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Accumulative sick leave</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Faculty lounge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Does Provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Bereavement leave (with pay)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Freedom to discipline students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Grievance procedure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Legal protection in court actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Maternity leave (without pay)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Opportunity to teach summer school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Salary schedule advancement credit for travel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Freedom to select texts and materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Release time to attend professional meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>