



SOCIAL SCIENCES

EDUCATION NUMBER 1

CORNELL UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES, A STATUTORY COLLEGE OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK

Factors influencing job satisfaction of lunchroom aides in selected New York State school districts¹

Arthur L. Berkey*

Introduction

Paraprofessionals are now widely used in New York State. Hixon et al. (1969: 4, 5) reported a total of 10,054 paid and 4854 voluntary paraprofessionals distributed in a wide range of types. Of these 14,909 paraprofessionals, the most numerous type was the lunchroom aide, with 3106 paid and 738 voluntary aides.

Several factors point to the continued and perhaps increased importance of paraprofessionals in the public schools. The federal government continues to fund innovative educational programs involving low teacher-pupil ratios. Many contracts negotiated by teacher organizations severely limit teacher performance of nonteaching duties — thus the need for personnel to perform these duties is created. Some of the new educational patterns gaining increasing popularity involve the use of paraprofessionals, for example, team teaching and alternative "free schools". In other cases, boards of education have employed paraprofessionals to handle increased enrollments rather than recruit additional professional staff.

Despite the widespread use of paraprofessionals in New York State, paraprofessional occupations as such have developed with little, if any, systematic planning. Administrators with responsibility for initiating and implementing pro-

grams for use of paraprofessionals find limited research data to answer the many questions requiring immediate decisions. For example, "What are the basic qualities and background factors to look for in recruitment and selection of paraprofessionals?" "What new employer skills will be needed for mutually satisfying working relationships?" "What type of status, roles, conditions of work, rewards, and career ladders will be necessary for job satisfaction levels that will promote recruitment and retention of competent paraprofessionals? Data to help provide answers to these and other related questions will be necessary if satisfactory occupations for paraprofessionals are to be developed.

¹ The data for this bulletin were collected as part of the study of school lunchroom para-professionals (Hixon 1970), which is part of a larger study of all paraprofessionals currently functioning in New York State school districts (see Hixon 1969). This research is being conducted by staff members of the Department of Education, N.Y. State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. The author served as a member of the research team for the findings reported here, which are the results of further analysis of the data in terms of job satisfaction. * Associate professor, Department of Education, New York State College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Purpose

Positive psychological and material job satisfaction of employed persons is one primary index of a dynamic occupation. The purpose of this study is to provide data that may be used in development of viable occupations for non-instructional paraprofessionals in New York State school districts. To accomplish this purpose, selected occupational factors are analyzed in terms of their relationship to levels of lunchroom aide job satisfaction, and the satisfaction of significant others (principals and teachers) with the lunchroom aides' job performance.

Methodology

From a population of 407 New York State school districts (New York City and common schools excluded) reporting 3106 paid lunchroom aides and 18 school districts reporting 738 voluntary aides, a random sample of 20 rural central schools, 20 suburban central schools and 5 enlarged city school districts was drawn. In these 45 school districts, 150 school buildings were selected on the basis of the criterion of having 3 or more lunchroom aides working in the building. Respondents for the study from the 150 buildings were all lunchroom aides and building principals, and a 25 percent random sample of teachers.

Respondents in 134 (89.3%) of the 150 buildings returned 1437 questionnaires. The division of respondents was 330 lunchroom aides, 979 teachers, and 129 building principals.

Facilities of the Office of Computer Services (OCS) at Cornell University were used to analyze the data.² The statistic used to determine relationships between variables was Kendall's tau for ordered contingency tables (Kendall 1962: 4-8, 34-8, 49-53). All significant values are at the probability level of .05 percent or greater.

Occupational Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction

Before proceeding with the data on the relationship of the occupational factors to job satisfaction, knowledge in two areas is important for interpreting the data. First is the distinction between the satisfaction that the lunchroom aides felt with their work, and the satisfaction with the aides' work as expressed by teachers and principals. Lunch-

room aides indicated their level, overall job satisfaction and satisfaction in each of the 5 component areas of job satisfaction as identified by Hulin (1964, 3) (persons worked with, supervision received, work done, promotions available, and pay received). Teachers and principals replied in terms of their overall satisfaction with job performance by lunchroom aides. Thus lunchroom aide responses reflect satisfaction with their job without any judgment of how well the job is performed. Teachers and principals are responding in terms of satisfaction with aide job performance, which does carry judgment of quality and importance.

The second area that is important for interpretation deals with the levels of satisfaction for lunchroom aides, teachers, and principals. Table 1 shows the mean satisfaction levels in terms of a 1-5 point scale where dissatisfied is rated 1, and satisfied as 5. Overall satisfaction is high — between somewhat satisfied (4) and satisfied (5). The component areas of satisfaction for lunchroom aides show lower satisfaction in the areas of "pay received" and "promotions available". A more comprehensive picture of the component satisfaction areas is presented in table 2, which shows that in the matter of promotion possibilities more than half (51.6%) of the aides are less than somewhat satisfied. Over 31 percent of aides are below somewhat satisfied for pay received, which should be interpreted in terms of most (86.4%) of the lunchroom aides working in a paid status.

In interpreting the overall versus the component areas of job satisfaction for lunchroom aides, it must be recognized that an average of the 5 composite satisfaction ratings cannot necessarily be equated with overall satisfaction, since not all components are of equal importance to all workers. For example, a worker may be satisfied with components 1-4 but dissatisfied with pay received. If dissatisfaction with pay received should outweigh the other components, this worker may be dissatisfied in overall satisfaction.

The 9 occupational areas related to job satisfaction are listed below; data for areas 1, 5, 6 and 8 are limited to

Table 1. *Mean satisfaction with lunchroom aides' job by aides, teachers, and principals*

Job condition	Mean† satisfaction level		
	Type of respondent		
	Lunchroom aides	Teachers	Principals
People worked with	4.78	*	*
Supervision received	4.70	*	*
Type of work	4.43	*	*
Promotions available	2.67	*	*
Pay received	3.55	*	*
Overall satisfaction	4.49	4.09	4.39
	N = 321	N = 959	N = 124

† Respondents rated satisfaction on 5-point scale of (1) dissatisfied to (5) satisfied.

* Data not applicable.

²Computer program used was a filter tau bivariate frequency table (FTAU) program from Institute for Social Sciences Research, Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Table 2. *Lunchroom aide job satisfaction in component areas*

<i>Job conditions</i>	<i>Satisfied</i>		<i>Somewhat satisfied</i>		<i>Neutral</i>		<i>Somewhat dissatisfied</i>		<i>Dissatisfied</i>	
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Persons with whom you work	294	91.0	19	5.9	6	1.9	4	1.2	0	0
Supervision you receive	287	90.3	21	6.6	8	2.5	2	.6	0	0
Work you do	239	75.2	44	13.8	20	6.3	13	4.1	2	.6
Promotions available	98	38.6	25	9.8	68	26.8	22	8.7	41	16.1
Pay you receive	148	48.5	58	19.0	36	11.8	24	7.9	39	12.8

responses by lunchroom aides. The other 5 areas (2-4, 7, and 9) are analyzed by responses of aides, followed by an analysis of teacher and principal responses in a separate section.

1. Background characteristics of lunchroom aides
2. Adequacy of job preparation
3. Definition and knowledge of lunchroom aide role
4. Importance of lunchroom aides job to aide and to others
5. Working conditions for lunchroom aides' job
6. Fringe benefits received
7. Professional and social status of lunchroom aides
8. Lunchroom aides' perception of degree of underemployment
9. Knowledge of criteria for evaluation of lunchroom aides

Satisfaction by Lunchroom Aides

Background characteristics

The background characteristics of lunchroom aides examined in this section are:

- a. length of time in position
- b. employment in a second job
- c. sex
- d. age
- e. marital status
- f. number of children
- g. years of school completed
- h. previous para-professional experience

None of these background characteristics were significantly³ related to the overall job satisfaction of lunchroom aides.

The characteristics of length of time in position (table 3), sex, and years of school completed (table 4) are significantly related to satisfaction with the work performed. Aides with shorter tenure have higher satisfaction, indi-

³ A significance (probability) level of .05 is used throughout this report.

Table 3. *Relationship between satisfaction with work done and length of time in position (N = 329)*

<i>Level of satisfaction</i>		<i>No response</i>	<i>Less than 1 year</i>		<i>1-3 years</i>		<i>More than 3 years</i>	<i>Total</i>
			<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>		
No response	No.	4	3	1	3	11		
	%	1.2	0.9	0.3	0.9	3.3		
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	1	1	2		
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6		
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	8	3	2	13		
	%	0.0	2.4	0.9	0.6	4.0		
Neutral (3)	No.	0	11	6	3	20		
	%	0.0	3.3	1.8	0.9	6.1		
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	26	11	7	44		
	%	0.0	7.9	3.3	2.1	13.4		
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	96	77	66	239		
	%	0.0	29.2	23.4	20.1	72.6		
Total percent								100.0

Tau = 0.133. Probability less than .05.

Table 4. *Relationship between satisfaction with work done and years of school completed (N = 329)*

<i>Level of satisfaction</i>		<i>No response</i>	<i>Years of school completed</i>							<i>Total</i>
			<i>Eighth grade or less</i>	<i>Some high school</i>	<i>High school graduate</i>	<i>Trade school</i>	<i>Some college</i>	<i>B.S. degree</i>	<i>Other</i>	
No response	No.	3	1	2	2	0	2	0	1	11
	%	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.3	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	0	7	0	6	0	0	13
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.8			4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	3	13	1	2	1	0	20
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.0	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	1	2	26	6	7	0	1	44
	%	0.3	0.3	0.6	7.9	1.8	2.1	0.0	0.3	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	10	48	140	11	18	6	4	239
	%	0.6	3.0	14.6	42.6	3.3	5.5	1.8	1.2	72.6
Total percent										100.0

Tau = -.180. Probability less than .05.

Table 5. *Relationship between satisfaction with promotions available and years of school completed (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Years of school completed							Total
			Eighth grade or less	Some high school	High school graduate	Trade school	Some college	B.S. degree	Other	
No response	No.	3	4	13	44	3	6	1	1	75
	%	0.9	1.2	4.0	13.4	0.9	1.8	0.3	0.3	22.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	1	0	26	2	11	1	0	41
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	7.9	0.6	3.3	0.3	0.0	12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	6	11	3	2	0	0	22
	%	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.3	0.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	6.7
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	11	42	3	7	2	3	68
	%	0.0	0.0	3.3	12.8	0.9	2.1	0.6	0.9	20.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	2	2	13	3	4	0	0	25
	%	0.3	0.6	0.6	4.0	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	7.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	5	23	54	4	5	3	2	98
	%	0.6	1.5	7.0	16.4	1.2	1.5	0.9	0.6	29.8
Total percent										100.0

$\tau = -.174$. Probability less than .05.

Table 6. *Relationship between satisfaction with supervision and employment in a second job (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Second job	No second job	Total
No response	No.	3	6	2	11
	%	0.9	1.8	0.6	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	6	2	8
	%	0.0	1.8	0.6	2.4
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	17	3	21
	%	0.3	5.1	0.9	6.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	266	21	287
	%	0.0	80.9	6.4	87.3
Total percent					100.0

$\tau = -.135$. Probability less than .05.

cating possible boredom with the static role of longer-tenured aides.

Almost all of the aides (96.7%) were females. While this high percentage prevents meaningful statistical comparisons, it is evident that the population that is willing and perhaps available for recruitment as lunchroom aides is female.

Table 4 shows that a majority (57.2) of the aides who had attended or completed high school were "satisfied" with the work they were doing. Educational level is also significantly related to satisfaction with availability of promotions (table 5) and pay received (table 7). Aides were generally less satisfied with these two areas, and a majority of the dissatisfied group had completed some or graduated from, high school.

Satisfaction with supervision is related to employment in

Table 7. *Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and years of school completed (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Years of school completed							Total
			Eighth grade or less	Some high school	High school graduate	Trade school	Some college	B.S. degree	Other	
No response	No.	3	2	5	10	0	4	0	0	24
	%	0.9	0.6	1.5	3	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	6	21	4	6	1	1	39
	%	0.0	0.0	1.8	6.4	1.2	1.8	0.3	0.3	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	2	14	2	4	1	0	24
	%	0.0	0.3	0.6	4.3	0.6	1.2	0.3	0.0	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	6	24	0	3	2	1	36
	%	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.3	0.0	0.9	0.6	0.3	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	2	8	38	3	7	0	0	58
	%	0.0	0.6	2.4	11.6	0.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	17.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	7	28	83	9	11	3	4	148
	%	0.9	2.1	8.5	25.2	2.7	3.3	0.9	1.2	45.0
Total percent										100.0

$\tau = -.099$. Probability less than .05.

Table 8. *Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and age (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Age of lunchroom aide						Total
			Under 20 years (1)	20-25 years (2)	26-29 years (3)	30-39 years (4)	40-49 years (5)	Over 49 years	
No response	No.	3	0	0	0	10	8	3	24
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.4	0.9	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	2	17	16	4	39
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	5.2	4.9	1.2	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	0	0	6	11	7	24
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.3	2.1	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	1	0	0	4	14	10	7	36
	%	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.3	3.0	2.1	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	0	1	18	28	11	58
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	5.5	8.5	3.3	17.8
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	1	1	4	44	55	43	148
	%	0.0	0.3	0.3	1.2	13.4	16.7	13.1	45.0
Total percent									100.0

Tau = .101. Probability less than .05.

a second job outside of school (table 6). The higher satisfaction of aides with a second job (80.9%) may indicate that the lunchroom aides' job is more satisfying when it is a supplementary source of income.

Satisfaction with pay received was related to years of school completed (table 7) and age (table 8). Aides age 30 or older, with high school level education, were most satisfied with the pay.

Adequacy of job preparation

Lunchroom aides that perceived themselves to be "adequately" or "well" prepared for their jobs tended to be satisfied overall (table 9) and satisfied with the work (table 10). The other 4 component areas of job satisfaction were not found to be significantly related to adequacy of preparation.

Table 9. *Relationship between overall job satisfaction and preparedness for job (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Poorly prepared (1)	Ade-quately prepared (2)	Well prepared (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	1	4	8
	%	0.9	0.0	0.3	1.2	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	2	10	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.0	3.6
Neutral	No.	1	0	8	16	25
	%	0.3	0.0	2.4	4.9	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	20	53	73
	%	0.0	0.0	6.1	16.1	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	28	182	210
	%	0.0	0.0	8.5	55.3	63.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .158. Probability less than .05.

Definition and knowledge of role

Lunchroom aides were asked to respond "yes" "uncertain", or "no" to the following 5 statements indicating how well they and the teachers knew what they should do in their job.

1. I know what my job includes.
2. Most teachers in this school know what my job includes.
3. I was given a written list of duties for my job.
4. I was told what to do in my job.
5. I know what *not* to do in my job.

Statement 1 was found to be positively related to overall satisfaction (table 11), satisfaction with supervision (table 12), and work done (table 13). Knowledge of what the aides' job does *not* include (statement 5) was also significantly related to overall satisfaction (table 14) and

Table 10. *Relationship between satisfaction with work done and preparedness for job (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Poorly prepared (1)	Ade-quately prepared (2)	Well prepared (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	8	11
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.6	4.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	1	12	13
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.6	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	1	0	7	12	20
	%	0.3	0.0	2.1	3.6	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	14	30	44
	%	0.0	0.0	4.3	9.1	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	36	203	239
	%	0.0	0.0	10.9	61.7	72.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .145. Probability less than .05.

Table 11. Relationship between overall job satisfaction and knowing what job includes (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	5	8
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	3	9	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.7	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	1	24	25
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	7.3	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	3	70	73
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	21.3	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	1	209	210
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	63.5	63.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = -.196. Probability less than .05.

Table 12. Relationship between satisfaction with supervision received and knowing what job includes (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	8	11
	%	0.9	0.0	0.8	2.4	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	1	7	8
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.1	2.4
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	3	18	21
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	5.5	6.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	3	284	287
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	86.3	87.2
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .286. Probability less than .05.

Table 13. Relationship between satisfaction with work done and knowing what job includes (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	8	11
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	2	11	13
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.3	2.0
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	3	17	20
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	5.2	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	1	43	44
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	13.1	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	2	237	239
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	72.0	72.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .202. Probability less than .05.

Table 14. Relationship between overall job satisfaction and knowing what is not included in job (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	5	8
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	3	1	7	12
	%	0.3	0.9	0.3	2.1	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	2	22	25
	%	0.0	0.3	0.6	6.7	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	3	3	6	61	73
	%	0.9	0.9	1.8	18.5	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	9	7	10	184	210
	%	2.7	2.1	3.0	55.9	63.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .109. Probability less than .05.

Table 15. Relationship between satisfaction with supervision received and knowing what is not included in job (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	7	0	0	4	11
	%	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	1	0	2
	%	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	0	7	8
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	2.1	2.4
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	3	3	15	21
	%	0.0	0.9	0.9	4.6	6.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	9	9	15	254	287
	%	2.7	2.7	4.6	77.2	87.2
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .199. Probability less than .05.

Table 16. Relationship between satisfaction with supervision received and being told what to do (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	4	0	0	7	11
	%	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	0	1	2
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	1	7	8
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.1	2.4
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	3	18	21
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	5.5	6.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	5	2	277	287
	%	0.9	1.5	0.6	84.2	87.2
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .210. Probability less than .05.

Table 17. *Relationship between promotions available and being told what to do (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	6	1	0	68	75
	%	1.8	0.3	0.0	20.7	22.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	2	39	41
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	11.9	12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	3	1	18	22
	%	0.0	0.9	0.3	5.5	6.7
Neutral (3)	No.	0	2	2	64	68
	%	0.0	0.6	0.6	19.5	20.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	0	25	25
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	7.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	1	0	1	96	98
	%	0.3	0.0	0.3	29.2	29.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .138. Probability less than .05.

supervision (table 15), but not work done. Statement 4 was related to satisfaction with supervision received (table 16) and promotions available (table 17). No significant relationships were found for statements 2 and 3.

The data clearly show that it is important for job satisfaction that the aides know what they should do on the job but that it is not necessary for teachers to know.

Importance of lunchroom aides' job

Lunchroom aides "agreed", were "uncertain", or "disagreed" with 4 statements regarding the importance of their job to themselves and its significance to others:

1. I feel my work is important to this school.
2. The principal feels my work helps students.
3. Teachers in this school appreciate my work.
4. Parents support my work in this school.

Table 18. *Relationship between overall job satisfaction and importance of job (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	4	0	0	4	8
	%	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	2	10	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	3.0	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	7	18	25
	%	0.0	0.0	2.1	5.5	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	1	4	68	73
	%	0.0	0.3	1.2	20.7	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	7	1	9	193	210
	%	2.1	0.3	2.7	58.7	63.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .160. Probability less than .05.

Importance of the lunchroom aides' job to self (statement 1) and to the principal (statement 2) were both related to overall job satisfaction and to type of work done (tables 18-21). In each case, the majority of aides who responded "agree" also had the highest level of satisfaction.

Job importance to teachers was not significantly related to job satisfaction. It was found that teachers' knowledge of their role also was not related to job satisfaction. Teachers seem not to be particularly strong "significant others" for lunchroom aides.

Although not related to overall job satisfaction, parental support (statement 4) is related to people worked with, work done, promotions available, and pay received (tables 22-25). The relationships here are weaker, since a number of aides with high satisfaction were "uncertain" as to the statement.

Table 19. *Relationship between satisfaction with work done and importance of job (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	5	0	0	6	11
	%	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	1	12	13
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	3.6	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	8	12	20
	%	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.6	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	2	42	44
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	12.8	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	6	2	11	220	239
	%	1.8	0.6	3.3	66.9	72.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .146. Probability less than .05.

Table 20. *Relationship between overall job satisfaction and importance of job to principal (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	4	0	0	4	8
	%	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	0	3	8	12
	%	0.3	0.0	0.9	2.4	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	1	0	6	18	25
	%	0.3	0.0	1.8	5.5	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	14	59	73
	%	0.0	0.0	4.3	17.9	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	12	0	20	178	210
	%	3.6	0.0	6.1	54.1	63.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .150. Probability less than .05.

Table 21. Relationship between satisfaction with work done and importance of job to principal (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	5	0	1	5	11
	%	1.5	0.0	0.3	1.5	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	0	2	10	13
	%	0.3	0.0	0.6	3.0	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	8	12	20
	%	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.6	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	2	0	7	35	44
	%	0.6	0.0	2.1	10.6	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	10	0	25	204	239
	%	3.0	0.0	7.6	62.0	72.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .144. Probability less than .05.

Table 22. Relationship between satisfaction with people worked with and importance of job to parents (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	4	0	0	2	6
	%	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	3	1	4
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.3	1.2
Neutral (3)	No.	1	0	3	2	6
	%	0.3	0.0	0.9	0.6	1.8
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	1	15	3	19
	%	0.0	0.3	4.6	0.9	5.8
Satisfied (5)	No.	10	11	134	139	294
	%	3.0	3.3	40.7	42.2	89.2
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .141. Probability less than .05.

Table 23. Relationship between satisfaction with work done and importance of job to parents (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	4	1	1	5	11
	%	1.2	0.3	0.3	1.5	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	0	9	3	13
	%	0.3	0.0	2.7	0.3	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	13	6	20
	%	0.0	0.3	4.0	1.8	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	3	24	16	44
	%	0.3	0.9	7.3	4.9	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	9	7	107	116	239
	%	2.7	2.1	32.5	35.3	72.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .141. Probability less than .05.

Table 24. Relationship between satisfaction with promotions available and importance of job to parents (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	10	3	30	32	75
	%	3.0	0.9	9.1	9.7	22.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	3	19	19	41
	%	0.0	0.9	5.8	5.8	12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	18	4	22
	%	0.0	0.0	5.5	1.2	6.7
Neutral (3)	No.	1	3	35	29	68
	%	0.3	0.9	10.6	8.8	20.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	15	10	25
	%	0.0	0.0	4.6	3.0	7.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	4	3	38	53	98
	%	1.2	0.9	11.6	16.1	28.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .130. Probability less than .05.

Table 25. Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and importance of job to parents (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	8	0	3	13	24
	%	2.4	0.0	0.9	4.0	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	1	3	18	17	39
	%	0.3	0.9	5.5	5.2	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	13	10	24
	%	0.0	0.3	4.0	3.0	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	0	2	25	9	36
	%	0.0	0.6	7.6	2.7	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	3	1	31	23	58
	%	0.9	0.3	9.4	7.0	17.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	5	65	75	148
	%	0.9	1.5	19.8	22.8	45.0
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .110. Probability less than .05.

Working conditions

Six conditions of work were examined for relationships to the job satisfaction of lunchroom aides:

1. Type of school district—central school rural, central school suburban, or enlarged
2. Pay status (paid or volunteer)
3. Full-time or part-time work
4. Number of hours worked per week
5. Doing work she was hired to do when hired
6. Type of immediate boss (teacher, principal, cook, food supervisor, or other)

Type of school district, hours worked per week, and type of immediate boss were not found to be significantly related to either overall or any components of job satisfaction.

A meaningful statistical test was not possible for pay status and time worked, since a high percentage (86.4%

Table 26. *Relationship between overall job satisfaction and if doing work expected when hired (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchrom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No Response	No.	3	0	5	8
	%	0.9	0.0	1.5	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	1	0	1
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	3	9	12
	%	0.0	0.9	2.7	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	2	23	25
	%	0.0	0.6	7.0	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	4	68	73
	%	0.3	1.2	20.7	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	4	3	203	210
	%	1.2	0.9	61.7	63.8
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .208. Probability less than .05.

Table 27. *Relationship between satisfaction with work done and doing work expected when hired (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchrom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	4	0	7	11
	%	1.2	0.0	2.1	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	1	1	2
	%	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	5	8	13
	%	0.0	0.6	5.5	6.1
Neutral (3)	No.	0	2	18	20
	%	0.0	0.6	5.5	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	2	41	44
	%	0.3	0.6	12.5	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	3	233	239
	%	0.9	0.9	79.8	72.6
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .280. Probability less tha .05.

and 94.4% respectively) of aides were paid, part-time workers. This probably reflects the nature of the aides' job and that most persons will need to be paid to perform this work.

A strong relationship was found between doing work prescribed when hired and overall satisfaction (table 26) and satisfaction with work done (table 27). This emphasizes the importance of an accurate job description for recruitment and retention of aides.

Fringe benefits received

The types of fringe benefits investigated were:

1. Health insurance
2. Sick leave with pay
3. Retirement

4. Vacation with pay
5. Life insurance
6. Meals

The two fringe benefits provided to over 10 percent of the aides were free meals (31.6%) and sick leave with pay (41.9%). It is therefore interesting that the two benefits found negatively related (aides were satisfied, though the benefits were not provided) were life insurance and vacation with pay.

Life insurance was related to overall satisfaction (table 28), promotions available (table 29), and pay received (table 30). Vacation with pay was related to people worked with (table 31) and pay received (table 32). It may be that vacation with pay is a factor because teachers are typically paid when school is not held. The emphasis on

Table 28. *Relationship between overall job satisfaction and life insurance (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchrom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	1	6	1	8
	%	0.3	1.8	0.3	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	1	0	1
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	9	3	12
	%	0.0	2.7	0.9	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	4	21	0	25
	%	1.2	6.4	0.0	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	66	6	73
	%	0.3	21.1	1.8	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	202	5	210
	%	0.9	61.4	1.5	63.8
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .138. Probability less than .05.

Table 29. *Relationship between satisfaction with promotions available and life insurance (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchrom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	5	69	1	75
	%	1.5	21.0	0.3	22.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	34	7	41
	%	0.0	10.3	2.1	12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	19	3	22
	%	0.0	5.8	0.9	6.7
Neutral (3)	No.	2	64	2	68
	%	0.6	19.5	0.6	20.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	24	1	25
	%	0.0	7.3	0.3	7.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	95	1	98
	%	0.6	28.9	0.3	28.8
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .210. Probability less than .05.

Table 30. *Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and life insurance (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	4	20	0	24
	%	1.2	6.1	0.0	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	32	7	39
	%	0.0	9.7	2.1	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	22	2	24
	%	0.0	6.7	0.6	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	2	33	1	36
	%	0.6	10.0	0.3	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	53	4	58
	%	0.3	16.1	1.2	17.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	145	1	148
	%	0.6	44.1	0.3	45.0
Total percent					100.0

$\tau = .209$. Probability less than .05.

Table 31. *Relationship between satisfaction with people work with and vacation with pay (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	1	6	1	8
	%	0.3	1.8	0.3	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	1	0	1
	%	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	9	3	12
	%	0.0	2.7	0.9	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	4	21	0	25
	%	1.2	6.4	0.0	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	66	6	73
	%	0.3	21.1	1.8	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	3	202	5	210
	%	0.9	61.4	1.5	63.8
Total percent					100.0

$\tau = .159$. Probability less than .05.

Table 32. *Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and vacation with pay (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	4	20	0	24
	%	1.2	6.1	0.0	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	38	1	39
	%	0.0	11.6	0.3	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	24	0	24
	%	0.0	7.3	0.0	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	2	33	1	36
	%	0.6	10.0	0.3	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	55	2	58
	%	0.3	16.7	0.6	17.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	132	14	148
	%	0.6	40.1	4.3	45.0
Total percent					100.0

$\tau = .132$. Probability less than .05.

life insurance may be explained by the fact that other benefits, such as health insurance and retirement, possibly are being provided by another worker in the aide's family.

Professional and social status

Status relationship data was obtained by having lunchroom aides respond "yes" or "no" if they could do the following:

1. Use the teachers' lounge. (50.2%)*
2. Attend faculty meetings. (6.2%)*
3. Join teachers at coffee breaks. (26.3%)*
4. Attend Parent-Teacher Association meetings as part of the job. (24.2%)*
5. "Chit-chat" with teachers. (25.6%)*

* indicates percent responding "yes"

Apparently lunchroom aides place limited value on status relationships as determinants of job satisfaction. The only significant relationship was a negative one between use of the teachers' lounge and satisfaction with supervision. A higher percentage (41.0) of satisfied aides felt they could not use the teachers' lounge than did those that could use the lounge (37.4%).

Degree of underemployment perception

Underemployment perception was measured by asking aides:

1. Do you feel qualified to do more responsible work in this school than you are presently doing? (74.5%)*
2. If yes, would you be willing to accept a job that includes this work? (62.6%)*

* indicates percent responding "yes"

Responses to question 1 were found to be positively related to overall satisfaction and satisfaction with work

Table 33. *Relationship between satisfaction with supervision received and use of teachers' lounge (N = 329)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	6	1	4	11
	%	1.8	0.3	1.2	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Neutral (3)	No.	1	3	4	8
	%	0.3	0.9	1.2	2.4
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	4	5	12	21
	%	1.2	1.5	3.6	6.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	29	135	123	287
	%	8.8	41.0	37.4	87.2
Total percent					100.0

$\tau = .123$. Probability less than .05.

Table 34. Relationship between overall job satisfaction and qualification for more responsible work (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	3	1	4	8
	%	0.9	0.3	1.2	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	11	12
	%	0.0	0.3	3.3	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	2	2	21	25
	%	0.6	0.6	6.4	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	7	65	73
	%	0.3	2.1	19.8	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	17	50	143	210
	%	5.2	15.2	43.5	63.8
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .189. Probability less than .05.

Table 35. Relationship between satisfaction with work done and qualification for more responsible work (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	4	1	6	11
	%	1.2	0.3	1.8	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	2	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	13	13
	%	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	1	1	18	20
	%	0.3	0.3	5.5	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	5	39	44
	%	0.0	1.5	11.9	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	18	54	167	239
	%	5.5	16.4	50.8	72.6
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .183. Probability less than .05.

Table 36. Relationship between satisfaction with promotions available and qualification for more responsible work (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	13	10	52	75
	%	4.0	3.0	15.8	22.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	2	39	41
	%	0.0	0.6	11.9	12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	1	20	22
	%	0.3	0.3	6.1	6.7
Neutral (3)	No.	1	13	54	68
	%	0.3	4.0	16.4	20.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	2	23	25
	%	0.0	0.6	7.0	7.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	8	33	57	98
	%	2.4	10.0	17.3	29.8
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .266. Probability less than .05.

Table 37. Relationship between satisfaction with pay received and qualification for more responsible work (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide		Total
			No (1)	Yes (2)	
No response	No.	10	1	13	24
	%	3.0	0.3	4.0	7.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	2	4	33	39
	%	0.6	1.2	10.0	11.9
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	3	21	24
	%	0.0	0.9	6.4	7.3
Neutral (3)	No.	0	3	33	36
	%	0.0	0.9	10.0	10.9
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	2	12	44	58
	%	0.6	3.6	13.4	17.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	9	38	101	148
	%	2.7	11.6	30.7	45.0
Total percent					100.0

Tau = .162. Probability less than .05.

done, promotions available, and pay received. That is, those aides responding that they did feel qualified for more work were satisfied. Question 2 responses were not related to satisfaction.

The conclusion here is that despite a high percentage of aides feeling qualified for, and willing to accept, more responsible work, this is not a factor in job satisfaction. This may be explained by the preceding section, where most aides reported they were doing what they had expected to do when hired.

Knowledge of evaluation criteria

The extent to which lunchroom aides know the factors on which their work is judged is positively related to overall satisfaction, satisfaction with people worked with, and

Table 38. Relationship between overall job satisfaction and knowing job evaluation criteria (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Response of lunchroom aide				Total
			Don't know (1)	Know somewhat (2)	Know well (3)	Know clearly (4)	
No response	No.	3	0	0	0	5	8
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.4
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	3	3	6	12
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.9	1.8	3.6
Neutral (3)	No.	3	3	3	6	10	25
	%	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.8	3.0	7.6
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	8	19	25	20	73
	%	0.3	2.4	5.8	7.6	6.1	22.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	11	15	28	34	122	210
	%	3.3	4.6	8.5	10.3	37.1	63.8
Total percent							100.0

Tau = .179. Probability less than .05.

Table 39. Relationship between satisfaction with people worked with and knowing job evaluation criteria (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		Response of lunchroom aide					Total
		No response	Don't know	Know somewhat	Know well	Know clearly	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
No response	No.	4	0	0	0	2	6
	%	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.8
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	2	2	0	4
	%	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	1.2
Neutral (3)	No.	1	1	1	0	3	6
	%	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.9	1.8
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	3	5	6	5	19
	%	0.0	0.9	1.5	1.8	1.5	5.8
Satisfied (5)	No.	13	22	45	60	154	294
	%	4.0	6.7	13.7	18.2	46.8	89.4
Total percent							100.0

Tau = .143. Probability less than .05.

Table 40. Relationship between satisfaction with work done and knowing job evaluation criteria (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		Response of lunchroom aide					Total
		No response	Don't know	Know somewhat	Know well	Know clearly	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
No response	No.	6	0	0	0	5	11
	%	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	3.3
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	1	0	1	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.6
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	2	3	2	6	13
	%	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.6	1.8	4.0
Neutral (3)	No.	3	2	4	3	8	20
	%	0.9	0.6	1.2	0.9	2.4	6.1
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	3	8	19	13	44
	%	0.3	0.9	2.4	5.8	4.0	13.4
Satisfied (5)	No.	8	19	37	44	131	239
	%	2.4	5.8	11.2	13.4	39.8	72.6
Total percent							100.0

Tau = .123. Probability less than .05.

work performed. Another relationship expected was for supervision received but none was found.

The data show that aides who know the evaluation criteria for their job are typically satisfied overall and with fellow workers.

Satisfaction by Teachers and Principals

This section examines the relationships of selected occupational factors to satisfaction by teachers and principals with the overall job performance of lunchroom aides. An important point to remember here is that while the preceding section dealt with job satisfaction of lunchroom

aides, teacher and principal ratings are in terms of satisfaction with performance, which adds the dimensions of performance level. Further, while lunchroom aide satisfaction included the 5 component areas of job satisfaction, satisfaction by teachers and principals is limited to overall satisfaction.

Adequacy of job preparation

Teachers' and principals' perceptions of the adequacy of the lunchroom aides' job preparation were positively related to their satisfaction with aide job performance (tables 41 and 42). Teachers and principals who felt aides to be well prepared for their jobs were also satisfied with the aides' job performance.

Table 41. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and extent of aide preparedness (N = 329)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Poorly prepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared	
No response	No.	13	0	6	0	19
	%	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	3	29	2	0	34
	%	0.3	3.0	0.2	0.0	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	3	47	27	1	78
	%	0.3	4.8	2.8	0.1	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	13	23	87	6	129
	%	1.3	2.4	8.9	0.6	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	11	28	187	15	241
	%	1.1	2.9	19.1	1.5	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	12	12	291	162	477
	%	1.2	1.2	29.8	16.6	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .492. Probability less than .05.

Table 42. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and extent of aide preparedness (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Poorly prepared	Adequately prepared	Well prepared	
No response	No.	1	0	1	0	2
	%	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	4	3	0	7
	%	0.0	3.8	2.8	0.0	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	2	3	0	5
	%	0.0	1.9	2.8	0.0	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	7	25	0	32
	%	0.0	6.6	23.6	0.0	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	1	1	40	18	60
	%	0.9	0.9	37.7	17.0	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .506. Probability less than .05.

Definition and knowledge of role

Teachers and principals were asked to respond "yes", "uncertain", or "no" to 5 statements about how well defined were the functions of the lunchroom aides:

1. Lunchroom aides know what their job includes.
2. Most teachers in this school know what the lunchroom aides' job includes.
3. Lunchroom aides are given a written list of duties.
4. Lunchroom aides are told what to do in their jobs.
5. Lunchroom aides know what their job *does not* include.

Teachers' responses to all 5 statements were positively related to their overall satisfaction with aide performance (tables 43-47). The strongest relationships existed for statements 1 and 5. Some uncertainty existed in responses to statement 3. Thus teachers who are satisfied with aide performance also tend to believe that the aides' role is well defined and known.

Table 43. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and aide knowledge of what job entails (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	10	0	6	3	19
	%	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.3	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	3	21	10	34
	%	0.0	0.3	2.1	1.0	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	3	37	37	78
	%	0.1	0.3	3.8	3.8	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	4	1	59	65	129
	%	0.4	0.1	6.0	6.6	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	2	3	70	166	241
	%	0.2	0.3	7.2	17.0	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	2	0	51	424	477
	%	0.2	0.0	5.2	43.4	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .368. Probability less than .05

Table 44. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and teacher knowledge of what job includes (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	8	4	4	3	19
	%	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.3	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	5	15	14	34
	%	0.0	0.5	1.5	1.4	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	8	27	42	78
	%	0.1	0.8	2.8	4.3	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	5	17	54	53	129
	%	0.5	1.7	5.5	5.4	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	25	73	142	241
	%	0.1	2.6	7.5	14.5	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	5	21	112	339	477
	%	0.5	2.1	11.5	34.7	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .196. Probability less than .05.

Table 45. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and aide having list of duties (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	10	1	8	0	19
	%	1.0	0.1	0.8	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	11	23	0	34
	%	0.0	1.1	2.4	0.0	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	14	58	5	78
	%	0.1	1.4	5.9	0.5	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	6	15	105	3	129
	%	0.6	1.5	10.7	0.3	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	6	23	198	14	241
	%	0.6	2.4	20.2	1.4	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	14	56	371	36	477
	%	1.4	5.7	37.9	3.7	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .076. Probability less than .05.

Table 46. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and aide being told what to do (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	10	0	7	2	19
	%	1.0	0.0	0.7	0.2	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	3	14	17	34
	%	0.0	0.3	1.4	1.7	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	5	36	36	78
	%	0.1	0.5	3.7	3.7	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	6	2	69	52	129
	%	0.6	0.2	7.1	5.3	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	4	4	84	149	241
	%	0.4	0.4	8.6	15.2	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	8	5	131	333	477
	%	0.8	0.5	13.4	34.0	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .194. Probability less than .05.

Table 47. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and aide knowing what job does not include (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	10	0	8	1	19
	%	1.0	0.0	0.8	0.1	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	6	23	5	34
	%	0.0	0.6	2.4	0.5	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	2	9	59	8	78
	%	0.2	0.9	6.0	0.8	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	5	4	93	27	129
	%	0.5	0.4	9.5	2.8	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	5	12	147	77	241
	%	0.5	1.2	15.0	7.9	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	7	5	230	235	477
	%	0.7	0.5	23.5	24.0	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .282. Probability less than .05.

Table 48. *Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and aide knowing what job includes (N = 106)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	1	0	0	1	2
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	0	7	7
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	1	4	5
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.8	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	2	30	32
	%	0.0	0.0	1.9	28.3	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	0	60	60
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.6	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .188. Probability less than .05.

Table 49. *Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and aide knowing what job does not include (N = 106)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			No (1)	Uncertain (2)	Yes (3)	
No response	No.	2	0	0	0	2
	%	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	4	3	7
	%	0.0	0.0	3.8	2.8	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	1	3	5
	%	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.8	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	12	20	32
	%	0.0	0.0	11.3	18.9	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	1	2	4	53	60
	%	0.9	1.9	3.8	50.0	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .345. Probability less than .05.

Principals' responses to questions 1 and 5 were significantly related to their satisfaction with aide performance (tables 48 and 49). While teachers' knowledge of the aides' role was related to teacher satisfaction, teacher satisfaction (statement 2) was not related to principals' satisfaction. This indicates that principals do not view teachers as significant others in their satisfaction with aide performance.

Importance of lunchroom aides' job

Using an "agree", "uncertain" or "disagree" scale, teachers and principals responded to 4 statements about the importance of the lunchroom aides' job:

1. I feel lunchroom aides' work helps students.
2. Lunchroom aides feel their work to be important to the school.
3. Teachers in this school appreciate the lunchroom aides' work.
4. Parents support the lunchroom aides' work in this school.

The overall satisfaction of both teachers and principals was positively related to all four of the preceding statements (tables 50-57). Relationships for principals were especially strong. The data show that perceived importance of the aides' jobs is an important factor in satisfaction with aides' job performance. It should be noted that where teachers' knowledge of the aides' role is not related to principals' satisfaction, teachers feeling the aides' job to be important is related.

Table 50. *Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to students (N = 978)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	10	0	4	5	19
	%	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.5	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	16	13	5	34
	%	0.0	1.6	1.3	0.5	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	19	36	22	78
	%	0.1	1.9	3.7	2.2	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	3	13	58	55	129
	%	0.3	1.3	5.9	5.6	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	3	16	85	137	241
	%	0.3	1.6	8.7	14.0	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	4	14	85	374	477
	%	0.4	1.4	8.7	38.2	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .369. Probability less than .05.

Table 51. *Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to aide (N = 978)*

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	9	1	5	4	19
	%	0.9	0.1	0.5	0.4	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	4	19	11	34
	%	0.0	0.4	1.9	1.1	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	32	45	78
	%	0.0	0.1	3.3	4.6	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	4	5	62	58	129
	%	0.4	0.5	6.3	5.9	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	4	64	173	221
	%	0.0	0.4	6.5	17.7	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	5	3	76	393	477
	%	0.5	0.3	7.8	40.2	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .282. Probability less than .05.

Table 52. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to other teachers (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	8	0	2	9	19
	%	0.8	0.0	0.2	0.9	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	5	8	21	34
	%	0.0	0.5	0.8	2.1	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	4	20	54	78
	%	0.0	0.4	2.0	5.5	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	3	3	18	105	129
	%	0.3	0.3	1.8	10.7	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	5	21	214	241
	%	0.1	0.5	2.1	21.9	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	1	3	17	456	477
	%	0.1	0.3	1.7	46.6	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .248. Probability less than .05.

Table 53. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to parents (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	9	0	8	2	19
	%	0.9	0.0	0.8	0.2	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	6	25	3	34
	%	0.0	0.6	2.6	0.3	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	4	62	12	78
	%	0.0	0.4	6.3	1.2	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	6	9	86	28	129
	%	0.6	0.9	8.8	2.9	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	4	9	153	75	241
	%	0.4	0.9	15.6	7.7	24.6
Satisfied (5)	No.	9	13	243	212	477
	%	0.9	1.3	24.8	21.7	48.8
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .226. Probability less than .05.

Table 54. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to students (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	1	1	0	0	2
	%	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	2	4	7
	%	0.0	0.9	1.9	3.8	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	0	4	5
	%	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.8	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	2	11	19	32
	%	0.0	1.9	10.4	17.9	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	5	55	60
	%	0.0	0.0	4.7	51.9	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .341. Probability less than .05.

Table 55. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to aide (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	1	0	1	0	2
	%	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	1	3	3	7
	%	0.0	0.9	2.8	2.8	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	1	4	5
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.8	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	8	24	32
	%	0.0	0.0	7.5	22.6	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	3	57	60
	%	0.0	0.0	2.8	53.8	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .353. Probability less than .05.

Table 56. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to teacher (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	1	0	0	1	2
	%	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	1	6	7
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	5.7	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	0	5	5
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	0	4	28	32
	%	0.0	0.0	3.8	26.4	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	0	60	60
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.6	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .253. Probability less than .05.

Table 57. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and importance of job to parents (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response			Total
			Disagree (1)	Uncertain (2)	Agree (3)	
No response	No.	1	0	1	0	2
	%	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	5	2	7
	%	0.0	0.0	5.7	1.9	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	3	1	5
	%	0.0	0.9	2.8	0.9	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	0	1	19	12	32
	%	0.0	0.9	17.9	11.3	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	0	0	17	43	60
	%	0.0	0.0	16.0	40.6	56.6
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .371. Probability less than .05.

Table 58. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and size of school district (N = 126)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Size of school district			Total
			Central school, rural	Central school, suburban	Enlarged	
No response	No.	0	1	1	0	2
	%	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.0	1.6
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	1	1	2	3	9
	%	0.8	0.8	3.2	2.4	7.2
Neutral (3)	No.	0	1	3	1	5
	%	0.0	0.8	2.4	0.8	4.0
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	3	7	26	2	83
	%	2.4	5.6	20.4	1.6	30.0
Satisfied (5)	No.	6	19	44	3	72
	%	4.8	15.1	35.0	2.4	57.3
Total percent						100.0

Tau = .179 Probability less than .05.

Size of school district

Three sizes of school districts were included in the study: central school rural, central school urban, and enlarged.

Size of school district was related (negatively) to principals' satisfaction of the aides' performance (table 58) but was not related to the satisfaction of teachers. Principals in the rural central and suburban central districts had higher satisfaction with aide performance than did principals in enlarged districts.

The explanation here may be that lunchroom programs in the enlarged schools are subject to pressures similar to those affecting academic programs in urban areas.

Professional and social status

Status was studied in terms of teachers' and principals' perceptions if lunchroom aides could do 5 things in the school:

1. Use teachers' lounge
2. Attend faculty meetings
3. Join teachers at coffee breaks
4. Attend PTA meetings as part of their job
5. "Chit-chat" with teachers

None of these five status factors was related to the satisfaction of teachers or principals with the job performance of lunchroom aides. In the preceding section on lunchroom aides, the relationship of satisfaction by aides was also limited. It appears that the above status factors have little relationship to satisfaction by or with aides.

Knowledge of evaluation criteria

Teachers and principals responded as to the degree of their knowledge of the criteria on which the work of the lunchroom aide was judged. Knowledge of the criteria was related to satisfaction with aides' performance by both

Table 59. Relationship between teacher satisfaction with aide performance and knowing job evaluation criteria (N = 978)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response				Total
			Don't know (1)	Know somewhat (2)	Know well (3)	Know clearly (4)	
No response	No.	10	6	3	0	0	19
	%	1.0	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	19	10	4	1	34
	%	0.0	1.9	1.0	0.4	0.1	3.5
Somewhat dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	41	31	4	2	78
	%	0.0	4.2	3.2	0.4	0.2	8.0
Neutral (3)	No.	1	77	46	3	2	129
	%	0.1	7.9	4.7	0.3	0.2	13.2
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	2	73	119	35	12	241
	%	0.2	7.5	12.2	3.6	1.2	24.6
Satisfied	No.	4	132	222	84	35	477
	%	0.4	13.5	22.7	8.6	3.6	48.8
Total percent							100.0

Tau = .212. Probability less than .05.

Table 60. Relationship between principal satisfaction with aide performance and knowledge of evaluation (N = 106)

Level of satisfaction		No response	Teacher response				Total
			Don't know (1)	Know somewhat (2)	Know well (3)	Know clearly (4)	
No response	No.	2	0	0	0	0	2
	%	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Dissatisfied (1)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Somewhat (1) dissatisfied (2)	No.	0	0	1	2	4	7
	%	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.9	3.8	6.6
Neutral (3)	No.	0	0	0	3	2	5
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	1.9	4.7
Somewhat satisfied (4)	No.	1	0	4	13	14	32
	%	0.9	0.0	3.8	12.3	13.2	30.2
Satisfied (5)	No.	1	0	2	14	43	60
	%	0.9	0.0	1.9	13.2	40.6	56.6
Total percent							100.0

Tau = .240. Probability less than .05.

teachers (table 59) and principals (table 60). However, where principals who were satisfied with the aides' performance tended to have clear knowledge of the criteria, the opposite was true when the teachers had a considerably lower level of knowledge about the evaluation criteria than the principals had.

Summary of Relationships

A summary of occupational factors significantly related to satisfaction levels of lunchroom aides, teachers and principals is presented in table 61. Additional information on the nature of the relationship may be found by turning to the table numbers indicated in the text.

Table 61. Summary of occupational factors with statistically significant relationships† to job satisfaction

Occupational factors of lunchroom aides	Lunchroom aide satisfaction						Teacher: overall satisfaction	Principal: overall satisfaction
	People worked with	Supervision	Work done	Promotions available	Pay received	Overall satisfaction		
Background characteristics								
Length of time in position			3				*	*
Employment in second job		6					*	*
Sex							*	*
Age					8		*	*
Marital status							*	*
Number of children							*	*
Educational level			4	5	7		*	*
Previous para-professional experience							*	*
Adequacy of preparation for job			10			9	41	42
Definition and knowledge of role								
Knowledge by lunchroom aide		12	13			11	43	48
Knowledge by teachers							44	
Lunchroom aide given list of duties							45	
Lunchroom aide told what to do		16		17			46	
Lunchroom aide know what job includes		15				14	47	49
Importance of job to aide and others								
Importance to lunchroom aide			19			18	51	55
Importance to principal			21			20	*	*
Importance to teachers							52	56
Importance to parents	22		23	24	25		53	57
Importance to students	*	*	*	*	*	*	50	54
Working conditions								
Type of school district								58
Paid or volunteer status							*	*
Full-time or part-time work							*	*
Hours worked per week							*	*
Doing work expected when hired			27			26	*	*
Type of immediate boss							*	*
Fringe benefits received								
Health insurance								
Sick leave with pay							*	*
Retirement							*	*
Vacation with pay	31				32		*	*
Life insurance				29	30	28	*	*
Meals							*	*
Professional and social status								
Use teachers' lounge		33						
Attendance faculty meetings								
Join teacher coffee breaks								
Attend PTA as part of job								
"Chit-chat" with teachers								
Degree underemployment perception								
Qualify for more responsible work			35	36	37	34	*	*
Accept more responsible work							*	*
Knowledge of evaluation criteria								
Knowledge by lunchroom aide	39		40			38	*	*
Knowledge by teachers							59	*
Knowledge by principal							*	60

† Numbers on table refer to table numbers in text and indicate that a statistically significant relationship exists between the occupational factor and the area of satisfaction. Blanks indicate nonsignificant relationships.

* Not applicable.

Summary of Occupational Factors Significantly Related to Job Satisfaction

The occupational factors with statistically significant relationships (at a probability of .05 or less) are summarized in table 61. Blanks in the table indicate that the relationship was not significant. In several instances, significant relationships exist for individual satisfaction factors but not for overall satisfaction. Similarly, overall job satisfaction may be related to an occupational factor, when only one individual satisfaction factor is related. This pattern demonstrated the importance of interpreting the data with the realization that individual satisfaction factors are of varying importance to a given occupational factor. For example, under *Background characteristics*, "previous para-professional experience" is related to 3 individual satisfaction factors but not to "overall job satisfaction". The occupational factor *Adequacy of preparation for job* is related to only one individual satisfaction factor ("work done") yet it is also related to "overall job satisfaction".

The numbers in table 61 refer to the corresponding table in the text that presents the relationship in detail.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The high overall satisfaction of lunchroom aides, teachers, and principals with the use of aides indicates potential for a continuation of this type of assistance in New York school districts.

2. Principal satisfaction indicates that the use of lunch room aides may be most successful in the medium-size or smaller school districts, although type of school district was not related to teacher or aide satisfaction. Administrative problems particular to the urban districts is an area for further study.

3. The type of person most available for recruitment as a lunchroom aide is a female with children and a second job.

4. Lunchroom aides with a second job tended to be better satisfied with the supervision received, probably because these aides are more realistic in their willingness to accept orders. Thus, one desirable selection criteria may be some prior and/or concurrent employment.

5. Adequate preparation for their job is important if aides, teachers, and principals are to be satisfied. Since a high percentage of aides were rated as well prepared, it can be assumed that competent persons are available for recruitment.

6. A clear job description at the time of employment is important to aide satisfaction, especially for satisfaction with work done. The findings on knowledge of role also

support this conclusion.

7. Lunchroom aides, teachers, and principals all considered awareness of what the aides' job does and does not include to be essential to high satisfaction. Satisfaction in the component areas of supervision received and work done was of particular importance to aides. In contrast, the teachers' being knowledgeable about the aides' role was not important to the aides or principals but was important to the teachers. Thus a well-defined role for aides that is clearly communicated to teachers, aides, and the principal will help to assure satisfaction with aides' work. The group most likely to be omitted in the communication is the one the teachers comprise.

8. There is a need for career ladders for younger, highly qualified paraprofessionals. As the aides' education level rises, satisfaction in the areas of work performed, promotions available, and pay received diminishes. Tenure in the position decreases satisfaction with work performed, and age below 30 years decreases satisfaction with pay levels.

9. Aides feeling themselves qualified to do more responsible work also tended to be better satisfied. Yet no such relationship was found for willingness to accept more responsible work. This indicates that aides feel confident of their ability to climb a career ladder but that their satisfaction with present conditions is not lowered by this assurance, since most reported that their responsibilities were as had been described to them when hired for the job.

10. The fringe benefits least available to aides are vacation with pay (5.6%) and life insurance (4.7%). Since aides do not generally expect these benefits, their absence does not affect the degree of their satisfaction. In some cases the benefits may be offered in a second job.

11. Neither type of supervisor nor previous experience as a paraprofessional were found to be related to aide satisfaction. It may be that these two factors are of limited importance in recruitment and management of lunchroom aides.

12. The professional and social status factors in this study are not important to the satisfaction of the aides, teachers, or principals. Aides' use of the teachers' lounge was important for their satisfaction with supervision but not for overall satisfaction. In general, aides felt that they had somewhat fewer privileges than the principals and teachers perceived them as having.

13. Teachers are not perceived as significant others by lunchroom aides but are perceived as important to satisfaction with aides by principals and other teachers. Parents considering the lunchroom aides' job to be important is related to the satisfaction of aides, teachers, and principals. This indicates that status relationships between teachers and aides should be clearly established to avoid possible conflict. Further, that opportunity for two-way communi-

cations between parents and the school to resolve any problem areas will be a necessary provision for successful use of aides.

14. Knowledge of the criteria for evaluating the lunch-

room aides' job is essential for satisfaction with use of this type of aide. A clear statement, well communicated, logically follows a similar recommendation for a description of the aide's job.

References

Hixon, Lawrence B., et al.
1969. Status of paraprofessionals in New York school districts; phase one of a continuing study, school paraprofessionals; roles and job satisfactions. Univ. of State of N.Y., Bur. Occup. Educ. Res. Albany, N.Y. Nov.
1970. Status and role of lunchroom aides in selected New York school districts: Phase one of a continuing study. Univ. of State of N.Y., Bur. Oc-

cup. Educ. Res. Albany, N.Y. June.
Hulin, Charles L.
1964. Cornell studies of job satisfaction II, model and method of measuring job satisfaction. N.Y.S. Coll. Indus. and Lab. Rel., Cornell Univ. Ithaca, N.Y.
Kendall, Maurice G.
1962. Rank correlation methods, third edition. Charles Griffin and Co., Ltd. London, England.

Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Methodology	2
Occupational factors associated with job satisfaction	2
Satisfaction by lunchroom aides	3
Satisfaction by teachers and principals	12
Summary of relationships	16
Summary of occupational factors significantly related to job staisfaction	18
Conclusions and recommendations	18
References	19