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ABSTRACT

Initially, this study examined the views of teachers who work in faith-based schools, relating to the nature of spirituality and religiosity. Then this study explored the self-ratings of teachers with regard to their religiosity, spirituality and five aspects of the work of teaching; colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself and recognition, and how these factors impacted overall job satisfaction.

A mixed methods approach that involved the collection and analysis of both qualitative (opened questions) and quantitative (Likert scale response items) data was adopted, using a one-phase survey design. Analysis of the quantitative data involved comparison of the religiosity, spirituality and the five aspects of the work of teaching for various teacher sub-groups and the exploration for relationships between these variables and job satisfaction. The qualitative data was analysed using inductive thematic analysis to explore the impact that religiosity, spirituality and participant-identified aspects related to the work of teaching had on teachers’ overall job satisfaction. The sample consisted of nine schools in two Australian faith-based educational systems: Lutheran and Seventh-day Adventist (SDA).

Teachers within the SDA and Lutheran school systems saw Religiosity and Spirituality as distinct constructs, but they perceived there was a connectedness in that both are linkages to one’s relationship with God. Analysis of the five aspects of the work of teaching found that responsibility and work itself were the high rating factors, while working conditions and recognition were the low rating factors. In terms of the variables classified as Worldview factors, the spirituality factor rated significantly greater than the religiosity factor. Age had no significant impact on the magnitude of either worldview factors or the aspects of work elements. The teachers in the Lutheran schools scored higher on the five aspects of teaching elements, while the SDA teachers scored higher on the spirituality and religiosity elements. Primary teachers most often scored higher than the secondary teachers on each scale for the aspects of the work of teaching, but showed no significant differences for the religiosity and spirituality scales whereas the females scored every element higher than the males except for religiosity.

Regression analysis of the quantitative data indicated that overall job satisfaction was influenced by a combination of direct and indirect relationships that centred around, working
conditions, work itself, religiosity, and the age of the respondent. In terms of the two faith-based educational systems the data indicated that the teachers in Lutheran schools perceived that religiosity had a strong direct impact on their overall job satisfaction, while for those teaching in SDA schools it was spirituality that had this direct impact. When the teachers were given the opportunity to outline their own framework for factors that influence overall job satisfaction three major themes emerged from the analysis of the data: people (others and oneself), processes (the job itself), and the purpose for teaching. When the school administration is able to give clear directions and colleagues are helpful and share their expertise and a team spirit exists this has a positive impact on the overall job satisfaction. Similarly when the students are developing/progressing and a difference is being made in their lives, together with the teachers themselves having a positive attitude then overall job satisfaction is high. Also, overall job satisfaction was increased when teachers perceived that their work had a higher calling or some connectedness with the divine.

Considering both data sources this study found that religiosity impacted overall job satisfaction directly and indirectly via the mediating element of spirituality. Also spirituality itself indirectly influenced overall job satisfaction via the purpose for teaching element. Finally the data indicated that overall job satisfaction increased when teachers’ relationships with their students and colleagues were positive and the teachers perceived there was a degree of organisational efficiency within their workplace.
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CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.1 Preamble

Some years ago now, actress Jessica Simpson got a lot of people’s attention when she played ‘Daisy’ in the Dukes of Hazzard (sic) movie ("The Internet Movie Database," 2009). More recently she gained this writer’s attention when she was quoted making a comment about her relationship with God. Andrew Taylor of the Sydney Morning Herald wrote that Miss Simpson, who was brought up in a strict Christian home, was too busy travelling to attend church regularly, but she says: "My church is my relationship with God" (Taylor, 2007).

In a similar vein, Alan Jamieson’s article ‘Churchless Faith’, based on his PhD research, examines the post-church phenomenon (Jamieson, 2003, p. 217f). Within the evangelical Pentecostal/charismatic stream of Christianity, Jamieson noted that a significant number of people were leaving the church and yet not experiencing a ‘dwindling faith’ (Jamieson, 2003, p. 217). The extent of this phenomenon led Jamieson to publish a book entitled ‘A Churchless Faith’.

It is in this context, that observers are seeing a new approach to the world view factors, religiosity and spirituality, and this is often characterised by thoughts that may be expressed in the following manner: I was raised a [insert religion of choice here] and while I agree with the overall moral thing they were trying to teach me, I don’t believe you have to go to a [insert; church, mosque, synagogue or temple] to be a good person.

In the 21st century, this sentiment can be expressed in many places, including the workplace, and yet increasingly employees appear to be looking for a purpose and fulfilment in the workplace, in addition to achieving the organisation’s objectives. The importance of studying the world view factors religiosity and spirituality in the workplace can also be underlined by the fact that some researchers go so far as to suggest “that work organizations are our most significant community, replacing institutions such as the church” (Bell & Taylor, 2001, p. 2).
From an educational administrator’s perspective, particularly those in faith-based institutions, the issue of religiosity and spirituality in the workplace is paramount because organisational performance is inextricably linked to the health, happiness and satisfaction of the individual employee. Furthermore for many young people, it is often the only place where values are presented in their lives. As a result, for both students and teachers, the school has for some become the 21st century ‘church’.

1.2 The need for the study

In 2010 Australia had 1017 independent schools and 1708 Catholic schools and between these two sectors there are employed over 100,000 teachers (2010 - 102,410) (“School Statistics,” 2010).

According to the Independent Schools Council of Australia (ISCA) 85% of all independent schools have a religious affiliation. (“Snapshot 2008 - Independent Schooling in Australia,” 2008, p. 1) It would appear that having some form of empirical data that identifies the religion related factors most likely to promote job satisfaction for all the teachers in this sector, would be in the interests of many administrators.

It does not matter whether one scans libraries, Google or the ProQuest database there appears to be a dearth of information specifically relating to religiosity, spirituality and the teachers involved in education.

Research has been carried out on the world view factors religiosity/spirituality and breast cancer screening in African American women (Gullatte, 2006); religiosity/spirituality and depression (Yi, Luckhaupt, Mrus, Mueller, & et al., 2006); religiosity/spirituality and adolescent psychosocial adjustment (Good & Willoughby, 2006); religiosity and suicide (Walker & Bishop, 2005); religiosity/spirituality and localised prostrate cancer (Hamrick & Diefenbach, 2006). You can also find the similarities and differences between religiosity and spirituality in African American college students (Berkel, Armstrong, & Cokley, 2004); religiosity/spirituality and psychotherapy supervision (Bienenfeld & Yager, 2007); religiosity/spirituality and reasons for living in the elderly (Shreve-Neiger & Edelstein, 2002); religiosity/spirituality and the sexual attitudes of college [university] students.
(Beckwith & Morrow, 2005); religiosity/spirituality and general life satisfaction (Zullig, Ward, & Horn, 2006); one can even get the perceptions of elderly Iranian immigrants on spirituality versus religiosity (Martin, 2004).

Peach writing in the Australian Medical Journal states that in the last 10 years the number of articles presenting original research on the relationship between spirituality and health has increased sixfold, and now exceeds 1200. (Peach, 2003, p. 86)

It is clear from this trend that many researchers are beginning to explore the linkages between health and spirituality. Similarly we are beginning to see an explosion of books that focus on workplace spirituality in the corporate sector: (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Guillory, 2001; J. Marques, Dhiman, & King, 2007; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Smith, 2006). Also a quick search on the ‘net’ will find a plethora of websites devoted to ‘workplace spirituality’. Despite this diversity, there is very limited research that has been done on those who work with the young, the normal and our future – the religiosity/spirituality of teachers!

Why is it that the gerontologist, psychologist, counsellor, palliative and supportive care worker, nurse, psychotherapist, social researcher or organisational scientist can examine religiosity and spirituality but not the teacher? Why is it that we are beginning to see transformation in business as they acknowledge and learn about workplace spirituality, but education as a sector sees very little development in this area? Can we educate people to help them explore outer space when we are unable or unwilling to investigate inner peace?

Are the guardians of curriculum incapable of adapting to the changing landscape of the 21st century? Is the apparition of a value-free educational environment able to frequent academia again?

The lack of a spiritual basis and the importance of values in education are illustrated by the experience of the Sacred Heart Catholic schools of the west coast of the United States in the late 1960s (”Value Free Education 'Bankrupt',' 1989). This was the school system that supplied the ‘guinea pigs’ for the original value-free environment. Dr W. R. Coulson (a veteran educator who worked with Carl Rogers), reflecting on the experiment indicated that he believed he and his colleagues owed the nation’s parents an apology. The comments from Coulson below illustrate why.
Youthful experimentation with sex, alcohol, marijuana, and a variety of other drugs - whatever's popular at the time - has been shown to follow value-free education quite predictably. We now know that after these classes, students become more prone to give into temptation than if they'd never been enrolled. One cause lies in an educational philosophy that calls on students and teachers alike to disbelieve in the concept of temptation. Moral absolutes are routed ... in favor of a psychotherapeutic imperative. ("Value Free Education 'Bankrupt',' 1989)

Coulson also added that there are no more Sacred Heart Schools on the west coast – the system eventually collapsed. Such is the importance of values and a spiritual basis in education.

In conclusion, there is a need to further understand the impact of spirituality and religiosity on job satisfaction in the educational context, as there is only limited research in this domain. In contrast, there is considerable research in many other workplaces.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The focus of this study is to examine factors that impact overall job satisfaction among teachers who work in faith-based environments, i.e. schools with a religious or faith backing. In particular the intent is to ascertain whether there are any relationships that can be found between teachers’ levels of religiosity, spirituality and satisfaction with specific aspects of teaching and levels of overall job satisfaction.

The objective does not necessarily include reference to causation, but rather to identify whether there is any correlation between the teachers’ level of satisfaction with aspects of teaching, religiosity and spirituality and their overall job satisfaction. The objectives are further narrowed by limiting the participants in the study to those whose expertise is in education that takes place within the context of a faith-based educational environment. There are self-imposed geographic constraints limiting the study to schools that are located within the state of Victoria.

King (2008) states that “research focused on religion’s influence … is light, and mostly outside the mainstream of the [management] field” (p. 215). In a similar manner it is self-
evident that there is a lack of empirically documented studies on the relationship between religiosity/spirituality and job satisfaction amongst teachers.

Hill and Hood (1999) in the introduction to their monumental work ‘Measures of Religiosity’ acknowledge both the distinction and the overlap between the concepts of religion and spirituality. They also state that researchers have focused in many areas, however “… most significant are the efforts to investigate the relationship between ‘religion’ and concepts that are closely related such as ‘spirituality’…” (Hill & Hood, p. 5).

Hill and Hood also note the need for more work in the areas of spirituality and religiosity. The paucity of information and research conducted in the context of education relating to religiosity, spirituality and job satisfaction has already been stated, and this study, is one small step to filling the void in this area of research.

1.4 Problem and Hypothesis

This thesis suggests a model that explains how the variables may interact. However, before one can examine the model, a number of fundamental issues must be resolved and this is difficult because of the fluid nature of the concepts under evaluation. One can describe the process as somewhat akin to ‘trying to nail jelly to the wall’.

Of the three variables only job satisfaction has a long and relatively extensive history. Further to this, empirical studies that involve the areas of spirituality and religiosity have a two-fold problem. The first problem is the definitional quagmire that confronts the researcher. This issue will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Two. The second problem is one of measurement. Can something as elusive (some might say illusive) as spirituality actually be measured? If so, using what? And how is spirituality different from religiosity?

It is understood that today’s search for the spiritual may not lead to the church, mosque, synagogue or temple. Organised religion no longer has the monopoly on matters spiritual and this may have led to the confusing number of definitions. There is no debate that our society is developing an increasing interest in matters spiritual (Carette & King, 2004; Giacalone &

In outlining the definitional parameters for spirituality and religiosity it is readily acknowledged that their boundaries are blurred. Although still possessing common characteristics this distinction in concepts is considered by some to be a recent phenomenon.

“It was not until the second half of the twentieth century that ‘spirituality’ came to signify a de-institutionalised and privatised religion as it does today” (Carette & King, 2004, p. 26).

Similarly, Hill and Hood (1999, p. 359) note that for many people, “spirituality is experienced and expressed through conventional religious understanding, and the contemporary conception of spirituality as separate from religion has a surprisingly short history”.

Robert Nash, a professor from the University of Vermont, is quoted as stating that “Religion … is the institution; spirituality is the personal. Religion is what we do with others; spirituality is what we do within ourselves. Public vs. private faith. Religion is head; spirituality is heart” (Jones, 2005, p. 3).

While this may seem to solve the definitional dilemma, the complexity of this area of study will be considered in later chapters.

With this brief outline of two of the variables, we return to the relatively ‘trouble-free’ factor of job satisfaction and note that this area of research often takes place within an understanding of organisational behaviour.

Management thinking and research has a long and rich history. It has developed considerably from the days when ancient Sumerians and Egyptians settled around the Euphrates and Nile, and the Greek and Roman armies battled all-comers. There is no doubt that both European and Asian city-states developed with complex organisational structures, which usually had
some socio-religious layer, either undergirding or in some cases being superimposed upon the human landscape.

The model proposed in this thesis can be illustrated by Figure 1 below. Here we see the interplay of demographic data, the worldview factors - religiosity and spirituality, and satisfaction with aspects of teaching, and their influence on overall job satisfaction. The double-ended arrow indicates an acknowledgement of covariance – where two variables change in conjunction with each other.

![Original Model](image)

Figure 1.1 - The Original Model
1.5 Research questions

This research will be guided by the following research questions:

1. How do teachers who work in faith-based school systems rate themselves in terms of agreement with worldview factors related to religiosity and spirituality (when specified definitions of these factors are adopted) and how satisfied are these teachers with various aspects of teaching and their jobs?

2. What are the relationships between teachers’ religiosity, spirituality and job satisfaction within this given framework?

3. What is the nature of the teachers’ perceptions of religiosity and spirituality when allowing for the respondents to formulate their own framework in which to describe these constructs?

4. What do teachers perceive impacts on satisfaction with their job, when allowing for the respondents to formulate their own framework in which to describe these constructs?

1.6 Arrangement of the Report

This paper will now review the literature relevant to this research. Firstly, this review will look at the definitional dilemmas of religiosity and spirituality, and concentrate on the concerns surrounding measurement of such ethereal concepts. Then this review will examine perspectives arising from the corporate / business, medical, psychology / mental health, career development, and educational environments. In addition to this, recent theses in the area will also be investigated. This will be followed by a section on research design and then chapters covering presentation and analysis of the data. The last chapter will contain the conclusions limitations and recommendations that can be established from the research.
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter includes a review of the relevant literature that primarily seeks to provide understanding of the worldview factors spirituality and religiosity, and their relationship to organisational behaviour and overall job satisfaction. It should be noted that it is difficult to restrict the focus of this review to just the educational environment, which is the centre of attention for this thesis. Firstly, because of the paucity of material that has been written on the spirituality and religiosity of teachers. Secondly, it would be a rather restricted view on a complex topic and would be an injustice to providing the context for such a diverse body of knowledge. Finally, the research and findings that have come from the para-medical fields, the corporate world, and other disciplines, all have much to offer those who ‘dare to teach.’

2.2 Spirituality

Throughout history there have been many attempts to document in writing, religious thought and an understanding of the spiritual. Whether one looks to The Theogony – a poem by Hesiod in around 700BC (Tebben, 1986, p. 205), Persia’s Zoroastrianism or Eastern Confucianism there have been continual attempts to make sense of the world around us. While it is true that matters religious and spiritual can be traced back thousands of years, the formal study in this area combined with empirical research is a more recent phenomenon.

2.2.1 The Workplace/Management Context

Judi Neal (J. F. Marques, 2004, pp. viii - ix) gives a concise outline of the history of management theory including the introduction of spirituality to management theory in the foreword of ‘Spirituality in Workplace.’

The earliest management theories were developed by people in the early 20th century with an engineering approach, most notably Frederick Taylor. … The next phase of management thought came out of the Hawthorne studies and similar work in the 1930s and 1940s. … In the late 1970s and throughout the 1990s, an expansion of management theories included focus not just on the workers as physical beings, or as emotional beings, but also as thinking beings. … As our concept of what it means to be human is expanding, so too are our management theories expanding. … Pioneers
such as the authors of this book have been teaching management theories and practices that now include our spiritual nature.

The limited history of the empirical analysis of spirituality in a business context can be well illustrated by the number of comments found in recently published books on corporate spirituality. For example, Stephen Charles Mott writing about ‘Workplace Spirituality – A Complete Guide for Business Leaders’ states that the book is “an insightful and comprehensive presentation of an important new focus on spiritual presence. Smith’s up-to-date coverage of recent writings gives the reader a comprehensive introduction to important writings in the field… (Smith, 2006, p. Back cover)”.

Also Warren Bennis in the Foreword to ‘A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America’, states it like this:

… what makes this book unique, powerful, and something of a landmark contribution is that they base their findings – the first book to my knowledge that does this, thankfully – on an empirical and conceptual integration of spirituality in the workplace (Mitroff & Denton, 1999, p. xii).

In the same fashion, Barry Posner writing in the Foreword to ‘Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance’ indicates that the readers are; “indebted to the editors and authors within who have taken this absolutely essential first step [of exploring spirituality], and they’ve done so in a first-rate fashion” (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003, p. xiii).

The editors of this same book also acknowledge the cutting edge nature of their work in the Preface:

This book is the beginning of a scientific investigation in the role “spirituality” plays in workplace performance. … The answers to these issues can only be found if scholars choose to advance this new frontier of organizational science (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003, p. xvi).

Likewise John E Renesch in writing the Preface to The Living Organisation – Spirituality in the Workplace states that the book contains; “…models for the companies most likely to succeed in the coming years as we navigate the whitewater of tumultuous change in values, global economics, social responsibility and worker fulfillment” (Guillory, 2001, p. viii).
Also writing about the same book Jack Lowe comments that the author, in examining spirituality, is; “exploring critical terrain for organizations that wish to anticipate or, at least, react to these changes and thrive in the 21st century” (cited in Guillory, 2001, p. vii).

At this point two things deserve highlighting - note the words used: ‘pioneers’, ‘exploring’, ‘the first book’, ‘first step’, ‘new frontier’, ‘new focus’ and secondly the publication dates of almost all the books – they are within the last ten years.

However, this new interest of spirituality in the workplace and its accompanying explosion of scholarly articles have not been without concerns being expressed in some quarters. For example, not all corporate personnel view the study of spirituality as a positive element. This is acknowledged by Poole (2009, p. 577) where she refers to the area of study as “still not yet mainstream”. Similarly King’s (2008) article ‘Dismissing the Obvious’ examines whether mainstream management research will ever consider the spiritual as a topic for serious research. Len Tischler, Jerry Biberman and Yochanan Altman have identified that ‘theory development and research in the field of spirituality in organizations has to date been fragmented.’ (Tischler, Biberman, & Altman, 2007, p. 23) In addition to this, there is widespread acceptance of the interdisciplinary nature of this field of study (Fornaciari & Dean, 2004); (Furnham, 2003); (Ingersoll, 2003); (Rhodes, 2003).

In an attempt to organise the research in this multi-faceted domain, so as to allow researchers to be more effective in their research and to build on one another’s knowledge, Tischler and team proposed a model that would allow spirituality to be more clearly understood. The three-dimensional model consists of levels, measures and validity. The ‘level’ is a reference to the level of analysis: individual, work unit, organization and society. The ‘measures’ relate to the type of data under consideration and the validity refers to the way the phenomenon is being studied – internal perceptions or externally observed (Tischler, et al., 2007, p. 26).
Figure 2.1 - Areas of Research: Spirituality in Organisations

Using this construct to give analysis a context, means that research can fall into one or more of 32 different ‘boxes’. The measurement of a person’s religiosity and spirituality would belong in box 1. A general self-reported job satisfaction measure would to a large extent belong in box 2. Using this framework this study mainly accesses information from boxes 1 and 2, which are at the individual level. However, because the respondents are questioned about their perceptions of job satisfaction in general, one could argue that elements of boxes 17 and 18 are likely to influence their responses as well. It could be further argued that dependent upon the size of the school, boxes 9 and 10, the work unit influence may also influence self-reported job satisfaction measures.
2.2.2 Definition Issues

Can we adequately define concepts like spirituality that appear to be so intangible? As previously noted, the initial quandary that confronts researchers in this area is a definitional one. Hill and Hood attempt to make sense of this confusion by examining historical usage:

... the word “spirituality” is taken from the Latin root *spiritus* meaning life or breath, with the Latin *spiritulis* designating simply a person “of the spirit.” Spirituality is frequently mentioned in both the Hebrew Old Testament (*ruach*) and the Greek New Testament (*pneuma*), and the term has historically been referenced only in the context of religion. For many, spirituality as separate from religion has a surprisingly short history. Indeed it was with the rise of secularism in this century [20th] and a growing disillusionment with religious institutions, particularly in Western society since the 1960s, that spirituality began to acquire distinct meanings and connotations separate from religion. (Hill & Hood, 1999, p. 357)

Hamilton illustrates this bipartite thinking in his book ‘No Regrets’.

It is possible to be a spiritual person and to practice spiritual principles without being religious, because spirituality is not necessarily the same as religious belief. While established religious traditions provide a structured way to a deeper faith and greater spirituality it is possible to begin a spiritual journey with no faith in the God of traditional religions. (Hamilton, 2004, p. 4)

D’Souza states that ‘while spirituality is a concept globally acknowledged there is no consensus on how to define it. (D'Souza, 2007, p. 857) This difficulty is also echoed by others: “The conceptualization of ‘religiosity’ and ‘spirituality’ involves complex issues” (Neff, 2006, p. 449). “Spirituality … is more difficult to define” (Koenig, 2007, p. S45). “There is no widespread agreement on what spirituality means …” (Koenig, 2007, p. S45). “Spirituality means many things to different people …” (Cavanagh & Bandsuch, 2002, p. 109). “Definitions and terms in the physical sciences are generally quite specific …[In referring to spirituality] the situation is far more ambiguous in the social sciences.” (Dean, Fornaciari, & McGee, 2003, p. 381). “… varying definitions of spirituality …” (Duffy, 2006, p. 53). “Since this stream of research is still in its infancy exacting definitions describing spirituality have not been developed” (Moore & Casper, 2006, p. 110).

This definitional confusion over spirituality is illustrated by the title of Stuart Rose’s (2001) journal article entitled – ‘Is the Term ‘Spirituality’ a Word that Everyone Uses, But Nobody Knows What Anyone Means by it?’ This confusion may come from the lack of
acknowledgment of the different forms of spirituality. For example Roof (1993), states that baby boomers

… speak of creation spirituality, Eucharistic spirituality, Native American spirituality, Eastern spiritualities, Twelve-Step spiritualities, feminist spirituality, earth-based spirituality, eco-feminist spirituality, Goddess spirituality, and men’s spirituality, as well as what would be considered traditional Judeo-Christian spiritualities. (Roof, 1993)

Giacalone and Jurkiewicz illustrate the diversity of views well by providing a representative list of definitions of spirituality in literature. (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003, p. 7) The table is reproduced below:

Table 2.1 – Definitions of Spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Spirituality</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The personal expression of ultimate concern</td>
<td>Emmons (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That which involves ultimate and personal truths</td>
<td>Wong (1998), p. 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the individual lives meaningfully with ultimacy in his or her responses to the deepest truths of the universe</td>
<td>Bregman and Thierman (1995), p. 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of a relationship with a higher power that affects the way in which one operates in the world</td>
<td>Armstrong (1995), p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our response to a deep and mysterious human yearning for self-transcendence and surrender, a yearning to find our place</td>
<td>Benner (1989), p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way of being and experiencing that comes through awareness of a transcendent dimension that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, life, and whatever one considers to be the ultimate</td>
<td>Elkins et al. (1988), p. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A transcendent dimension within human experience … discovered in moments in which the individual questions the meaning of personal existence and attempts to place the self within a broader ontological context</td>
<td>Shafranske and Gorsuch (1984), p. 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A subjective experience of the sacred</td>
<td>Vaughn (1991), p. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A personal life principle which animates a transcendent quality of relationship with God</td>
<td>Emblen (1992), p. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The human dimension that transcends the biological, psychological, and social aspects of living</td>
<td>Mauritzen (1998), p. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The vast realm of human potential dealing with ultimate purposes, with higher entities, with God, with life with compassion, with purpose</td>
<td>Tart (1975), p. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That human striving for the transforming power present in life; it is that attraction and movement of the human person toward the divine</td>
<td>Dale (1991), p. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertaining to the innate capacity to, and tendency to seek to,</td>
<td>Chandler and Holden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transcend one’s current locus of centricity, which transcendence involves increased knowledge and love  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The animating force that inspires one toward purposes that are beyond one’s self and that give one’s life meaning and direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKnight (1984), p. 142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zinnbauer and Pargament also acknowledge the range of views with two tables of their own – one for spirituality and one for religion (Paloutzian & Park, 2005, p. 23); accessing 17 more authors resulting in 14 more definitions! The term spirituality cuts across all religions and value systems, and it is this universality that makes defining it so difficult.

King (2007, p. 105) in his essay ‘Spirituality and Public Service’, struggles with this lack of an agreed definition because it leads to a significant question that he poses: “What forms of religious and spiritual behaviour are politically acceptable and legally permissible in the public workplace?” While it is acknowledged that King’s work is based in the United States and deals with the public service and his workplace case studies are all American, there is still some relevance to how we understand this area of research here in Australia. Despite the fact that this study focuses on the religious and spiritual elements of teachers working in faith-based schools, and it could be argued that this would pose little concern in these workplaces, we must recognise that Australia is becoming an increasingly litigious society.

2.3 Religiosity

King, (2008) in his article ‘(Dis)Missing the obvious’, challenges those who raise issues with the influence of religion in the workplace and suggests that there is no reason to be reluctant to undertake scholarly research. Exploring the question as to whether ‘mainstream management research will ever take religion seriously’ King (2008) notes that while more than 80% of the world’s population are connected to some religion there is little in the way of research that investigates its impact in management science. This lack of research is surprising given the rise of what has become known as the ‘faith-at-work movement’ in the United States as well as the increasingly religiously diverse workforce that is developing in Australia.
King proposes that there should be open discussion of the often unspoken reluctance to engage in rigorous research and to critically examine the objections that have been proffered in the past. The view that academics and researchers have avoided the analysis of religion’s impact in business and management appears to be supported by the following data:

A search of the top 21 management journals (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin 1992) revealed religion as the subject of only 4 articles over the past 10 years. A wider search of refereed management journals in ABI/Inform yielded just 19 articles on religion and work issues over the past 10 years. (J. E. King, 2008, p. 215)

When it comes to clarifying the term religiosity there is also a similar level of uncertainty of relationship to the term spirituality. King and Crowther (2004, p. 85) point out that in some psychology literature there is a trend towards the use of ‘religiousness instead of religiosity.’ Academics and researchers in other disciplines could be forgiven for throwing their hands up in horror complaining (with a touch of irony) that ‘God only knows what they’re talking about!’ Perhaps an agreed set of definitions as well as an agreed set of terminology are long overdue.

2.3.1 Definition Issues

King citing a number of authors (James, and Miller & Thoresen) gives a definition that begins to shed light on the matter.

Religiosity (or religiousness) speaks to the degree to which an individual “practices” a religion or the strength of his or her connection with, adherence to, or conviction for the beliefs, practice or precepts of a religion. (J. E. King, 2008, p. 215)


A religion organises the collective experiences of a group of people into a system of beliefs and practices.
Religiosity refers to the degree of participation in, or adherence to, the beliefs and practices of a religion.

This begins to give a further clarification of the concepts under discussion.
2.4 The Spirituality / Religiosity Distinction

With the outline of multiple definitions above it is now appropriate to examine the distinction between these concepts. A common topic of discussion in many articles is the problem of distinguishing between spirituality and religiosity (Stanard, Sandhu, & Painter, 2000). It has been described as the ‘Eternal Conundrum’. (Green, Benshoff, & Harris-Forbes, 2001, p. 55). Yet at the same time, there is no doubt that popular and academic literature has begun to distinguish between spirituality and religiosity.

As King and Crowther (2004, p. 84) note with regard to the distinction between religiosity and spirituality there is some difference of opinion.

Some regard the constructs as indistinguishable, while others argue that religion and spirituality are uniquely different ….

Previously the Fetzer group had identified and noted this diversity of views when a working party was formulating the concepts and measurement tools that linked the domains of religiousness and spirituality with health. They stated that while … some may regard the 2 as indistinguishable, others believe religiousness has specific behavioral, social, doctrinal, and denominational characteristics … [and spirituality] is concerned with the transcendent, addressing ultimate questions about life’s meaning (Abeles, 2003, p. 2).

Paloutzian and Park (2005, p. 21) more recently assert:

Given this increasing knowledge base, one might assume that there exists a clear consensus among psychologists about the nature and definition of religiousness and spirituality. Alas, this is not the case.

So it needs to be acknowledged that nature of the difference between religiosity and spirituality is still a contested topic for a number of researchers in this area.

As noted previously, historically the two constructs, within a workplace context at least, were understood as identical and this conceptual understanding is illustrated in Figure 2.2 below:
There are a growing number of researchers who accept that there is a difference between religiosity and spirituality, but there are some dissenting voices that see this as a ‘con’ or a takeover.

Carette and King (2004) in their book ‘Selling spirituality: the silent takeover of religion’ maintain that the growing commercialisation of ‘religion’ and seeing it re-packaged into the popular concept of ‘spirituality’ is a cause for concern (Carette & King, 2004, p. x).

Carette and King put forward the idea that

what is being sold to us as radical, trendy and transformative spirituality in fact produces little in the way of significant change in one’s lifestyle or fundamental behaviour patterns. (Carette & King, 2004, p. 5)

Carette and King’s concerns also include the secularisation of society, the privatisation and individualisation of religion. It appears that Carette and King acknowledge that spirituality is for many people replacing religion, however they see this within the context of modernity and the erosion of traditional ideas. They challenge a spirituality that for them appears to have been hijacked by an economic agenda. Secondly, they challenge a spirituality that is, in
their opinion, bland and fails to trouble our thinking and in doing so allows consumerism and corporate capitalism to gain a monopoly status. (Carette & King, 2004, pp. 4-5)

Of those researchers who accept that there is a difference between religiosity and spirituality there is a group that see one as a particular expression or subset of the other. Guillory (2001, p. 33) makes this type of distinction between the two concepts.

Spirituality and religion are often thought to be the same, but in fact they are different. Spirituality is a way of being that predetermines how we respond to life experiences; whereas religion deals with the incorporation and implementation of organized belief systems. Religion is actually a form that spirituality takes in practice.

Similarly Clark (2007, p. 1321) define the terms adopting a similar basis:

Spirituality has been recognized as the core or essence of a person and as an essential part of an individual’s wellbeing. … Religiosity, however, is a narrower concept than spirituality and it refers to organized religion with codified belief systems, whereas spirituality neither has the codification nor the organization.

Another perspective on this approach comes from Rose (2001) where in his journal article ‘Is the Term ‘Spirituality’ a Word that Everyone Uses, But Nobody Knows What Anyone Means by it?’ he makes a number of interesting conclusions. His work, a qualitative study based on the questionnaires completed by 57 ‘leading figures in each major religion’, firstly states that ‘Spirituality was not found to be dependent on belonging to a religion’. Secondly, and perhaps more surprising Rose acknowledges that while differences are shown to exist between the terms ‘religiousness’ and ‘spirituality’, the overall view appears to be that the two terms have similar meanings. (Rose, 2001, p. 193)

For Rose (2001, p. 205) perhaps the difference between the terms ‘religion’ and ‘spirituality’ maybe “one of breadth”. (Rose, 2001, p. 205)

Zinnbauer and Pargament (2005) in their chapter Religiousness and Spirituality further develop an understanding for these two concepts based around this concept of one being a particular expression of the other. While they both acknowledge and agree that the concepts overlap they differ in the way that the concepts are positioned. For example, they agree that religiosity and spirituality both consist of three constructs – ‘significance’, ‘search’, and the ‘sacred’. Furthermore they contend that both spirituality and religiosity share common features:

a) both religiosity and spirituality can be pursued by individuals and groups
b) it is the religious or spiritual adherents’ perspective that determines whether a search for the significance is sacred or secular

c) neither religiosity or spirituality is inherently good or bad

d) both religiosity and spirituality may involve the unique and universal phenomenon.

At this point it is worth noting that Zinnbauer and Pargament use the term religiousness, however religiosity, except where quoted, will be used in this paper for the sake of consistency.

However, Zinnbauer defines spirituality as ‘a personal or group search for the sacred’ and religiosity as ‘a personal or group search for the sacred that unfolds within a traditional sacred context’ (Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005, p. 35). Pargament on the other hand defines spirituality as a ‘search for the sacred’ and religiosity as a search for significance in ways related to the sacred’ (p. 36).

The difference in the definitions is due to the differing views on the relative position of these concepts as outlined below:

Building on these common concepts, we then offer two different ways religiousness and spirituality can be defined that reflect contrasting trends in the field, one in which spirituality is viewed as the overarching construct and the other in which religiousness represents the more encompassing process. (Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005, p. 33)

This view that religiosity and spirituality are different but one is a subset of the other is represented in Figures 2.3 & 2.4 below.
For others such as Williams and Sternthal (2007) there is an overlap between the concepts religiosity and spirituality, but one is not just a subset of the other.

Williams and Sternthal in their study of what spirituality and religion mean to different people conclude that:
For many, spirituality refers to an individual’s attempt to find meaning in life, which can include a sense of involvement with the transcendent outside institutional boundaries. Religion tends to refer to aspects of belief and behaviour, including spirituality, that are related to the sacred or supernatural and are grounded in a religious community or tradition. (Williams & Sternthal, 2007, p. S47)

This difference from the previous position is illustrated in Figure 2.5.

For many researchers, however, religiosity and spirituality are two discrete constructs. As Koenig (2007, p. S45) states “the constructs should be non-overlapping’. This relationship can perhaps be best represented by two separated circles as shown in Figure 2.6.
The debate between spirituality and religiosity outside of academic circles, is illustrated in a number of articles by a Vancouver Sun journalist Douglas Todd. Todd in his article about Eckhart Tolle, who is heavily promoted by Oprah Winfrey, sums up Tolle’s view by stating that “His repeated message is "religion" is bad (oppressive) and "spirituality" is good (liberating).” (Todd, 2009a)

Todd also moderated an Anglican-Lutheran conference on the subject, "I'm spiritual, but not religious!" It was held on October 17, 2009, and featured a number of authors. Tolle has the backing of an extremely wealthy American media personality and this is maybe why his books sell by the millions and his impact is considerable. When popular culture’s usage of terminology becomes widespread this too can impact the way in which researchers approach their work.

Further in a Newsweek poll published in April 2009 it was clearly shown that the number of people who seek spiritual truth outside a religious organisation is growing. In 2009 30% of Americans identified themselves as "spiritual, not religious," this is an increase from the 24 percent who answered in 2005 (International, 2009 P.S.R.A.). Here we see the media is already using some form of assumed definitions and distinctions between two of the constructs under consideration. The question asked by *Princeton Survey Research Associates (P.S.R.A.) International* for Newsweek was:
In general, do you think of yourself as… … spiritual but NOT religious, religious but NOT spiritual, religious AND spiritual, or NOT spiritual and NOT religious?

Table 2.2 – Newsweek Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spiritual but not religious</th>
<th>Religious but not spiritual</th>
<th>Religious &amp; spiritual</th>
<th>Not spiritual/ not religious</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April ‘09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August ‘05</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those researchers who see religiosity and spirituality as discrete concepts there is considerable agreement that spirituality focuses on the individual experiences whereas religiosity focuses on the collective experiences.


Spirituality is distinct from institutionalized religion. While religion often directs people outward toward social rites and ritual, spirituality directs one inward toward the wealth of knowledge, senses, aspirations, and feelings one harbours within. … Spirituality is a non-dogmatic, non-exclusive, non-patriarchal and gender-neutral approach to connect with this one source of all existence.

For Green et al (2001, p.56)

One way to differentiate between religion and spirituality is to consider the collective, well defined and dogma-laden structure of religion in comparison to the individualized, more unstructured nature of spirituality.

Worthington et al (2003, p. 84) quote the National Institute of Healthcare Research for their definition of spirituality:

spirituality is defined as “the feelings, thoughts, experiences, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred”

Worthington and team (2003, p. 84) then quote Hill for their definition of religion:

…the means and methods (e.g., rituals or prescribed behaviors) of the search [for the sacred] that receive validation and support from within an identifiable group of people. (Hill, 1998, p. 21)
Peach (2003, p.86), a researcher within the medical context, presents the following definitions.

Spirituality has been defined as an experiential process whose features include quest for meaning and purpose, transcendence (a sense that being human is more than material existence), connectedness (e.g., with others, nature or the divine) and values (e.g., justice).
A religion organises the collective experiences of a group of people into a system of beliefs and practices. Religiosity refers to the degree of participation in, or adherence to, the beliefs and practices of a religion.

From this literature review it was initially decided to adopt the commonly accepted discrete non-overlapping religiosity / spirituality model for the quantitative data. Even those who favoured an overlapping model acknowledged that there were significant elements of difference between the two concepts. The discrete definition for religiosity and spirituality was reflected in the work of Marques et al (2007), Green (2001, Worthington (2003) and Peach (2003).

That is, for the teachers in this study spirituality is defined as a personal connectedness with a power or source in the universe (most often God given the significantly Judeo-Christian context) that is greater than oneself. In contrast religiosity is defined as the institutional, doctrinal public faith that is celebrated with others. In other words spirituality is focused around the intrapersonal while religiosity is focused around the interpersonal.

Finally, King and Crowther point out, that even though one adopts a discrete non-overlapping model of the relationship between religiosity and spirituality this does not rule out the possibility that each construct can influence the other.
Religiosity and spirituality have also been conceptualized to foster the development of the other. For example, religious practices encourage spiritual growth, while spiritual practices are often a salient aspect of religious participation. (J. E. King & Crowther, 2004, p. 84)

2.5 Studies relating to Impact of Religiosity and Spirituality in the Workplace

There are very few studies that look at the impact of religiosity and spirituality in the workplace simultaneously. Most studies have focused on either spirituality or religiosity.
Heaton notes that some studies have explored the link between spirituality and organizational performance. Measures that were used included net income, profitability, and productivity. Some of the ways in which the data gathered was presented included the following: units per man hour, annual sales per employee, the level of absenteeism, work days lost due to health or injuries or the reduction in customer complaints (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, & Travis, 2004, p. 73). Research that delivers data of this nature should be of interest to all administrators who value those who work in their organisation.

For those who have observed the increased attention to matters spiritual, from a medical perspective, it has not been a process without concerns being raised along the way. Williams and Sternthal (2007, p. S47) cite a 2001 publication that identified over 1200 studies that linked religious belief or behaviour to health. Harold Koenig (2007) states that in 2006 alone there were more than 70 published research studies that examined the linkages between religion, spirituality and health. However Williams and Sternthal (2007) also note that despite the ‘ongoing scientific interest in this topic’ there has also been ‘some debate about the relevance of these findings to Australia’. (Williams & Sternthal, p. S47)

Of particular interest in this study was a review of studies that looked at the impact of religiosity and/or spirituality had on workers job satisfaction.

One particularly pertinent study that explored the link between religiosity and job satisfaction was conducted on business school graduates (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005). One outcome of the study was that

‘religiosity was found to influence what employees want from a job environment and their job satisfaction, but only when organizational context was controlled’. (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 173)

A second outcome of the study was the finding that the interaction between an organization’s stance and an employee’s desire pertaining to the acceptance of workplace religious expression had the most significant influence on job satisfaction. (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 173)

The researchers noted that results in previous studies involving these two factors have been inconsistent and suggest three reasons for this: the differing instruments used; a narrow understanding of religiosity; and ignoring the organisational environment. This last factor is
the focus of King and Williamson’s study where workplace acceptance of religious expression (WARE) is investigated.

One specific hypothesis in King and Williamson’s study investigated the relationship between the individual and the organisation. It was suggested that where an employee (as an individual) advocates that religious expression at work is a positive aspect then they are more likely to be satisfied in his / her job, where there is a corresponding acceptance by the entire organisation. King and Williamson stated:

“… the interaction between an individual’s desire for workplace acceptance of religious expression (IWARE) and the level of the organizations workplace acceptance of religious expression (OWARE) is likely to have a significant influence on job satisfaction.” (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 182)

Given that the respondents in this present study are working in faith-based schools there is likely to be a high level of IWARE*OWARE match and so the reliability of the job satisfaction coefficient should be less influenced by this factor.

Clark et al conducted a study in which two of the four-fold purposes was to determine ‘whether spirituality has a relationship with job satisfaction’ and also ‘whether spirituality has a direct “causal” effect on job satisfaction.’ (Clark, et al., 2007, p. 1322) This study is one of very few that corresponds with the research focus of this paper even though it must be kept in mind that the study took place within a palliative care context. This team of eight researchers put forward four models as shown below, that illustrated four independent variables: Spirituality (SPR), Integration (INT), Self-actualization (ACT) and Job Satisfaction (JOB).
This study found that:

While statistically significant bivariate relationships were found among all four variables included in the study, the structural path model revealed that job satisfaction is more likely to be related to the transformation of one's spirituality at work and self-actualization rather than spirituality having a direct impact on job satisfaction. (Clark, et al., 2007, p. 1326)
The study also concluded that when workers in a Hospice integrate their spirituality at work there is a significant improvement in a team member’s job satisfaction (Clark, et al., 2007, p. 1321).

Spjut (2004) completed a Doctor of Management in Organizational Leadership where she examined the “Effects Of Spirituality On Job Satisfaction For Clinical Laboratory Science Professionals”. Using the Spirituality Assessment Scale © and the Job Diagnostic Survey © Spjut found that there was a “significant direct relationship between the variables of prayer/mediation and job satisfaction (T = 4.00) and a significant indirect relationship between the variables of prayer/meditation – personal growth – job satisfaction (T = 2.36 – T = 5.35)” (Spjut, 2004, p. 123).

Spjut found that the worker’s spirituality as measured by prayer / meditation had a direct relationship with job satisfaction. Further it was noted in her study that it was the intrinsic factors rather than the extrinsic factors that positively influenced the worker’s job satisfaction. She suggests that leaders should be ‘involved with their employees, to listen, to be aware, to be compassionate, and to acknowledge their employees’ strengths’. Further to this, they could assist workers in their personal growth by providing ‘meaningful work environments’, and having activities that “foster humility, honesty and service to others”. Finally it was suggested that career paths with ongoing education should be available to employees (Spjut, 2004, p. 132).

Thomas East (2005) focused his research in an area that is closer in its bearing to this study than most others. His PhD entitled – ‘A Grounded Study On How Spirituality In The Workplace Impacts A Person's Job Satisfaction’ – incorporates two elements that are also a feature of this study. East interviewed 37 individuals asking them a series of questions about spirituality, corporate spirituality, the workplace environment, job satisfaction, and leadership. The following three questions guided East’s research study:

1. What is the inclusive view of spirituality, workplace or organizational spirituality, and religion versus spirituality?
2. In what ways [do] organizational culture and leadership theories influence workplace spirituality and in turn a person's job satisfaction?
3. How does workplace spirituality impact a person's job satisfaction?

East (2005) found that workplace spirituality did in fact positively impact a person’s job
satisfaction. However this positive impact occurs only after “the intrinsic needs of the employee have first been met”. East (2005, p. 136) also found that the data suggested “that the participants’ view of spirituality is directly related to their religious beliefs”.

This ‘job satisfaction’ review would suggest it would be beneficial and timely to explore the relationship between teachers in faith-based schools, religiosity and spirituality and their satisfaction with their teaching role.
CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a rationale and description of the research methodology used in this study. A mixed methods approach, “empirical research that involves the collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data” (Punch, 2009, p. 288) was adopted. This triangulation was adopted to both validate and expand the conclusions obtained by the respective methodologies.

This research approach was considered appropriate in that the two components of the study: the use of a specified framework to explore the impact of teachers’ worldview (religiosity and spirituality) on their job satisfaction, along with an exploration of teacher perceptions of job satisfaction and worldview (religiosity and spirituality), require different types of data. The first component collected data using a quantitative approach that enabled the generation of profiles and the opportunity to discover relationships using the accepted frameworks. The second component collected data using a qualitative approach to enable the respondents to generate their own frameworks to present their perceptions.

This study was carried out using a one-phase design, where the two types of data were collected in the same time frame. This was achieved by the construction of a single questionnaire consisting of 6-point Likert scale questions and open-ended written response questions.

3.2 The Sample

To obtain data from teachers working within faith-based schools an approach was made to the Lutheran and Seventh-day Adventist school systems in Victoria. The administration of four Seventh-day Adventist and five Lutheran schools that were essentially urban in nature were approached and agreed to participate in the study. A total of 287 questionnaires were distributed across the nine schools and 221 usable questionnaires were returned. This gave a very acceptable return rate of 77%.
3.2.1 Research site

The location of the study was based in Victoria, a state located in the south-western corner of Australia.

Victoria has the highest population density of any of the Australian states, therefore rather than relying on a simple rural/urban classification it can be considered more appropriate to identify the capital (Melbourne) as the metropolitan location and all other locations as regional.

Figure 3.1 - Map of Australia

Figure 3.2 - Map of Victoria

It appears that most faith-based schools require a higher population threshold, which correlates with the fact that significant regional centres are well represented in the non-metropolitan data.
Five schools were based in mainly outer metropolitan (Melbourne) locations. While there were three schools that could be considered to be regional (Geelong).

### 3.3 Ethics

#### 3.3.1 Committee Approval

The questionnaire and relevant accompanying documentation such as the information letter were submitted to the Avondale Human Ethics Committee. The Committee gave approval on 12th June 2009. A copy of the approval letter is found Appendix 1. All participants were informed that confidentiality would be respected in the reporting of these results.

#### 3.3.2 Consent

Each respondent in this study was an adult working within a faith-based educational system. All received an information letter, which immediately followed the cover sheet and preceded the actual questionnaire. Because many of the respondents completed the questionnaires at the close of a staff meeting, the author informed staff that if they did not wish to complete the survey they could simply pretend they were completing it and then hand it in as they left with other staff members. In the school sites visited only two people chose this option, and one of them chose to leave immediately.

For those respondents who completed the survey via the online method, the same information letter preceded the questionnaire. The site was designed in such a way that the respondent was required to ‘navigate’ through the letter page before attempting the questionnaire. Only one respondent who began the on-line questionnaire failed to complete the survey. No reasons were given, although it was possible to write something in the two open-ended questions.

### 3.4 Questionnaire
The data collection instrument consisted of a 60-question survey that could be completed in less than 10 minutes although some respondents took up to 15 minutes to complete all items. There were many respondents who were able to complete the survey in 8-10 minutes.

The issue of how long the questionnaire took to complete was considered significant when designing the data collection instrument. It is the author’s contention based on personal experience and observation, that, despite the often-repeated ‘9am-3:30pm and lots of holidays’ misconception, teachers are in fact, time poor. Anything taking significantly longer than 10-15 minutes would seriously hamper one’s ability to collect the data.

The questionnaire consists of three sub-sections: Demographics, Questions About Your Job, [aspects of teaching] and World View Factors [spirituality and religiosity].

3.4.1 Demographic Variables

Participants in the study provided information about their gender, age groups (21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61+), years of teaching (0-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-20, 20+), qualifications (2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 4+ years), area of speciality in education, school type (K-6, 7-12, K-12), student enrolment (0-200, 201-300, 301-500, 500+), the school’s religious/faith connection, personal religious/faith connection, Australian or overseas born and whether they had a first language other than English.

3.4.2 Quantitative Data Section Instrument Format

This section consisted of a satisfaction with aspects of teaching instrument containing 29 items, a religiosity instrument containing 9 items and a spirituality instrument containing 8 items. Participants responded to these questions on a one to six Likert scale indicating the level of agreement with the statement (Strongly Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Slightly Disagree, Slightly Agree, Moderately Agree, Strongly Agree). The forced choice 6-point Likert scale was selected to avoid the neutral answers that a 5 or 7-point scale can encourage.

3.4.3 Qualitative Data Section Instrument Format

The qualitative instrument consisted of two open-ended questions. One question related to general comments the respondent could make about his or her job satisfaction and the other
provided an opportunity for respondents to comment about their own religiosity and / or spirituality.

3.5 The Survey Instrument Sections

3.5.1 Aspects of Teaching Instrument

Initially the author considered using the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Long form – 100 questions) however this would have been far too time consuming for respondents. The MSQ (short form - 20 questions) was also considered, and although it has the benefit of being one of the most widely used instruments in research within this area, it lacked the specificity relating to education.

The work of Scott and Dinham in developing scales to measure the occupational satisfaction of teachers and school executives as a part of The International Teacher 2000 Project was also examined. (Dinham & Scott, 1998; Scott & Dinham, 2003) This survey instrument consisted of 150 questions and was far too extensive for the scope of this research project.

It was for this reason that the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), developed in 1984 by Paula Lester, was used as a basis to assess teachers’ satisfaction with specific aspects of teaching. The complete TJSQ contains 77 self-reported items on a five point Likert scale. (Lester, 1987)

This questionnaire takes about 20 minutes to complete and explores 9 factors that Lester found to be significant to teacher job satisfaction: Supervision (14 items), Colleagues (10 items), Working Conditions (7 items), Pay (7 items), Responsibility (8 items), Work Itself (9 items), Advancement (5 items), Security (3 items), and Recognition (3 items). (Lester, 1987, pp. 227-231)

The reliability coefficient of each factor was also suitably high (>0.6); .92 supervision, .82 colleagues, .82 work itself, .83 working conditions, .80 pay, .73 responsibility, .81 advancement, .71 security, and .74 recognition. (Lester, 1987, p. 231)
One positive of the TJSQ is that it contains ‘clear, concise statements consisting of no more than 20 words’ (Lester, 1987, p. 226). The original instrument was designed for the North American context and it examined 9 sub-scales relating to teacher’s satisfaction with specific aspects of teaching (Supervision, Colleagues, Working Conditions, Pay, Responsibility, Work Itself, Advancement, Security, Recognition). For the Australian teacher working within a faith-based school, where most schools are small to medium in size and the level of supervision is relatively minor, where advancement is not always sought and the teachers most often opt to work in these schools for reasons other than pay, it was decided to omit the supervision, pay, advancement and security sub-scales of the TJSQ to generate an instrument that was more applicable to this context. For this study these sub-scales were as follows: Colleagues (8 questions), Working Conditions (4), Responsibility (7), Work Itself (8), Recognition (2) – a total of 29 items.

The reduction in survey size was also achieved by removing some questions that were ‘duplicated’ by being expressed in both the positive and negative forms. About half of the 77 statements in the TJSQ were written in the negative form to avoid response bias (Lester, 1987, p. 226). Of the 29 items selected from the TJSQ 10 of these were items remained in their negative form to maintain this feature of response bias avoidance. For analysis negative items were reverse coded.

The original 5-point Likert scale was modified to a 6-point scale: 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Moderately Disagree 3. Slightly Disagree 4. Slightly Agree 5. Moderately Agree 6. Strongly Agree. There are two reasons for this change, firstly it avoids the predominance of neutral answers that often give very little information to the researcher and secondly it provides an impetus for the respondent to decide, even if somewhat marginally, to select one way or the other.

This instrument is displayed in Table 3.1.

### Aspects of Teaching Instrument

#### Table 3.1 - Aspects of Teaching items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleagues (n = 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I like the people with whom I work.
I get along well with my colleagues.
I do not get cooperation from the people I work with.
My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.
My colleagues are highly critical of one another.
I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.
My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.
My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions (n = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions in my school are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration in my school communicates its policies well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions in my school can be improved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility (n = 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get along well with my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be aware of the policies of my school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do have responsibility for my teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students respect me as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not responsible for my actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Itself (n = 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching is very interesting work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching encourages me to be creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching does not provide me the chance to develop new methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work of a teacher consists of routine activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am indifferent toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work of a teacher is very pleasant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition (n = 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one tells me that I am a good teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2 Worldview Factors Instrument

The section on Worldview Factors (religiosity and spirituality) provided some challenges in determining what instrument to use for data collection. Initially the Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMR) was considered (Abeles, 2003, p. 85). This questionnaire consists of just 38 questions, however many of them covered areas such as religious support and spiritual coping, which reflected its focus on health research.

The Assessment of Spirituality and Religious Sentiments (ASPIRES) (Piedmont, Werdel, & Fernando, 2009) was also briefly considered and with only 9 items it looked suitable for this project, however it was rejected because of its inability to distinguish between religiosity and spirituality, the model adopted for this study.

Hill and Hood (1999) with over 125, scales or instruments, provide an extensive array of measures of religiosity. The Spiritual Well Being (SWB) Scale has been identified as one of the most widely used instruments (Hill & Hood, 1999, p. 359). Consisting of a religious well-being (RWB) and an existential well-being (EWB). The SWB was developed as ‘a general measure of the subjective quality of life’ (Hill & Hood, 1999, p. 382). Although only 20 questions in length this questionnaire did not appear to seek the data that allowed an analysis of the two variables under discussion – religiosity and spirituality.

Finally the choice was made to use The Religious Commitment Inventory – 10 (RCI – 10). (Worthington, et al., 2003) This ten-item instrument qualified on the basis of brevity, but more importantly it distinguished between different factors within religious studies research and followed the intrapersonal/interpersonal distinction adopted for this study. After factor analysis was performed on the 10 items, two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were found by Worthington and the team. Six questions represent Intrapersonal Religious Commitment (largely cognitive) and the remaining four questions represented Interpersonal Religious Commitment (largely behavioural) (Worthington, et al., 2003, p. 87).

This distinction between the intra-personal and the inter-personal correlates well with the definitions of spirituality and religiosity as previously outlined in chapter two. In addition to the questions from the RCI-10, nine additional questions were added to the Perspectives on
Life section. Six of these came from the BMMR and three other questions were added after discussions with supervisors. These additional questions were added to provide a broader coverage of contemporary lifestyle elements, such as volunteer work and to enable some of the BMMR questions to be presented in a Likert-scale form.

The second question from the RCI-10 regarding financial contributions was omitted and a question requesting more detail was used in its place. This resulted in Section 3 of the survey having 18 items in total. The details of this are shown below.
Table 3.2 - Worldview Factors – Spirituality and Religiosity sub-scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>SUB-SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>I often read books and magazines about my faith</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>My religious beliefs are the basis of my whole approach to life</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Religious beliefs influence all my dealings in life</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMR</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>I consider myself to be a religious person</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMR</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>I consider myself to be a spiritual person</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>The voluntary work you do for the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. RCI-10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>The financial contributions that you make towards the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. BMMR</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Besides religious services, how often do you take part in other activities at a place of worship?</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMMR</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>How often do you go to religious services?</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. BMMR</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>How often do you watch or listen to religious programs on TV, radio or DVD?</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. BMMR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>How often do you pray?</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Please write any thoughts that you have on your own spirituality / religiosity.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mod = Modified
Questions 43 – 53 required respondents to use a simple, numbered six-point Likert scale.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Moderately Disagree
3. Slightly Disagree
4. Slightly Agree
5. Moderately Agree
6. Strongly Agree

Question 54 and 55 used the following options:

1. Nothing
2. Very little
3. Little
4. Moderate
5. Substantial
6. Very substantial

Questions 56 – 58 used the following options:

1. Never
2. Once or twice a year
3. Every month or so
4. Once or twice a month
5. Typically every week
6. More than once a week

Questions 59 used the following options:

1. Never
2. Very little
3. Little
4. Weekly
5. Daily
6. Many times a day

Questions 60 is an open question allowing the respondent to have free input and to be able to provide their own framework for the concepts under study.
The separate items for the religiosity section of the Perspectives on Life instrument are shown in Table 3.3, while the those for the spirituality section are shown in Table 3.4.

**Religiosity (Interpersonal)**

**Table 3.3 - Perspectives on Life: Religiosity items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From RCI-10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From the BMMRS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to religious services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besides religious services, how often do you take part in other activities at a place of worship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The financial contributions that you make towards the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The voluntary work you do for the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be a religious person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you watch or listen to religious programs on TV, radio or DVD?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spirituality (Intrapersonal)

Table 3.4 – Perspectives on Life: Spirituality items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From RCI-10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious beliefs influence all my dealings in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often read books and magazines about my faith.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From the BMMRS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself to be a spiritual person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you pray?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.3 Outcome measure – Job Satisfaction

Scarpello & Campbell (1983) in their study “Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there?” indicate that defining overall job satisfaction as the sum of discrete elements may not take into account “major determinants” of overall job satisfaction. The “whole” appears to be more than the sum of known elements. Their results suggest that a single global rating of overall job satisfaction may be a “more inclusive measure” (Scarpello, 1983).

For this study the outcome measure, ‘overall job satisfaction’ was measured using the single item, which stated, “Rate your overall job satisfaction on the [1-6] scale below”.

3.6 Data Analysis

3.6.1 Quantitative Component
The data from the questionnaire was entered into the statistical software package, PASW 18.0 (PASW 18.0 for Mac. (2010) SPSS Inc.). Descriptive statistics for each subscale were determined. Independent groups, t-tests and one-way between groups ANOVA with post-hoc
comparisons were run to locate any area of significant difference between participant subgroups. In addition a linear regression analysis was used to explore the relationship between sets of individual variables and respective dependent variables. Reliability for each scale and subscale was reviewed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis and the internal reliability reported by Cronbach’s alpha.

3.6.2 Qualitative Component
The individual open-ended responses were transcribed and this data was collated in a number of ways to highlight the range of understandings that were expressed by the respondents and to explore the links between these understandings. This data was then further analysed using inductive thematic analysis, (Flick, 2009, p. 318) beginning with coding common words and phrases, combining codes into respective categories (Punch, 2009, p. 183) and linking categories within themes. The relationships between these themes were expressed via models that illustrated the phenomena.

A more fully detailed explanation of the analysis undertaken with the collected data will be outlined in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the teachers involved in this study and the nature and analyses of the data obtained from these respondents.

4.2 Sample

The sample consisted of 221 teachers, 89 employed by Lutheran Education Australia within 5 Victorian schools and 131 employed by Adventist Schools Australia within 4 Victorian schools.

4.2.1 Age

The participants were distributed across the following age groupings 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60 and 61+, as shown in figure 4.1. Almost an equal distribution of age groups except for the greater than 60 group.

![Figure 4.1 - Age](image)
4.2.2 Gender

The sample consisted of 36.6 % males and 63.4 % females. This higher distribution of females is typical of overall ratios found in K-12 education.

Figure 4.2 - Gender
4.2.3 Number of Years Teaching

The experience level of the teachers was diverse with representation in all categories approximating 20% except for very experienced teachers being more highly represented and inductees (0-2 years) being less represented.
4.2.4 Highest Qualification

Respondents were asked to identify their level of training and the vast majority were four or more year trained. Just 7.8% were 2 or 3 year trained reflecting the increasing requirements for teacher registration in recent years.

![Pie chart showing highest qualifications](image)

Figure 4.4 - Highest Qualification
4.2.5 Area of Specialisation

A little over half 53.3% of respondents indicated that they were involved in some level of primary education with the remainder of respondents specifying their area of secondary specialisation.

My area of speciality in education is …

![Pie chart showing areas of specialisation]

**Figure 4.5 - Area of Specialisation**
4.2.6 Type of School

The type of school structure indicated that a little over half (51.4%) of the respondents came from K-12 schools. The rest of the respondents came from either a separate primary (35.9%) or secondary (12.7%) work environment.

![Figure 4.6 - Type of School](image_url)
4.2.7 School Enrolments

The size of the schools varied from small schools with less than 200 students to schools that had over 500 students. The largest group of respondents came from the largest school enrolment category. This obviously reflected the greater number of staff employed in the bigger schools.

Figure 4.7 - School size
4.2.8 School Religious / Faith Connection

From the 221 respondents, 131 (59.5%) indicated that they were teaching in an Adventist school and 89 (40.5%) stated that they were teaching in a Lutheran school.

4.2.9 Personal Religious / Faith Connection – all schools

Of the 89 respondents who indicated that they worked in a Lutheran school, 53 respondents indicated that they were from a Lutheran heritage (59.5%). Similarly of the 131 respondents who indicated that they worked in a Seventh-day Adventist school, 120 respondents stated that they were from an Adventist background (91.6%). There were no Seventh-day Adventists in Lutheran schools and no Lutherans in Adventist schools.

Figure 4.8 – Personal religious / faith affiliation - all schools
4.2.9.1 Personal Religious / Faith Connection – Lutheran Schools

Figure 4.9 - Personal religious / faith affiliation - Lutheran schools
4.2.9.2 Personal Religious / Faith Connection – SDA Schools

My personal religious / faith connection is ...

Figure 4.10 - Personal religious / faith affiliation - SDA schools
4.2.10 Australian born / Overseas born

The local versus overseas born distinction clearly showed that the overwhelming majority of teachers were born in Australia.

Figure 4.11 - Australian born / overseas born
4.2.11 First Language other than English

The characteristic of having a first language other than English can be seen to be almost 14%, which very clearly has a probable linkage to the previous question regarding place of birth.

![Pie chart showing percentage of respondents with a first language other than English](Figure 4.12 - First language other than English)
4.3 Quantitative Component

4.3.1 Introduction

This section presents results that relate to the first two research questions:

1. How do teachers who work in faith-based school systems rate themselves in terms of agreement with worldview factors related to religiosity and spirituality (when specified definitions of these factors are adopted) and how satisfied are these teachers with various aspects of teaching and their jobs?

2. What are the relationships between teachers’ religiosity, spirituality and job satisfaction within this given framework?

4.3.2 The Quantitative Component Instruments

The quantitative component instruments of the survey consisted of two sections: a ‘Questions About Your Job’ (Aspects of Teaching) instrument and a ‘Perspectives On Life’ (Worldviews) instrument.

4.3.2.1 Aspects of Teaching

The ‘Questions About Your Job’ section in the survey instrument consisted of 29 questions, which came from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). The original 5-point Likert scale was increased to a 6-point Likert scale, to produce a forced-choice system. Finally an additional summative overall job satisfaction question (Q 41) was added.

Consequently this ‘Questions About Your Job’ section covered five aspects of teaching factors or sub-scales (See Table 3.1) plus one summative question:

- Factor 1 - Colleagues - 8 items
- Factor 2 - Working Conditions - 4 items
- Factor 3 - Responsibility - 7 items
- Factor 4 - Work Itself - 8 items
- Factor 5 - Recognition - 2 items
- Summative Question – Overall Job Satisfaction
4.3.2.2 Perspectives on Life

The ‘Perspectives On Life’ instrument consisted of 18 questions, nine of which came from the Religious Commitment Inventory 10 (RCI-10) and eight questions from the Brief Multi-dimensional Measure of Religiousness / Spirituality: 1999 (BMMRS). All questions were converted to a 6-point Likert scale, to produce a forced-choice system. The ‘Perspectives On Life’ instrument contained two worldview factors:

- Factor 1 - Religiosity – (9 items, see Table 3.3)
- Factor 2 – Spirituality – (8 items, see Table 3.4)

The five aspects of teaching factors and the two worldview factors now have specific definitions and when these terms are presented in a capitalised form they will refer to the above definitions.

4.3.2.3 Instrument Analysis

The Perspectives On Life or Worldview factors (Religiosity and Spirituality) and the Aspects of Teaching (Work Itself, Recognition, Responsibility, Colleagues, and Working conditions) factors were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis to verify that the respective items for each factor were appropriate and that they were distinct constructs. The factor analysis indicated that religiosity and spirituality were distinct constructs (Appendix 2), though it suggested that each construct consisted of sub-constructs. The factor analysis indicated that there were five Aspects of Teaching components (Appendix 3), even though for this data set, the factors ‘Work Itself’ and ‘Responsibility’ have some minor overlap.

For this study, the Religiosity and Spirituality factors were considered as single units, and the five Aspects of Teaching factors as indicated in the methodology were adopted as single measures.

The internal reliability of each of the factors was calculated using a Cronbach alpha index. In the ‘Work Itself’, ‘Responsibility’, and ‘Working Conditions’ factors, one item was removed.
to improve the sub-scale’s internal reliability. The Cronbach alpha indices of these resultant factors lay between 0.600 and 0.867, an acceptable range.

The final nature of the Spirituality, Religiosity and the Work Itself, Recognition, Responsibility, Colleagues, and Working Conditions factors, with their respective Cronbach alpha indices, are shown in Tables 4.1-7. Further the mean and standard deviation for each of the individual items are shown in these tables. A mean of 1 indicates strong disagreement with the statement while a mean of 6 indicates a strong agreement with the statement.

### Table 4.1 - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Itself (n=7) Alpha = 0.600</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Teaching is very interesting work.</td>
<td>5.5415</td>
<td>0.70328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Teaching encourages me to be creative.</td>
<td>5.3073</td>
<td>0.79100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Teaching does not provide me the chance to develop new methods.</td>
<td>4.8585</td>
<td>1.17343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Teaching provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.</td>
<td>5.6829</td>
<td>0.61193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 I am indifferent toward teaching.</td>
<td>5.3463</td>
<td>1.08558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions.</td>
<td>4.3951</td>
<td>1.34856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 The work of a teacher is very pleasant.</td>
<td>5.902</td>
<td>1.03748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2 - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition (n=2) Alpha = 0.600</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.</td>
<td>3.8605</td>
<td>1.27853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 No one tells me that I am a good teacher.</td>
<td>4.2605</td>
<td>1.35587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3 - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility (n=6) Alpha = 0.679</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 I get along well with my students.</td>
<td>5.4619</td>
<td>0.64961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 I try to be aware of the policies of my school.</td>
<td>5.1429</td>
<td>0.87963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 I do have responsibility for my teaching.</td>
<td>5.5095</td>
<td>0.85973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 My students respect me as a teacher.</td>
<td>5.3333</td>
<td>0.76611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.</td>
<td>5.6476</td>
<td>0.73179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.</td>
<td>5.7000</td>
<td>0.62676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4 - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleagues (n=8) Alpha = 0.756</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 I like the people with whom I work.</td>
<td>5.5215</td>
<td>0.77259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I get along well with my colleagues.</td>
<td>5.4354</td>
<td>0.67716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 I do not get cooperation from the people I work with.</td>
<td>5.0813</td>
<td>1.18812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.</td>
<td>4.4450</td>
<td>1.15112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 My colleagues are highly critical of one another.</td>
<td>4.5694</td>
<td>1.36446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.  

My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.  

My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching.

---

**Table 4.5** - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions (n=3)</th>
<th>Alpha = 0.757</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Working conditions in my school are good.</td>
<td>4.8910</td>
<td>1.10947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The administration in my school communicates its policies well.</td>
<td>4.4028</td>
<td>1.16855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Working conditions in my school can be improved.</td>
<td>2.6919</td>
<td>1.27050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 4.6** - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity (n=9)</th>
<th>Alpha = 0.819</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I enjoy working in the activities of my religious organization</td>
<td>4.9343</td>
<td>1.05712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I enjoy spending time with others of my religious affiliation</td>
<td>5.0909</td>
<td>1.06719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I keep well informed about my local religious group and have some influence in its decisions</td>
<td>4.0354</td>
<td>1.46491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Besides religious services, how often do you take part in other activities at a place of worship?</td>
<td>4.7071</td>
<td>0.96909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>How often do you go to religious services?</td>
<td>3.7020</td>
<td>1.46952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>The financial contributions that you make towards the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
<td>4.0909</td>
<td>1.14076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>The voluntary work you do for the religious organisation to which you belong could best be described as:</td>
<td>3.7374</td>
<td>1.29494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I consider myself to be a religious person</td>
<td>4.6010</td>
<td>1.40968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>How often do you watch or listen to religious programs on TV, radio or DVD?</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>1.56239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 4.7** - Cronbach alpha indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality (n=8)</th>
<th>Alpha = 0.867</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>My religious beliefs are the basis of my whole approach to life</td>
<td>5.4307</td>
<td>0.82718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith</td>
<td>4.9010</td>
<td>1.08362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and reflection</td>
<td>5.1535</td>
<td>1.04677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Religious beliefs influence all my dealings in life</td>
<td>5.1733</td>
<td>1.08572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life</td>
<td>5.2673</td>
<td>0.99142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I often read books and magazines about my faith</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.24289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I consider myself to be a spiritual person</td>
<td>5.3960</td>
<td>0.90964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All sub-scales have been listed above. A total of three items from the original survey instrument were removed, as their removal resulted in a higher Cronbach’s Alpha score.

4.3.2.4 Aspects of Teaching and Worldview Factors: Characteristics

The mean and standard deviation of the scales for the Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors are shown in Table 4.8

| Table 4.8 - Mean and Standard Deviation – All Factors |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                             | Aspects of Teaching            | Worldview Factors               |
|                             | Colleagues | Working Cond. | Respons. | Work Itself | Recognition | Spirituality | Religiosity |
| N                           | 221        | 221           | 221      | 221         | 221         | 221          | 221         |
| Mean                        | 4.731      | 4.011         | 5.480    | 5.095       | 4.057       | 5.127        | 4.256       |
| Std Dev                     | 0.673      | 0.963         | 0.462    | 0.539       | 1.104       | 0.727        | 0.812       |

The mean values (on a one to six Likert scale, with six indicating that they strongly agreed with the positive statement and one indicating that they strongly disagreed with the positive statement relating to aspects of teaching, spirituality and religiosity) ranged from a low of 4.001 to a high of 5.480. The standard deviations ranged from 0.462 (Responsibility) to a rather large 1.104 (Recognition).
4.3.3 Profiles

The nature of a particular group or sub-group within this sample can be described with reference to their aspects of teaching and worldview factors. Such a description, in this study, has been labelled as the groups or sub-groups profile.

4.3.3.1 Overall Profile

When the sample is considered as one group their profile is shown Figure 4.13.

![Figure 4.13](image)

- The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors for all data

Of the Aspects of Teaching factors, Responsibility with a mean of 5.480 and Work Itself with a mean of 5.095 are the factors with higher mean scale scores, and Working Conditions with a mean of 4.011 and Recognition with a mean of 4.057 have the lower scores. It should be noted that the Responsibility factor has the lowest standard deviation (0.462) and the Recognition factor the highest standard deviation (1.104) with the standard deviation for the other Aspects of Teaching factors being in between.
In terms of Worldview the Spirituality factor score with a mean of 5.127 is significantly greater than the Religiosity factor with a mean of 4.256. This indicates that respondents that report stronger agreement with possessing Spirituality than Religiosity.

4.3.3.2 Gender Profile

The mean values of the male and female respondents for the respective factors are illustrated in the gender profile shown in Figure 4.14.

![Figure 4.14](image)

**Figure 4.14** - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: gender comparison

The general trend of the data indicates that females most often score higher on each profile element. The difference between the male and female response was significant at the 0.05 level for the Aspects of Teaching sub-scales: Colleagues (t[215]=3.747, p<0.005), Working Conditions (t[215]=2.342, p<0.005), Responsibility (t[215]=2.167, p<0.005), Work Itself (t[215]=2.097, p<0.005), with the females means score being significantly higher. Although the graph on Recognition appears to show a significant difference between the males and the
females, this difference is not statistically significant due to the high standard deviations for both the female (1.121) and the male (1.085) sub-groups.

There is no statistically significant difference between the males and the females in terms of their self-rating of both spirituality and religiosity (Figure 4.14).

4.3.3.3 Age Group Profile

The mean values of the respective age groups are illustrated in the Age Group Profile shown in Figure 4.15

![Figure 4.15 - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: age grouping comparison](image)

In terms of the Aspects of Teaching factors it is the 41-50 age group that most often score the highest, whereas the trend is for the youngest and the oldest groups to score the lowest. (Figure 4.16) There is, however, no statistically significant difference between the respective age groups for any of the other Aspects of Teaching factors or sub-scales.

Similarly for the Spirituality and Religiosity factors there is no statistically significant differences between the respective age groups. There is a trend however, with the middle age groups (31-40, 41-50 and 51-60) scoring higher than the youngest and oldest age groups.
4.3.3.4 Years of Teaching Experience Profile

The mean values for the teaching experience groupings (0-2 years, 3-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, 20+ years) for the respective factors are illustrated in Figure 4.16.

![Figure 4.16](image)

**Figure 4.16** - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: years of teaching experience comparison

Although there is not a statistically significant difference for any of the Aspects of Teaching factors between the years of experience groupings, there is within the Recognition factor a noticeably lower rating for both the 3-5 years and the 11-20 years groups.

In terms of the Worldview factors there is no statistically significant difference between the respective years of experience groupings, however, there is a statistically significant difference between the respective years of experience groupings in the Spirituality factor (F[4,215]=2.612, p<0.05). It is the 3-5 years experience group that has a statistically significantly lower spirituality rating than the others, but all the means are in the same category of moderately agreeing.
4.3.3.5 Highest Qualification Profile

The mean values for the respective qualification groupings (2 year qualification, 3 year qualification, 4 year qualification and 4+ year qualifications) are illustrated in Figure 4.17.

![Figure 4.17 - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: qualification levels comparison](image)

The data indicates for the Aspects of Teaching factors, that higher qualifications is statistically significant at the 0.05 level for the Working Conditions element ($F[3,215]=2.872$, $p<0.05$) with more highly qualified respondents registering lower Working Conditions scale scores. For the remaining Aspects of Teaching factors there are no statistically significant differences.

In terms of the Worldview factors, there are no statistically significant differences between the respective levels of qualification groupings.
4.3.3.6 School Student Enrolment Profile

The mean values for the respective school student enrolment profile groupings (0-200 students, 201-300 students, 301-500 students, 500+ students) are illustrated in Figure 4.18.

The general trend of the data indicates that school size has an impact on four of the five job satisfaction elements. The difference between the respondent’s school size was statistically significant at the 0.05 level for the job satisfaction sub-scales: Colleagues (F[3,216]=4.694, p<0.005), Working Conditions (F[3,216]=9.503, p<0.005), Responsibility (F[3,216]=5.009, p<0.005), Recognition (F[3,215]=3.718, p<0.005), with the larger schools scoring higher. Mid-range schools (201-300, 301-500) generally scored lower. Only for Working Conditions is there a difference across a category boundary. Schools of 301-500 indicate that they only slightly agree that there are appropriate Working Conditions, while the other size schools indicate that they moderately agree with the appropriateness of the Working Conditions.

In terms of the Worldview factors, there are no statistically significant differences between the respective school size groupings.
4.3.3.7 School Level Profile

The mean values for the respective school level profile groupings (Primary, Secondary) are illustrated in Figure 4.19.

![Figure 4.19](image-url)

Figure 4.19 - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: primary / secondary comparison

The general trend of the data indicates that primary teachers most often score higher on each profile element. The difference between the primary and secondary response was statistically significant at the 0.05 level for all the job satisfaction sub-scales: Colleagues (F[1,216]=17.190, p<0.005), Working Conditions (F[1,216]=25.107, p<0.005), Responsibility (F[1,216]=8.005, p<0.005), Work Itself (F[1,216]=8.529, p<0.005), Recognition (F[1,216]=8.121, p<0.005), with the primary teachers scoring significantly higher. However all means were in the same level of agreement category for each factor.

In terms of the Worldview factors, there are no statistically significant differences between the respective primary and secondary groupings.
4.3.3.8 School Religious Affiliation Profile

The mean values for the respective school student religious affiliation profile groupings (Lutheran, Seventh-day Adventist) are illustrated in Figure 4.20.

![Response Comparison Graph](image)

Figure 4.20 - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: school religious affiliation comparison

The general trend of the data indicates that teachers in Lutheran schools most often score higher on each job satisfaction element, while teachers in SDA schools score higher on the Worldview elements. The differences between the teachers in the Lutheran schools and the teachers in the SDA schools response was statistically significant at the 0.05 level for the job satisfaction sub-scales: Colleagues (t[218]=6.168, p<0.005), Working Conditions (t[1,218]=5.557, p<0.005), Responsibility (t[218]=3.885, p<0.005), Work Itself (t[218]=2.863, p<0.005), with the teachers in Lutheran schools scoring significantly higher, but with the same level of agreement. Although the graph on Recognition appears to show a significant difference between the teachers in Lutheran schools and the teachers in SDA schools, this difference is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, due to the high
standard deviations for both the teachers in Lutheran schools (1.141) and the teachers in SDA schools (1.073) sub-groups.

Similarly, although the graph on Spirituality appears to show a statistically significant difference between the teachers in Lutheran schools and the teachers in SDA schools this was not at a statistically significant level. Overall teachers in SDA schools rate themselves at a higher level of religiosity than the teachers in Lutheran schools do, and this response was significant at the 0.05 level: Religiosity (t[218]= -3.591, p<0.005).

4.3.3.9 Teacher Religious Affiliation Profile

The mean values for the respective teacher religious affiliation profile groupings (Lutheran, Other Christian, SDA) are illustrated in Figure 4.21.

![Figure 4.21](image-url) - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: teacher religious affiliation comparison
The difference between the respective religious affiliation groupings was statistically significant at the 0.05 level for the Aspects of Teaching sub-scales: Colleagues (F[2,218]=23.507, p<0.001); Working Conditions (F[2,218]=19.114, p<0.005); Responsibility (F[2,218]=7.886, p<0.005); Work Itself (F[2,218]=4.163, p<0.005), with the SDA teachers scoring the lowest and the Lutheran teachers scoring the highest.

Although the graph on Recognition appears to show a large difference between the Lutheran teachers and SDA teachers, this difference is not statistically significant due to the high standard deviations for all sub-groups: Other Christian (1.258) Lutheran (.983) and SDA (1.081).

In terms of the Worldview factors there is a statistically significant difference in the responses at the 0.05 level. The teacher religious affiliation profile shows the difference in both elements, the Spirituality factor (F[2,218]=5.121, p<0.05) and the Religiosity (F[2,218]=9.311, p<0.05) with the Other Christian teachers scoring the lowest and SDA teachers scoring the highest.

None of the differences related to personal religious affiliation crossed level of agreement boundaries, even the largest difference (Working Conditions – lower SDA scores) remained within the same category of agreement.
4.3.3.10 Australian Born / Overseas Born Profile

The mean values for the Australian Born / Overseas Born profile (Australian Born, Overseas Born) are illustrated in Figure 4.22.

![Figure 4.22](image)

Figure 4.22 - The mean response for the respective Aspects of Teaching and Worldview factors: Australian Born / Overseas Born comparison

The general trend of the data indicates that overseas born teachers most often score higher on each Aspects of Teaching factor except for the colleagues sub-scale. The differences between the overseas born teachers and the Australian born teachers responses were statistically significant at the 0.05 level for one job satisfaction sub-scale: Work Itself ($t[219]=-2.239$, $p<0.005$), with the overseas born teachers scoring significantly higher. Although the graph on Recognition appears to show a large difference between Australian born and others there is no statistical difference, this is possibly due to the high standard deviations for both groups (1.105, 1.060).

In terms of the Worldview factors, there are no statistically significant differences between the respective Australian born and overseas born groupings for religiosity, however the Spirituality element is significant at the 0.05 level: Spirituality ($t[219]=-2.282$, $p<0.005$).
4.3.4 Potential Relationships

Regression analysis was used to explore relationships between Overall Job Satisfaction and the respective Aspects of Teaching factors, Worldview factors, and the respective teacher’s demographics.

The demographics included:

- Age
- Gender
- Years of teaching
- Qualifications
- Area of speciality *
- School type *
- School size *
- School’s faith affiliation *
- Teacher’s faith affiliation
- Place of birth *
- First language *

* All these items were later eliminated from the model.

The Aspects of Teaching factors covered:

- Work Itself
- Recognition
- Responsibility
- Colleagues
- Working Conditions

The Worldview factors consisted of:

- Religiosity
- Spirituality

4.3.4.1 Regression analysis for predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction: Hierarchical Regression

To test the relative influence of each of these groups of variables on Overall Job Satisfaction, hierarchical regression analysis was carried out using this initial model. (Figure 4.23) A
number of demographic variables were omitted (*) because initial regression analysis indicated that they had minimal impact on Overall Job Satisfaction.

The model, then, for the predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction (dependent variable) consists of the following set of independent variables: Demographics - Age, Gender, Highest Qualification, Teacher Religious Affiliation; Aspects of Teaching factors – Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself, Recognition; Worldview factors – Spirituality, Religiosity.
Hierarchical regression of this model indicated that the Demographics accounted for 13.7%, the Aspects of Teaching factors accounted for 31.1% and the World View factors accounted for 2.2% of the explained variance in Overall Job Satisfaction.
4.3.4.2 Regression analysis for predictors of overall job satisfaction: Backward Regression

The initial model then for the predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction (dependent variable) consisted of the following set of independent variables: Demographics - Age, Gender, Highest Qualification, Teacher Religious Affiliation; Aspects of Teaching factors – Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself, Recognition; Worldview factors – Spirituality, Religiosity.

To test the relative influence of each of these dependent variables backward regression analysis was carried out using this model.

This model accounted for 47.2% of the explained variance. Backward regression, however, generated a four factor model (Table 4.9), significant (at the 0.05 level), which accounted for 45.4% of the explained variance in overall job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Respondent</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>6.884</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>5.598</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strongest predictor of Overall Job Satisfaction is Working Conditions, followed by Work Itself, and Spirituality with the Age of the Respondent having the least influence on the final outcome.

4.3.4.3 Regression analysis for predictors of Spirituality: Hierarchical Regression

It was noted that there was a strong correlation between Religiosity and Spirituality (.729) and between Spirituality and some demographics. This suggested that it would be appropriate to regress the Demographics and Religiosity factor onto Spirituality to explore the relationships between these groups.
The model then, for the predictors of Spirituality (dependent variable) consisted of the following set of independent variables: Demographics – Age (1 – lowest age group, 5 – highest age group), Gender (1- male, 2 – female), Highest Qualifications (1 – lowest qualification, 4 – highest qualification), Teacher Religious Affiliation; and the Worldview factor – Religiosity.

Within this model the Demographics accounted for 10.1% and the Religiosity factors accounted for 45.2% of the explained variance in Spirituality.

4.3.4.4 Regression analysis for predictors of Spirituality: Backward Regression

To test the relative influence of each of these dependent variables backward regression analysis was carried out using this model.

The model then, for the predictors of Spirituality (dependent variable) consisted of the following set of independent variables: Demographics – Age, Gender, Highest Qualifications, Teacher Religious Affiliation; and the Worldview factor – Religiosity.

| Table 4.10 - Predictors of Spirituality – All Respondents |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|--------|
| Independent Variables | R Square | Beta    | t     | Significance |
| Religiosity        | 0.539   | .729    | 15.623 | .000        |
| Gender             |         | -0.092  | -1.976 | .049        |

This model accounted for 54.2% of the explained variance. Backward regression, however, generated a two significant (at the 0.05 level) factor model (Table 4.10), which accounted for 53.9% of the explained variance in spirituality.

4.3.4.5 Modified Overall Job Satisfaction Model: Quantitative data

The above regression analyses indicate that although Overall Job Satisfaction is influenced by the following set of variables; Demographics, Aspects of Teaching and World View
factors as proposed in the initial model (Figure 4.23), not each variable within these sets had a significant impact on Overall Job Satisfaction.

For the Demographic set of variables it was only Age that has a significant and direct impact on Overall Job Satisfaction; with the older teachers being more satisfied with their teaching role than the younger ones. In terms of Aspects of Teaching, the variables Working Conditions and Work Itself were the only variables within the set that significantly contributed to Overall Job Satisfaction. Those teachers that perceived their working conditions were pleasant and the work itself was rewarding, registered the highest Overall Job Satisfaction. Finally, the Demographic variable Gender and the World View variable Religiosity positively influenced Overall Job Satisfaction indirectly through the mediating World View variable Spirituality.

4.3.4.6 Regression analysis for predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction: A comparison

Comparisons of the influences on Overall Job Satisfaction for the teaching personnel in the SDA school system as compared to those teachers in the Lutheran school system are presented below.

To test the relative influence of each of the independent variables on Overall Job Satisfaction (dependent variable) backward regression analysis was carried out using this model.

The model then for the predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction (dependent variable) consisted of the following set of independent variables: Demographics - Age, Gender, Aspects of Teaching factors – Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself, Recognition; Worldview factors – Spirituality, Religiosity.

For the teachers in Lutheran schools, the model accounted for 41.5% of the explained variance. Backward regression, however, generated a four-factor model, significant (at the 0.05 level) (Table 4.11), which accounted for 37.8% of the explained variance in overall job satisfaction.
Table 4.11  - Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction - Lutheran School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Respondent</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>2.771</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strongest predictor of Overall Job Satisfaction for teachers in Lutheran schools is Working Conditions, followed by Work Itself, and Religiosity with the Age of the Respondent having the least influence on the final outcome.

For the teachers in SDA schools, the model accounted for 49.1% of the explained variance. Backward regression, however, generated a three significant (at the 0.05 level) factor model (Table 4.18), which accounted for 47.2% of the explained variance in Overall Job Satisfaction.

Table 4.12  - Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction - SDA School Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>5.725</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strongest predictor of Overall Job Satisfaction for teachers in SDA schools is Working Conditions, followed by Work Itself, and with Spirituality having the least influence on the final outcome.

For both groups of teachers, the factors that have the greatest impact on Overall Job Satisfaction are; Working Conditions and Work Itself, followed by a worldview factor.

The most notable difference between the teachers in Lutheran schools compared to the teachers in SDA schools is that for the Lutherans religiosity (interpersonal-corporate
activities) directly influences Overall Job Satisfaction while for those teaching in SDA schools spirituality (intrapersonal aspects) directly influences Overall Job Satisfaction. The age of the respondent was a predictor of Overall Job Satisfaction only for those teachers in Lutheran schools.
4.5 Qualitative Component

4.5.1 Introduction

This section presents results that relate primarily to the third and fourth research questions:

3. What is the nature of the teachers’ perceptions of religiosity and spirituality when allowing for the respondents to formulate their own framework in which to describe these constructs?

4. What do teachers perceive impacts satisfaction with their job, when allowing for the respondents to formulate their own framework in which to describe these constructs?

4.5.2 The Qualitative Component Instruments

The qualitative component survey instrument consisted of two open-ended questions:

- Please write any thoughts that you have on your own job satisfaction.
- Please write any thoughts that you have on your own spirituality / religiosity.

The written responses to these questions were analysed following an inductive thematic analysis process.

4.5.3 The nature of Spirituality and Religiosity: The teachers’ perspectives

The teachers perceived that there was a difference between spirituality and religiosity, and even though they could not always clearly articulate this difference, they thought that this difference was extremely important. This is illustrated by the following responses: “There is a difference between spirituality and religion. I note myself as a spiritual rather than religious person” and “I am glad the distinction was made between religious vs spiritual”. There were a number of the respondents that perceived that spirituality was more important in their life than religiosity. To quote two respondents, “I believe in a relationship with God [spirituality] more than 'religion' [religiosity]”, and “I consider my personal spirituality more important than church affiliation.”
The characteristics of spirituality and religiosity as seen by the teachers are illustrated in the figure below:

![Figure 4.24 Unframed teachers’ perspective on Religiosity and Spirituality](image)

For these teachers, spirituality was firstly defined as a private relationship or something that dealt with one’s own faith. It emphasised the moral and ethical aspects of one’s worldview and was seen as somewhat independent of one’s religious affiliation. As one respondent stated: “I believe one's spiritual realm ought to be a private affirmation of one's faith and not necessarily a public affirmation. One's actions ought to be taken to an ethical and moral maxim in spite of one's religious affiliation.”

Secondly, spirituality was seen to be something that added security to one’s life and included prayer, but prayer that is personal in nature and this reinforced the relational aspect of this construct. One respondent stated it as follows: “My faith gives me an anchor point. A point of reference from which to view all the complexities of life”.

Finally, the teachers acknowledged that there is a difference between spirituality and religiosity, but some felt that spirituality “cannot be measured”, as one respondent said. There was a feeling amongst the respondents that spirituality was a personal relationship and as such that it may be difficult to measure.
For these teachers, religiosity was firstly defined as the public relationship or something that dealt with one’s community. Some respondents appeared to focus on the things that one does – reading books, watching DVDs, public prayer, rules, doing or not doing things.

“Always interested in reading spiritual books and listening to … talks on CDs.”
“Seem to be more liberal in my application of the ‘do’s’ and ‘don’ts’ of my religion.”

Some respondents also appeared to lament the busyness of their lives, which prevented them from accomplishing or doing more in this area of religious expression. This is illustrated by the following respondents’ comments:

“I could be more involved if work wasn’t so busy.”
“My work … has limited my ability to volunteer due to time demands.”
“I have a strong faith but find that being a busy mum limits these types of activities.”

It should be noted however that there were some aspects of religiosity that were considered negative. This is well illustrated by the following respondent’s comment: “I feel strict rules are less important than happiness / peace and a faith in the bigger picture”. Consequently the model has the dotted line to distinguish between the positive and negative elements of the Worldview factors.

In addition to this, a considerable number of respondents indicated that a ‘relationship with God’ seemed to connect both spirituality and religiosity with some emphasising that it covered both constructs while others suggesting that it moved beyond these constructs.

Comments from respondents included:

“Every day is an experience with God and I know and am convinced that God guides me [in] everything that I do.”
“I believe that a relationship with God is what counts.”

4.5.4 The factors that impact Overall Job Satisfaction: The teachers’ perspectives

When the teachers were given the opportunity to outline their own framework for factors that influence Overall Job Satisfaction three major themes began to emerge from the data: People (others and oneself), Processes (the job itself), and the Purpose for Teaching. (The lack of any significant mention of ‘advancement’, ‘pay’, or ‘security’ as a satisfaction element is noteworthy. This gives validity to the decision to omit these factors (Sect. 3.5.1) found in the original American-based TJSQ from the questionnaire used in this study).
Within the theme entitled ‘People’ there are four sub-sets that were identified: administration, colleagues, students and oneself. The teachers indicated that job satisfaction came when the administration was supportive of the staff and made them feel things were organised and they were included in the operation of the school. Further, this overall satisfaction was enhanced if the teachers perceived the administration were seeking God’s leading in the running of the institution. Communication, or the lack of it, also appeared to be an important factor in influencing job satisfaction. The considerable influence of the administration subset within ‘People’ and their impact upon Job Satisfaction is evident from the following quotes:

“In comparison to my past experiences, I love it here at [deleted]. I feel safe with the prayerful decisions made by our leadership staff.”
“Best school I have taught at. Great colleagues, great students, supportive parents and fantastic principal.”

The teacher’s evaluation of the influence of the administration is reinforced by the following negative comments:

“Job satisfaction is reduced by unorganised daily activities from administration, lack of support, workload.”
“My satisfaction is linked to the effectiveness of admin. to do their job well. e.g., Communicate, lead, hold students accountable for behaviour.”
“Communication between staff could be better. Staff morale could improve.”
“Everything is OK most of the time. Job satisfaction decreases during disagreement in decision making with Admin. When I feel that I am treated no better than a student.”

Secondly, one’s colleagues have a very important part to play in overall job satisfaction. Teachers stated that when their colleagues were helpful and assisted each other their levels of overall job satisfaction increased. Teachers also perceived that things worked better when they were able to call on and give their expertise to others. This is illustrated by comments from a number of respondents:

“My job satisfaction is due in a large part to the people I work with.”
“It really helps to get along with the people in your department = a better team.”

The influence of colleagues is further highlighted by the following negative comment:

“Most of the people around me don’t inspire me. My wife does a lot.”

Thirdly, the students were also deemed to be an important factor in determining job satisfaction. Teachers gain satisfaction from seeing students progress and develop in both the academic and spiritual / social domains of their lives. This was demonstrated by the respondents’ comments below:
“I love it when students tell me about what they have learned.”

“Job satisfaction for me is based on two factors. 1 – Success with my students in challenging them or seeing them give life a go. 2 – A working body who communicates well, you never feel lost or out of the loop.”

“I have been teaching in a variety of classes before 2010. This cohort are a really enjoyable group and have immense respect for self and others and adjust behaviour when they know they are acting inappropriately.”

“I enjoy having the opportunity to make a difference to children.”

“I love the job of teaching. I believe that we can make something wonderful out of every human being. The combination of religion and teaching is powerful. The value added component is often the difference in religious schools.”

“What keeps me highly motivated and focused is engaging with students, banter, camaraderie...”

The fourth and final subset within the People theme – Myself, clearly stated that the individual teacher was a significant controller of his or her own job satisfaction. Teachers stated that they have the control over their Overall Job Satisfaction. Some maintained that satisfaction is an intrinsic / internal thing that is not so dependent on external factors. Others stated that if one has organised him or her self and prepared ahead of time, then job satisfaction is greater. Note how the following quotes from various respondents support these concepts:

“Basically, teachers problems are self-imposed. This means that the level of satisfaction obtained from teaching requires temperance in judgment.”

“Like life, job satisfaction is what I make of it. I have the greatest input into whether it is 'grand' or ordinary.”

“Job satisfaction is probably more dependent on my frame of mind and attitude than anything else.”

“Job satisfaction relies on me being highly prepared in advance, so I can adapt the content and pace myself according to the classroom environment.”

“My job satisfaction is based on intrinsic values cultivated by my Christian philosophy and influenced by my Christian teachers. Thus it is possible for me to remain satisfied with my job regardless of extrinsic factors.”

“Satisfaction tends to be internally driven rather than externally driven.”

The second of three themes – Processes (or the job itself) – was also evident as a factor impacting Overall Job Satisfaction. Here the teachers outlined while they may enjoy teaching, there are systems, processes or protocols that reduce their level of job satisfaction. Some teachers found job descriptions, and guidance, together with the need to be efficient, were all important in the process of teaching to have job satisfaction. These thoughts are outlined in the quotes from various respondents:

“I do enjoy it but some things need to be changed in the school and its systems.”
“It would give more clarification if I were to have a job description to compare it to.”
“I enjoy teaching, but find the independent system frustrating to work within.”
“I get frustrated at inefficiencies within the school.”
“Apart from lack of initial guidance, job description, etc. my school is a pleasant, cooperative environment in which to work.”

Also within the Processes theme there were numerous references to time, or more specifically the lack of time associated with the job itself. In a similar manner to the need to be efficient, the need to get the job done within a reasonable amount of time was considered essential. The lack of time to complete the various jobs significantly reduces teacher’s job satisfaction. This is shown in the respondent’s comments below:

“The first couple of years aren’t that much fun because you are too busy. I think it’s getting better though.”
“Only frustration is limited time to achieve so much.”
“Not enough time!”
“Not enough time to spend with students and planning good classes. This decreases satisfaction.”
“Job satisfaction varies based upon stress levels and ‘busyness’ of the year.”
“Would be more satisfied if sufficient time was given to complete responsibilities adequately.”
“Job satisfaction is good, but it consumes almost all of my life and time - not a good balance to pursue other interests. Very demanding work - if it is to be done well.”
“Not enough time in my day to do everything as well as I would always like to.”
“Workloads are substantial but I do my best to get as much done each day as possible.”

The third theme to emerge from the data is identified as the Purpose for Teaching. It has been referred to as a ‘calling’. Teachers identified that for many they believe that they are doing God’s will in performing the role of a teacher. This in turn gives them a sense of peace and satisfaction. This is somewhat akin to how clergy have traditionally perceived their role in society. It appears that many teachers see their purpose in the classroom as being some sort of divine mission. Comments such as those below illustrate these sentiments:

“My job satisfaction is based on intrinsic values cultivated by my Christian philosophy and influenced by my Christian teachers. Thus it is possible for me to remain satisfied with my job regardless of extrinsic factors.”
“When students are happy to come into my classroom; enjoy learning and see Jesus through me then my job is satisfying.”
“I enjoy it even though it wears me out. I would move away from teaching if God called me elsewhere, otherwise I know God uses me here.”
“I believe I am doing the work God has for me right now.”
“So good to have a job that fulfils my personal beliefs and calling to ministry.”
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Even when teachers did not feel satisfied about their job there were those who recognised that the job of teaching could be considered a calling and the following respondent clearly did not feel called.

“I am not sure that I wish to remain in teaching in the long term. I do not feel ‘called’ to be a teacher; it is simply a job.”

At the beginning of this study, when examining the Spirituality / Religiosity Distinction (Section 2.4), it was decided to use a model that regarded these world-view factors as being discrete and stand alone, yet at the same time acknowledging that each factor influences the other. When the teachers in the study were permitted to formulate their own understanding of these world-view factors, we noted that they also regarded them as separate, yet related by a common theme – connectedness with the divine.

That is, for the teachers in this study spirituality is defined as a personal connectedness with a power or source in the universe (most often God given the significantly Judeo-Christian context) that is greater than oneself. In contrast religiosity is defined as the institutional, doctrinal public faith that is celebrated with others. In other words spirituality is focused around the intrapersonal while religiosity is focused around the interpersonal. This has led to a view that the final model should include some element that shows some connectedness between these two worldview factors.
5.1 Aspects of Teaching and World-view factor profiles.

This study explored the self-ratings of teachers who work in faith-based schools, with regard to the impact of their Religiosity, Spirituality and five Aspects of Teaching factors: Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself and Recognition, and how these influenced Overall Job Satisfaction.

The sample consisted of 221 teachers who worked in either the SDA school system or the Lutheran School system in Victoria, Australia. Four SDA schools and five Lutheran schools were involved and the number of teachers where their personal religious affiliation coincided with the school’s religious affiliation was 91.6% (SDA) and 59.5% (Lutheran).

The respondents consisted of 63.4% females and 36.6% males that were relatively evenly distributed across four of the five 10-year age groupings 21-30, 29.2%; 31-40, 20.5%; 41-50, 21.9%; and 51-60, 25.1%. Only the 60+ age category was underrepresented with 3.2%. The distribution of teachers between primary and secondary was 57.9% and 42.1% respectively.

This group of teachers can be characterised by their mean response to the respective Aspects of Teaching factors (Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself, Recognition) and Worldview factors (Spirituality, Religiosity). See Figure 5.1 copied below.
In terms of the respondents’ evaluation of the Aspect of Teaching, it is the Responsibility component (mean: 5.480) that features most prominently having the highest mean. Getting along with and having the respect of students; at that same time helping them learn; at all times accepting the responsibility for one’s own planning and teaching; all gives teachers a sense of responsibility, and it is this factor that features as most notable in the respondent’s view of Aspects of Teaching.

The second highest factor in Aspects of Teaching is Work Itself (mean: 5.059). These teachers considered there were significant opportunities to be creative, to use a variety of skills and they were free to make their own decisions with respect to carrying out their teaching role.

The next highest factor – Colleagues (mean: 4.731) although not as high as the previously outlined factors, still features highly in teacher’s framed perceptions of their job. These teachers, to a large extent, perceived that they got on well with and were stimulated to do their best by their colleagues.
The final two factors, Recognition and Working Conditions, were lower than the other Aspects of Teaching components, although they were rated higher than the mean (3.5) in this rating scale (1-6). Recognition – (mean: 4.057 – within the slightly agree category) indicates that the respondents considered that there was room for improvement in terms of being affirmed in carrying out their role. Working Conditions - (mean: 4.011 – within the slightly agree category) likewise indicates that the respondents saw a minor need to improve the physical environment of their workplace and the communication from administration.

In terms of the Worldview factors, it can be seen that the two elements are distinguished quite clearly in the graphical representation. Spirituality (mean: 5.127 – within the moderately agree category) is understood to relate to the intra-personal, relationship with God’s aspect of one’s world-view. On the other hand, Religiosity (mean: 4.256 – within the slightly agree category) is associated with the inter-personal and rituals aspect of one’s worldview.

When we focus on the seven factors found within the scope of this study, and then assess how the respondents compared along gender lines, Figure 4.14 showed that, apart from Religiosity where the male respondents rated marginally higher, clearly the female respondents rated higher in every element.

When examining how the age of the respondents impacted on their Aspects of Teaching and Worldview self-ratings the general trend showed that the younger and older age groupings were relatively less satisfied while the 41-50 and 51-60 age brackets rated more highly (Figure 4.15). This may be due to the levels of responsibility that are undertaken by those in the ‘prime’ of their career and the satisfaction that comes from positions which have greater influence on school policy and planning. Further research is needed in this area.

The data that compares the years of teaching experience has similar trends as the age profiles (Figure 4.16). The first four factors (Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself), show a positive correlation between years of teaching experience, and satisfaction levels, while the last three factors (Recognition, Religiosity and Spirituality) have a less identifiable pattern.

A distinctly different pattern emerges when one looks at the Aspects of Teaching factors in relation to a teacher’s qualification level. Generally speaking a negative correlation exists.
whereby as one’s qualification level increases, the respondent’s satisfaction or agreement levels decrease (Figure 4.17). When comparing the Worldview factors against qualification levels it can be seen that as the qualification level increases, Spirituality levels decrease and Religiosity marginally increases. Although apart from Working Conditions these trends are not at statistically significant levels. Higher education broadens the awareness, enhances critical thinking and often increases the willingness to express the negative, which may be contribute to this trend.

With the smaller (0-200) and larger schools (500+) it can be noted that there are higher satisfaction levels than those from mid-size schools (Figure 4.18). It may be that smaller schools inspire a higher level of camaraderie as they battle the challenges together, while larger schools possibly operate with a level of specialisation and with departments working together. These characteristics may not be present in medium-size (201-300, 301-500) schools and may account for the pattern that is evident in the data. The Worldview factors have no discernable pattern when compared to school enrolments or school size.

A most obvious pattern exists when the Aspects of Teaching factors are compared to the level of education that one is engaged in. Primary teachers are clearly happier than their secondary counterparts on all factors of the profile (Figure 4.19). This may be partly due to the complexity of teaching at the secondary level and the age of the students with which they interact. With the Worldview factors there is no discernable difference in perceived Religiosity, however once again primary teachers rate themselves more Spiritual than secondary teachers, but this is not at a statistically significant level.

Another area where significant trends are apparent is when the Aspects of Teaching factors are compared to school religious affiliation (Figure 4.20). Here teachers in Lutheran schools scored themselves happier in four of the five Aspects of Teaching factors when compared to teachers in SDA schools. Even in the one factor (Recognition) where the difference was not statistically significant, due to a large standard deviation, teachers in Lutheran schools still ranked themselves more satisfied. Conversely, teachers in SDA schools rated themselves higher on both Worldview factors (Spirituality and Religiosity), however only the Religiosity factor was statistically significant. This may be due to the overwhelming greater ratio of SDA teachers working within the SDA education system compared to the equivalent ration within the Lutheran education system.
Similarly, when we move the focus from the corporate level to the personal level and examine the Aspects of Teaching factors in the light of the teacher’s religious affiliation a familiar pattern emerges (Figure 4.21).

Firstly, teachers classified themselves according to their religious affiliation with Lutheran schools having 59.5% Lutheran adherents. Of the 36 (40.5%) non-Lutheran teachers in Lutheran schools they identified themselves as Anglican (6), Baptist (7), Catholic (7), Christian (8), and one each from the following: Assembly of God, Atheist, Church of Christ, Salvation Army, Ukrainian Catholic, Uniting (Methodist). One respondent did not answer the question. In SDA schools 91.6% of teachers identified themselves as Seventh-day Adventists. Of the 11 (8.4%) non-Adventist teachers in SDA schools, they identified themselves as: Christian (8), Catholic (1), Wesleyan Methodist (1), and one respondent did not answer the question.

Secondly, when the teacher’s religious affiliation and the Aspects of Teaching scales are used as the basis for analysis, the Lutheran teachers rated themselves higher on all five scales. However, the Recognition factor was not statistically significant due to the large standard deviations found within each sub-group of teachers.

Thirdly, a converse relationship is observable when the Worldview factors are examined in the context of the teacher’s religious affiliation. Here it can be seen that for both elements, Spirituality and Religiosity, SDA teachers rate themselves at higher levels than their Lutheran counterparts. Further to this, teachers classified as ‘Other Christian’ rate themselves at the lowest levels on the Worldview subscales.

While it may be considered a little harsh to identify the Adventist teachers as ‘sadly spiritual’ or ‘unhappily holier’ than other sub-groups with their higher scores on Religiosity and Spirituality and lower scores on the Aspects of Teaching scales when compared to the Lutherans and other Christian groups, all these groups to a great extent saw themselves as religious, spiritual and happy with their work.

When Aspects of Teaching and Worldview data is compared with the birth status of the individual (Australian born vs Overseas Born) it appears that overseas born teachers score
higher in six of the seven factors (Figure 4.22). Of these six factors only Work Itself and Spirituality were statistically significant. The one factor where overseas born teachers rated themselves with lower levels of satisfaction was Colleagues. It is speculative at best to identify the major determinant influencing this, however, it may be that overseas teachers have experienced more difficult circumstances before coming to Australia and regard their present lot as ‘not too bad’.

When we begin to examine the teacher’s perspectives on Religion and Spirituality we see that there is a trend consistent with previous research or study done in this area. For example the distinction between Religion and Spirituality is clearly understood and expressed even from within the framed data. Spirituality with its mean of 5.127, appears to be different from Religiosity with its lower mean of 4.256.

**5.2 The nature of Spirituality and Religiosity**

From the data it appears that the teachers perceive that Religiosity and Spirituality are different constructs but not mutually exclusive. They understood that there were elements that overlapped and this was primarily due to both constructs embodying a relationship with God. Although some researchers maintain that one construct is a subset of the other (Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005), and while others see them as discrete constructs (Koenig, 2007), the teachers’ perceptions of Spirituality and Religiosity are that they have common characteristics. This is consistent with the work of Hedley Peach (Peach, 2003) and others (Berry, 2005; Cavanagh & Bandsuch, 2002; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; S. M. King, 2007; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Williams & Sterntal, 2007).

Yet King and Williamson assert that little of the research work has focused on religiosity as opposed to spirituality (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 173). In their study that ‘empirically explore[d] the connection between religiosity and job satisfaction’ they maintain the importance and need for further study in this area.

> Regardless of its relationship to spirituality, religiosity is a valid construct (distinct or otherwise) that has been researched within social science, but continues to be understudied in organizational research even though it is centrally important to many
individuals and has been shown to have considerable influence in other areas of life (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 175).

From here it is clear that an understanding about the nature of Spirituality and Religiosity is developing among researchers, to the point where the two constructs are seen to be as distinct, yet overlapping or related. The teachers’ unframed perceptions of these constructs, free from the assumptions within the quantitative analysis scales, is of some interest and will be detailed in section 5.3.1.

5.3 Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction

5.3.1 Quantitative data: Model for predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction

When examining the predictors for Overall Job Satisfaction the initial analysis looked at 18 inputs from three discrete areas: Demographics, Aspects of Teaching factors and Worldview factors. Using regression analysis the number of potential predictor variables was reduced to 11 and an initial model for the predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction was constructed.

To determine the relative influence of each of these 11 factors, backward regression analysis was carried out and four independent variables were shown to be the strongest predictors of the Overall Job Satisfaction – the dependent variable. These were in order of strongest impact: Working Conditions, Work Itself, Spirituality and the Age of the Respondent.

Because of the previously noted strong correlation between Spirituality and some other factors, it was decided to model Spirituality as a dependent variable to ascertain what were its predictors. The first step in this process produced a model where Religiosity and Demographics, 45.2% and 10.1% respectively, accounted for the variance in Spirituality. This high level of interaction between Spirituality and Religiosity is in line with previous research that has been conducted on these two phenomena (Hill & Pargament, 2003; Hudson, 2007; J. E. King & Crowther, 2004; Koenig, 2007; Langehough, 1997; Neff, 2006; Piedmont, Werdel, & Fernando, 2009; Slater, Hall, & Edwards, 2001; Zullig, et al., 2006).

When this was completed, backward regression was performed to identify the predictors of Spirituality and both Religiosity and Gender were significant at the 0.05 level. This work
then resulted in the development of a modified model (Figure 5.2) for the predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction.

This model indicates that influences on Overall Job Satisfaction can be best described by a combination of direct and indirect relationships. The demographic variable – age, and the job satisfaction elements – Working Conditions and Work Itself, impact Overall Job Satisfaction directly. In contrast to this, the demographic variable – Gender, and the world-view factor – Religiosity, both influence Overall Job Satisfaction indirectly through their influence on Spirituality. In addition to this Religiosity also has a direct influence upon Overall Job Satisfaction. (Fig 5.2)
That is, in this study teachers indicated that working conditions that involved – a pleasant physical environment and where the administration communicates its policies well, and where the work enables one to be creative, using a variety of skills and providing opportunities to make one’s own decisions, have a major positive impact on Overall Job
Satisfaction. The data indicated that as age increased, Overall Job Satisfaction increased and also that the females demonstrated a higher level of Overall Job Satisfaction than the males. For the teachers, the greater they perceive their connectedness to the Divine, and the greater their involvement with their religious community, and the rituals of that community, then the greater their Overall Job Satisfaction. This impact was relatively minor compared to the Aspects of Work factors.

An interesting feature of the data was the difference in the predictors of the Overall Job Satisfaction for teachers who worked in Lutheran schools when compared with teachers who worked in SDA schools. Backward regression using the data produced a four-factor model for teachers in Lutheran schools: Working Conditions, Work Itself, Religiosity and the Age of the respondent.

In contrast to this when teachers working in the SDA system responded to the questionnaires the outcome of backward regression produced a three-factor model: Working Conditions, Work Itself and Spirituality.

It can be clearly seen that the teachers from the two different systems share two Aspects of Teaching factors in common – Working Conditions and Work Itself. Furthermore in both groups of teachers these factors are the strongest predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction. The teachers from the Lutheran system however are the only ones to have a demographic variable – age, that has any impact on Overall Job Satisfaction.

Interestingly, both groups of teachers have a Worldview factor that influences Overall Job Satisfaction, yet for each group it is a different factor. For teachers in the Lutheran system the Worldview factor is Religiosity while for teachers in the SDA system the Worldview factor is Spirituality. While it has already been stated that these two constructs are related, and this is consistent with previous research, a clear explanation for the difference is not immediately obvious.
In the models shown above we see that teachers in Lutheran schools see Religiosity as a more affirmed aspect of their lives and impacting on their job satisfaction. In contrast to this, the teachers in SDA schools see Spirituality as a more agreed component in their lives and impacting on their job satisfaction. A number of possible explanations exist. Firstly, it could
be that teachers in the respective systems have different understandings of the terms Religiosity and Spirituality and hence the different outcomes. Secondly, it could be that the teachers in the respective systems have the same understandings of the terms and yet their worldviews are influenced by different sets of evaluative criteria. One can speculate on what these criteria are, however this is an area where further research is recommended.

5.3.2 Qualitative data: Model for predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction

When given the opportunity to present their perspectives on factors that influence Overall Job Satisfaction without the constraints of a the survey framework, the teachers in this study included elements found from the survey analysis, but also presented additional factors. From the analysis of this qualitative data three major themes emerged as having a major impact on Overall Job Satisfaction: People, Processes and Purpose for Teaching (See Fig. 5.5).

**Factors that Impact Job Satisfaction - The Teachers’ Perspective.**

![Diagram showing factors that impact job satisfaction from the teachers' perspective.](image-url)

Figure 5.5 - Factors that Impact Job Satisfaction - The Teachers’ Perspective
Within the People theme the first sub-set was Administration, where administration that was perceived to be supportive and inclusive contributed to the teachers’ Overall Job Satisfaction. This component is similar to Working Conditions identified from the quantitative data analyses. The second sub-set was Colleagues, where if they were seen to be inspiring and motivating and acted with a team spirit, then this contributed positively to the teachers’ Overall Job Satisfaction; a component not identified from the quantitative data analysis. The third sub-set, which also was not identified from the regression analysis, was students. The Overall Job Satisfaction increased where teachers were able to see improvements within the academic and social arenas of their students. The fourth sub-set, which similarly was not identified from the quantitative data, was labelled as Myself. Those teachers, who maintained a positive attitude to their work and were consistent in their planning so as to remain organised, recorded greater Overall Job Satisfaction.

Within the second theme of Processes, it was those teachers that perceived the workplace to have efficient and inclusive systems in place and there were acceptable workloads that resulted in higher Overall Job Satisfaction ratings. This theme had some level of similarity to the Working Conditions component from the quantitative analysis.

The final theme was Purpose for Teaching. This theme was unique to the qualitative data and was perceived to be a very important factor in influencing one’s Overall Job Satisfaction. Where teachers saw their role as having a higher purpose and some connection with the divine then higher levels of Overall Job Satisfaction were evident in the data.

5.2.3 Final model for predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction

A more complete model can be generated by using the information that was obtained from both the quantitative and qualitative analyses. This model includes those components that were unique to each of the respective analyses, as well as those components that were similar in nature (See Figure 5.6).
Figure 5.6 - Factors influencing Overall Job Satisfaction for teachers in faith-based schools
The Working Conditions component identified from the quantitative analysis covered both the leadership and the system aspects of the school operations. In this final model the Administration component was placed in the People Factor under the sub-set Administration, while the Working Conditions element within the Process theme was restricted to the system aspect of processes.

The nature of the Purpose for Teaching theme would suggest that it is in some way derived from a person’s worldview. For this reason it seemed appropriate that the Religiosity and Spirituality factors should influence a teacher’s understanding of their purpose. Hence the pathways linking Religiosity, Spirituality, Purpose for Teaching and Overall Job Satisfaction within the final model. This sequencing is supported by the work of Downey whose work indicated that vocation has an impact on personal sanctification and apostolic mission. Although Downey’s (2006) work (see Chap 2), located within a context of Catholic Spirituality, did not focus on job satisfaction, there are some parallels that exist in that the teachers’ unframed responses of this study, which point to the ‘purpose of teaching’ as being a significant factor influencing the dependent variable (Downey, 2006).

When one looks at the combined model based on both the quantitative and qualitative data we see that there are some factors that have a primary or direct influence on Overall Job Satisfaction and there are others whose influence is secondary or indirect. Finally those factors influencing the Overall Job Satisfaction that come from the qualitative data alone are found in italics in the Final Model.
CHAPTER SIX – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper looked at the constructs of Religiosity and Spirituality from the perspective of teachers who work in faith-based schools. Further it explored the relationship between Religiosity, Spirituality and Aspects of Teaching and Overall Job Satisfaction.

There is little doubt that research interest in the spiritual and the religious realms, in relationship to the workplace, has increased over the last decade or two. Books have arrived on shelves (Carette & King, 2004; Guillory, 2001; Hill & Hood, 1999; J. Marques, et al., 2007; Mitroff & Denton, 1999), handbooks to give help have appeared (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Paloutzian & Park, 2005), book sections have been written (Eisler & Montuori, 2003; Ingersoll, 2003), conference papers delivered (Bell & Taylor, 2001; Poole, 2006) and journal articles have been accepted for publication (Benefiel, 2003; Berkel, et al., 2004; Berry, 2005; Bienenfeld & Yager, 2007; C. S. King, 2006; Koenig, 2007; Krahmke, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Neal & Biberman, 2004; Perrone, Webb, Wright, Jackson, & Ksiazak, 2006). The constructs of Religiosity and Spirituality in this study, were determined to be distinct, yet there is an overlapping of these concepts partly brought about by both having a connectedness with the divine. For these teachers spirituality is focused around the intrapersonal, while religiosity is focused around the interpersonal.

The teachers from both the Lutheran and SDA education systems when considered as a single unit rated themselves more spiritual (mean: 5.127) than religious (mean: 4.256). That is the teachers rated themselves higher in terms of their personal connectedness with a power or source in the universe that is greater than oneself (spirituality), than their institutional, doctrinal public faith as celebrated with others (religiosity).

This study identified that there is a positive and direct relationship between some Demographics factors (age); People factors (Administration, Colleagues, Students, Myself); Working Conditions (physical and systems); Work Itself (system aspects); Religiosity and Spirituality; and Overall Job Satisfaction. In addition, the study indicated that Religiosity and Spirituality also had a positive impact on Overall Job Satisfaction indirectly, via a mediating variable - Purpose for Teaching, where teachers saw their role as having a higher purpose and some connection with the divine. It is interesting to note that Roundy (2009) found there to be ‘a positive relationship between religious callings and job satisfaction.’ Furthermore he
suggests that ‘this relationship is moderated by a third factor: organizational spirituality.’ (Roundy, 2009, p. 1) In some sense Purpose for Teaching is a parallel concept to religious calling and in this manner the present research is comparable to some of the findings of Roundy.

The findings of this study also concur with the work of King and Williamson (2005) where their data indicated that when controlled for the organisation’s workplace acceptance of religious acceptance (OWARE) there was a significant relationship between religiosity and job satisfaction. It seems that the organisational context can influence the relationship between religiosity and job satisfaction.

The data indicated that for both religiosity and spirituality the teachers from the SDA school system rated these constructs slightly higher than those in the Lutheran Education System. However the teachers from the Lutheran system were significantly more satisfied with the five aspects of their job: Colleagues, Working Conditions, Responsibility, Work Itself, Recognition.

As previously stated, a number of possible explanations exist. Firstly it could be that teachers in the respective systems have different understandings of the terms Religiosity and Spirituality and hence the different outcomes. Secondly, it could be that the teachers in the respective systems have the same understandings of the terms and yet their worldviews are influenced by different sets of factors. Here one can speculate on what these factors are, however this is an area where further research is recommended.

Of the nine aspects of one’s job that were perceived to influence Overall Job Satisfaction (Lester, 1987), for this group of teachers, only Working Conditions and Work Itself contributed significantly to Overall Job Satisfaction. In this case Working Conditions consisted of two components. Firstly there were the physical surroundings, consisting of buildings, facilities, landscaping, etc and secondly the systems, policies and protocols as communicated by the administration. Work itself, which was also deemed a significant influence involved the variety of skills employed, whether or not one had the freedom to make his/her own decisions, and the extent to which routine tasks are employed – essentially a focus on the art and science of teaching. Sufficient time to be able to do this was also a major factor in the opinion of the teachers.
This study also indicated that one of the more important influences on Overall Job Satisfaction were the People Factors at one’s workplace. When the Administration is able to give clear directions and Colleagues are helpful and share their expertise and a team spirit exists this has a positive impact on the Overall Job Satisfaction. Similarly when the students are developing/progressing and a difference is being made in their lives, together with the teachers themselves having a positive attitude then all of these factors work together to increase their Overall Job Satisfaction.

Finally, although some components may have a somewhat greater influence than others this was not fully explored in this study, yet it can be clearly seen from the final model (Fig 5.6) that the influences of Spirituality, Religiosity and Aspects of Teaching on Overall Job Satisfaction include both direct and indirect linkages.

As stated in the introduction, when examined within a framework of management, researchers have not extensively studied teachers and the impact that religiosity and spirituality has on their job, and the satisfaction gained from this endeavour. Yet, if we want satisfied teachers working in our schools surely the academic study of religiosity and spirituality must form a part of an overall matrix of influences. It would appear for both the Lutheran and SDA schools that where there is a concurrence between the school’s ethos and the individual teacher’s purpose for teaching we are going to see staff with higher levels of Overall Job Satisfaction. One would suspect that this may result in lower levels of staff turnover and a resultant positive impact on the students and their educational outcomes.

A number of recommendations stem from this study. Firstly, as King and Williamson state the need for further study is due to the far-reaching impact this area of our lives has;

> Regardless of its relationship to spirituality, religiosity is a valid construct (distinct or otherwise) that has been researched within social science, but continues to be understudied in organizational research even though it is centrally important to many individuals and has been shown to have considerable influence in other areas of life. (J. E. King & Williamson, 2005, p. 175)

This far-reaching impact is underscored by one of the earlier commentators on the psychology of religion; “No psychology can claim to have achieved a whole picture of [the individual] unless it considers religion” (James, 1961, cited in King and Williamson, 2008).
If religion and spirituality were the only area of our lives where there is the appearance that rationality has been suspended, then researchers may have some cause for concern. However, observe some people and their hobbies, those who are in love, those involved in politics and finally those who support with maniacal devotion some sporting team of dubious origins – all can be deemed worthy of study. So too, one’s religiosity and spirituality.

Furthermore, when religiosity and spirituality are put into the context of an examination of aspects of workplace diversity, one can clearly see the paucity of research that has been completed in this area. King, Bell and Lawrence outline this context (see Table A-4 in the Appendices) and call for further international research to supplement their American based work. (J. E. King, Bell, & Lawrence, 2009, p. 45)

Secondly, for one to achieve a significant level of teacher job satisfaction faith-based education systems need to ensure that the physical working conditions are pleasant for the teachers and the administration systems are well communicated, that the administration engender a collaborative approach to decision making and that there are opportunities provided for teachers to express their religiosity and spirituality.

This study is not without its limitations. Firstly, self-reported data can be seen as a limitation. Yet, the very nature of this research focusing on an area of significant personal value, suggests that this method is an extremely effective way to collect the data for the study. Both job satisfaction and the other factors of spirituality and religiosity are intensely personal, and one could argue that gaining the information from any other source or method would be fraught with difficulties of access and questionable accuracy. However, it is recognised that all data was collected during or at the close of the school-wide staff meetings. These events have been known to ‘suck the joy out of one’s existence’ and this may have had some impact on job satisfaction scores. To reduce the influence of this factor all respondents were ‘enjoying’ or ‘enduring’ the same activity. Furthermore on the positive side of the ledger, much of the data was gained during Term three – a time in the academic calendar when stress levels are relatively lower.

While there was a relative degree of diversity of race (almost 15% overseas born) this sample lacked any significant degree of diversity for religion. Just over 83% of respondents came from either an SDA or Lutheran background and the remaining respondents came from
mainly a mixture of other Christian denominations. It would be expected that future research is needed to explore variance across religions or possibly even within specified denominations. Therefore these findings should not be glibly generalised to other religious faiths or other contexts.

While these results generate interpretations based on the population of teachers from a number of schools, there was a range of school sizes within this sample and such interpretations may not accurately represent the situation for schools of different sizes. It is important to note that the stressors in small schools are significantly different to those in larger schools.

Furthermore there was a self-imposed geographic limitation that restricted respondents to the state of Victoria. It could be argued that the scope for future work could encompass the entire country and possibly even include some international data. ‘To everything there is a season.’

Although areas for further research have been identified in the discussion of the results gained from the study of faith-based schools; to gain a greater understanding of the impact of religiosity and spirituality on teachers’ job satisfaction studies ought to be carried out in non-faith-based schools.

In summary firstly, even though teachers within the SDA and Lutheran school systems saw Religiosity and Spirituality as distinct constructs they perceived there was a connectedness in that both are linkages to one’s relationship with God. Secondly, for the teachers within the Lutheran system it was their interpersonal worldview (Religiosity) that contributed rather than their intrapersonal worldview (Spirituality) that was the significant contributor to their Overall Job Satisfaction. In contrast, for teachers in the SDA system it was their intrapersonal worldview (Spirituality) that was the significant contributor. This outcome was not expected and needs further exploration. Finally, the most important factors in determining Overall Job Satisfaction were the Working Conditions, Work Itself and the People Factors (Colleagues, Students, Self). In terms of Working Conditions when there was perceived to be a pleasant physical environment and an organised systems environment, the teachers’ Overall Job Satisfaction was increased. When work itself provided opportunities for creativity, use of skills and the freedom to make decisions within their own classrooms, Overall Job Satisfaction was increased. Overall Job Satisfaction was increased when teachers perceived
there was a collaborative ethos amongst staff, that their students were progressing within the academic, social and spiritual domains and when their own attitude to teaching was positive. The impact they saw of their own attitude on Overall Job Satisfaction was not expected.
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22 June 2009

Mr Mark Vodell
c/- Dr Peter Morey
Faculty of Business & IT
Avondale College
COORANGBONG NSW 2265

Dear Mark

On Friday 12 June, the Avondale College Human Research Ethics Committee met and considered your research application for the project titled: It’s None of Your Business: Teacher job satisfaction and its correlation to teacher perspectives on life issues.

I am pleased to formally advise you that your project has been granted approval by the Avondale College Human Research Ethics Committee.

The following additional standard conditions would then apply:

1. That you notify the committee of any changes to circumstances or research design, which might require a review of the ethics approval.
2. That you provide an annual interim report of your progress to the committee, and a final report once this project is completed. The first report will be due twelve months from the date you commence the research.

We wish you well in this valuable research endeavour.

Sincerely

[Signature]

Dr Vivienne Watts
Chair
Avondale College Human Research Ethics Committee
Appendix 2

Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 54</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 55</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 56</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 51</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
<td>.455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 58</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td></td>
<td>.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 57</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 43</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 50</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 47</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td></td>
<td>.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 53</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td>.450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 48</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td></td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 59</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3

#### Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 38</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 33</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 27</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td></td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Table A-4 - Comparison of aspects of diversity on key contextual issues and level of research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Diversity</th>
<th>Conceptualization / definitional issues / questions</th>
<th>Societal context</th>
<th>Legal context [USA]</th>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>Level of extant research in management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Biological existence of race strongly questioned; nature and relationship to ethnicity is debated</td>
<td>No; only whites (men) considered “equal” at founding. Formal rights gained in social movements while inequality, contention, and backlash remain.</td>
<td>Yes, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.</td>
<td>Yes, generally.</td>
<td>Considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Display of femininity and masculinity varies. Sex, which is biological, is often confused with gender, which is socially constructed and culturally based.</td>
<td>No; women virtually ignored at founding; rights gained through suffrage and movements as elements of patriarchy remain.</td>
<td>Yes, Title VII.</td>
<td>Yes, generally.</td>
<td>Considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>Little confusion</td>
<td>Yes; guided by “melting pot” ideal that encouraged some disassociation from prior country, language, and cultural values.</td>
<td>Yes, Title VII.</td>
<td>No, but assumptions often made on appearance, attire or behavior.</td>
<td>Limited, but often concurrently studied with race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Disability Some specific instances (e.g. what is a disability) have to be decided in legal challenge.</td>
<td>No; generally marginalized as issue until some movement in late twentieth century.</td>
<td>Yes, ADA.</td>
<td>Varies.</td>
<td>Increasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Nature and relationships between heterosexuality, homosexuality, and bisexuality are debated</td>
<td>No; generally marginalized as issue until some movement in late twentieth century.</td>
<td>No, but some state and local statutes exist.</td>
<td>No, but assumptions often made on appearance, attire or behavior.</td>
<td>Increasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Nature and relationships of religion, religiosity, and spirituality are debated.</td>
<td>Yes; many settlers immigrated for religious freedom. Part of founders’ and societal consciousness in ideal of “separation of church and state,” despite varying interpretation and application</td>
<td>Yes, Title VII, but not widely understood.</td>
<td>No, but assumptions often made on appearance, attire or behavior.</td>
<td>Very limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

The survey is shown on the following pages.