TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

by

BRIAN KENNETH DAVIS

B.Ed., University of Victoria, 1974

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

ACCEPTED
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

[redacted]

DATE 18 Dec 78

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

[redacted]

C. F. Hodgkinson

[redacted]

J. K. Burbank

[redacted]

A. Kratzman

[redacted]

F. D. Roberts

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

June 1978

Supervisor: Professor Christopher E. Hodgkinson

ABSTRACT

This study, carried out in two British Columbia districts (N = 1237, representing a 76.5% return) was concerned with the relationship of teachers' job satisfaction to their state of decisional participation and to certain biographical data. Three categories of job satisfaction were identified: high, moderate, and low. Four categories of decisional participation were identified: saturated (participation greater than desired); deprived (participation less than desired); equilibrium positive (the desire to participate realized); equilibrium negative (the desire not to participate being realized).

No significant differences were predicted between the measures of job satisfaction and decisional participation and between these two variables and the biographical variables. Job satisfaction was measured by an instrument which focussed on the inducements necessary for a teacher to leave his present employ. Decisional participation was measured by the means of a discrepancy model approach focussing on the difference between desired and realized participation in the decision making process in seven task areas at the levels of classroom, school, and district.

It was found that decisional participation was related to some degree to job satisfaction, sex, age, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation. Job satisfaction was related to age, teaching level, and years of experience. The desire to participate in the decision making process was found to be stronger in males except at the classroom level. The participative desire was strongest in the 34-49 year age category for males and the 20-34 year age category for females. Participative desire generally declined with age and years of experience but increased with professional preparation. Participative desire declined from the classroom level to the district level. At the school and district level the participative desire was largely unrealized.

High job satisfaction appears to be related to realized desire to participate and low job satisfaction appears to be related to decisional deprivation and the realized desire not to participate. Job satisfaction was found to be higher in the urban location.

Examiners: [redacted]

C. E. Hodgkinson

[redacted]

I. K. Burbank

A. Kratzmann

[redacted]

F. D. Roberts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Mr. David Eldred, District Superintendent of Schools, School District No. 72; Dr. John Wiens, Assistant Superintendent of Schools (Curriculum), School District No. 61; and the University of Victoria for permission to conduct the study.

The author further wishes to express his appreciation to: Dr. C. Hodgkinson, Dr. I. Burbank, Dr. A. Kratzmann, and Dr. F. Roberts for their counsel and guidance during this study; Dr. W. Muir, Mr. P. Konkin, Mr. D. Pollard, and Mr. B. Wilson for their assistance in the areas of statistics and computer operations; the respondents for making this investigation possible; and Mrs. G. McElroy for her excellent typing.

DEDICATION

To Don D. who first guided me into this; L. L. Q. L. who continues to support me; and K. D. and M. D. who started it all.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A trend from decision making by individuals to cooperative decision making by groups in organizations is suggested by current organizational theory. In the field of education, numerous studies indicate that increased teacher participation in decision making processes in areas directly affecting their lives is not only desired by teachers but leads to higher productivity and increased teacher satisfaction (Miklos, 1970). A study by Simpkins and Friesen (1969) revealed that teachers see themselves as important decision makers, but in the classroom only. Decisions concerning teaching methodology, achievement testing, and relationships with pupils were the only ones that teachers viewed as theirs to make.

Studies (Bridges, 1964; Chase, 1952) suggest that the satisfaction gained from teaching as a profession is affected by the extent and nature of participation. Alutto and Belasco (1971 and 1972) have shown that not all segments of the school population are equally desirous of increased participation in organizational decision making. The personal and organizational characteristics of individuals experiencing each decisional participation state were discovered to be different. Other research (Inkpen et al, 1975; Rozycki, 1972; Balantine, 1968, Inabit, 1954) tended

to support these findings completely, to a degree, or not at all. Consequently a review of the literature does not suggest a definite conclusion concerning teacher participation in decision making within the school organization, or indicate the extent to which job satisfaction and desire for participation are related to one another and to individual differences such as age and sex.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Based on the above, the study attempted to investigate the level of decisional participation experienced by teachers in different task areas and at different levels within the organization, and to investigate the existence of any relationship with the job satisfaction level and the biographic data. Biographic data included sex, age, areas of responsibility, teaching level, experience, years of teacher education, and contract type. It was theorized that these personal characteristics may be related to levels of job satisfaction and categories of decisional participation.

Satisfaction has been defined as a willingness to remain within the current school organization despite inducements to leave (March & Simon, 1958); and state of decisional participation as the difference between realized and desired levels of participation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

A. DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION.

1. REALIZED: the extent to which an individual perceives current participation in a given situation.
2. DESIRED: the perceived wish of an individual to currently participate in a given situation.
3. SATURATED: a condition in which the individual's realized participation exceeds his desired participation.
4. DEPRIVED: a condition in which the individual's realized participation is exceeded by his desired participation.
5. EQUILIBRIUM POSITIVE: a condition in which an individual's desire to participate is matched by his realized participation.
6. EQUILIBRIUM NEGATIVE: a condition in which an individual's desire not to participate is matched by his realized participation.

B. JOB SATISFACTION.

The willingness of an individual to remain within the current organization despite inducements to leave.

C. ORGANIZATION.

A human group with both formal and informal structures having a distinct purpose or purposes in the broader social context. In this study it is a

public school system as represented by British Columbia School Districts #61 (Greater Victoria) and #72 (Campbell River).

D. PROTESTANT ETHIC (OR WORK ETHIC).

The valuing or seeking of mentally challenging work.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.

The purpose of this study is twofold. Firstly, it attempts to provide an empirical test within the school system for the theories regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and decisional participation with the concomitant substrata and their relationship to personal characteristics. It may provide an opportunity for re-evaluation and reformulation of the theoretical models, an often ignored feature of the theory-research enterprise (Dubin, 1976). Secondly, it provides the district administrator with an index of satisfaction within his district, and district administrators in general with an indication of the decision making areas in which teachers desire to be involved.

If, as stated by Vroom (1964), individuals are satisfied with their jobs to the extent to which their jobs provide them with what they desire, it becomes important to investigate the relationship between satisfaction and

desired participation in decision making. Further (Vroom, 1964), if individuals perform effectively in their jobs to the extent that effective performance leads to the attainment of what they desire it will be important to identify the different substrata of satisfaction in order to provide increased participation where it is desired. Such an approach may be necessary if the organization wishes to attain a high quality of performance from each classroom teacher. It may be that the greatest part of the desire for increased involvement by teachers, as well as by students and parents, can be met at the level of the school. Unless this is possible the school district faces the very difficult task of trying to cope with an overwhelming number of committees and councils which will probably serve only to frustrate those who seek to become more highly involved (Miklos, 1970).

DELIMITATIONS.

Data were obtained from seventy schools of two school districts in British Columbia, one district identified as rural and the other as urban. The former consisted of 143 secondary and 160 elementary teachers, and the latter 673 secondary and 646 elementary teachers. Every teacher in both districts was included in the sample which totalled 1622.

As much of the data was based on individuals' perceptions, and the form of data collection was by questionnaire, it is important to understand that no causal theory is put forward. A data gathering technique involving longitudinal case studies using interviews would alleviate problems associated with individual differences in question interpretation and present a fuller and more integrated picture of the whole individual--providing a logical validity to the research (Locke, 1976). Several factors preclude the use of this technique and therefore, to some extent, the study will replicate previous research. However, the findings may substantiate previous findings or provide opportunities for their modification; and particular attention will be given to deviant cases and non-fitting data.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS.

a) DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION.

A most basic assumption is that a problem concerning the degree of participation exists in the decision making area in schools. Within the teaching profession one of the most frequently mentioned sources of dissatisfaction is the frustrated desire for greater participation in the organization's decision making process. A compelling reason for encouraging shared

participation with administrators in the central decision making process in the organization is the hope that better decisions will result. The school's staff will expect to be fully involved in the professional questions which will affect them (Owens, 1970, p.104). The administrator can influence the school to move toward or away from professional status depending upon the skill and energy with which he encourages meaningful participation in the decision making process.

> The first responsibility of a principal and staff is to discuss the whole range of decision making as it applies to the school. The second is to determine the areas in which the best and most expeditious decisions may be made by the teacher alone. The second (sic) is to determine those which must be made by the principal alone. The third is to determine those which are best made by the principal in consultation with staff specialists or pupils or parents. The final responsibility is to discuss in very great detail the area in which shared decision making is best. (Stables, 1978, p.2).

b) JOB SATISFACTION.

Locke (1976, p. 1297) gives the figure of 3,350 as representing the minimum number of articles or dissertations on the subject of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction may be loosely defined as the concept of a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Job

satisfaction results from the perceptions that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs (Locke, 1978, p. 1307). Theories concerning man's needs and their relationship to job satisfaction are discussed in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into six sections. In the first the historical perspective of job satisfaction is considered. Section two deals with the two major theories which have dominated the contempary scene in attempting to specify the particular needs that must be satisfied or the values that must be attained for an individual to be satisfied with his job. The third section explores the research evidence for the efficacy of participative management in organizations in general, while section four relates decisional participation specifically to the teaching profession. The fifth section pursues theories concerning the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and decisional participation. The final section poses the central question for study with the associated subordinate and related questions.

A comprehensive review of the literature on job satisfaction alone, even if only of the last decade, would be impossible here as the literature is prolific. Theory and research pertaining to major issues will be reviewed and the theories critically examined. The consequences of job satisfaction and decisional participation as expounded by various researchers will also be considered.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.

The historical trends concerning the factors most conducive to job satisfaction for the employee fall into three schools of thought. The emphasis of the Physical-Economic School, whose major proponents were Taylor, the British Industrial Research Board (e.g. see Vernon, 1921; Wyatt, 1927), and most American researchers of the 1920's (e.g. Gilbreth; Drury; Mayo) emphasized the role of the physical arrangements of the work, physical working conditions and pay. This period is otherwise known as the era of scientific management and gave rise to the so-called classical theory of administration, generally accepted as dating from about 1910 to 1935. The Human Relations School, arising in the mid 1930's, emphasized the role of good supervision, friendly employee-management relations, and cohesive work groups. Its proponents were the investigators involved in the Western Electric studies, Elton Mayo being one of the best known to educators, and more recently industrial sociologists and the Michigan and Ohio State leadership researchers. The Human Relations School of thought traces its origins in large part to the work of Mary Parker Follett in the interbellum period. However her contributions are basically philosophical rather than empirical. Hoppock (1935) published the first intensive study of job satisfaction. His results and interpretations emphasized the multiplicity of factors that could affect job satisfaction, including both

factors that had been studied previously (fatigue, monotony, working conditions, supervision) and those which were only to be emphasized later (achievement). The contemporary Growth (or Work Itself) School arising around 1950 initiated the era of the behavioral approach which emphasizes the attainment of satisfaction through growth in skill, efficacy, and responsibility made possible by mentally challenging work. The "schools" above overlap in time and are all three prevalent to some degree today and although this categorizing may represent somewhat of an oversimplification it provides a useful framework for summarizing major trends.

Following the Harwood Manufacturing Corporation experiments (Coch and French, 1948) and the writings of Mayo and Lewin the Human Relations approach came to emphasize the importance of communication between the ranks, of explaining to the lower participants the reasons why a particular course of action is taken; the importance of decision making in which lower ranks share in the decisions made by higher ranks, in particular matters which affect them directly; and the virtues of democratic leadership which not only is highly communicative and encourages participation but also is just, non-arbitrary and concerned with the problems of the workers, not just those of work. The

underlying assumption was that the most satisfying organization would be the most efficient. Leaders of the movement in the postwar years were industrial sociologists such as Homans (1950) and Whyte (1955), and psychologists such as Fleishman (1972), Halpin and Winer (1957), Likert (1961), and Marrow et al. (1967), the latter two being the foremost advocates of participatory management. Many studies have attempted to support the belief that high satisfaction will lead to high performance. An initial study by Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) obtained an insignificant relationship and a review of literature on the topic (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955) concluded that there is little evidence that a relationship exists between satisfaction and performance, but it was noted that job satisfaction did seem to be positively related to two other kinds of employee behaviour, absenteeism and turnover--both of which are no less important in education than in any other field. Another review (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957, p.98) was most optimistic in viewing the evidence:

> There is frequent evidence for the often suggested opinion that job attitudes are favorable to increased productivity. The relationship is not absolute, but there are enough data to justify attention to attitudes as a factor in improving the worker's output.

CONTENT THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION.

Theories about the content of Job Satisfaction which attempt to specify the particular needs that must be attained for an individual to be satisfied with his job are numerous though they have been dominated on the contemporary scene by two: Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene theory and Maslow's Need Hierarchy theory.

Herzberg and his colleagues (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959) distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. Intrinsic factors are those associated with job content, in particular those things that make one's work personally rewarding and satisfying. Extrinsic factors are primarily associated with job context, referring to such things as the quality of one's supervision, working conditions, and company policies and practices. According to this theory, intrinsic factors mediate job satisfaction and this group was termed Motivators. Extrinsic factors mediate job dissatisfaction and this group was termed Hygienes. The basic tenet of the theory is that the two types of factors are independent. Herzberg later expanded his theory by tying these findings to a specific view of the nature of man (Herzberg, 1966): Hygiene factors operate only to

frustrate or fulfill man's physical needs, while the Motivators serve to fulfill or frustrate man's growth needs.

Due to a substantial body of disconfirming studies, Herzberg's formulations are currently suffering some discredit (see Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick, 1970; Porter 1966; Locke , 1976) although he has made a major contribution to the knowledge and understanding of the nature of job satisfaction. One criticism concerns Herzberg's insistence on the idea that intrinsic and extrinsic factors exist on two completely separate dimensions governing worker satisfaction. Furthermore the theory has not specified which job dimensions (e.g., autonomy, variety, etc.) satisfy motivator needs, nor does it deal with the question of how worker characteristics or background interact with the motivating conditions (Beer, 1976).

Maslow's theory (Maslow, 1954, 1970) asserts that man has five basic categories of needs: physiological, including food, air, water, etc.; safety, including freedom from physical threats and harm as well as economic security; belongingness and love needs; esteem needs for mastery and achievement, and for the recognition and approval of others; and the need for self-actualization, defined as the desire

to become everything one is capable of becoming. The theory further argues the existence of a prepotent hierarchy of these needs (from most to least, above) in that the lesser are neither desired nor sought until the more prepotent are satisfied to a sufficient degree. Maslow did not develop a specific theory of work motivation as such but the implications for incentive systems design are obvious.

This theory too has been the recipient of various criticisms. Campbell and Pritchard (1976, p. 97) point out that it is not based on any empirical foundation but was derived primarily from Maslow's clinical experience. While referring to the "intuitive" appeal of Maslow's need hierarchy theory, Locke (1976) criticizes the fact that there is little firm support for its major thesis of a fixed hierarchy of needs which automatically governs action.

> It is not necessarily what a man needs but what he values most strongly that dominates his thoughts and actions. Since values are acquired rather than innate, since men have the capacity to choose their values, and since men are not omniscient, such values may or may not be congruent with their needs. Furthermore, the individual's value hierarchy may put (known) physical needs first or it may not. In the case of a teen-ager who takes drugs which he knows to be dangerous solely in order

footnote

> to "belong" to his peer group, the desire for acceptance (and the illusion of self-esteem) clearly overrides his desire for physical well-being. Any value can dominate action, including self-destructive values. (Locke, 1976, p.1309).

Even so, viewing dissatisfaction as a product of work environment, and satisfaction as a function of the content of work, would appear to provide a very basic relevance in the case of teacher-workers (Clarke, 1976, p.8). It may well be that the 'demands' of teachers, which the public perceives as being met by increased salary and job security, bring merely "hygienic" improvements which may make work more tolerable for those involved, but which do not necessarily increase motivation or productivity.

THE EFFICACY OF PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT.

There are now a large number of motivational techniques designed to alter the choice or behaviour of individuals. These include incentive payments, flexible hours, employee counseling, management by objectives, supervisory consideration, participation in decision making, and job enrichment. Behavioral scientists, pointing to evidence of restriction of output and lack of involvement under traditional leadership methods, have argued for greater influence in decision making on the part of those

held responsible for executing the decisions (Vroom, 1976, p. 1538). Research evidence provides some but not overwhelming support for the efficacy of participative management. (Coch and French, 1948; Bavelas 1950; Marrow, Bower and Seashore, 1967). Experiments by French, Israel, and As (1960) and Fleishman (1965) yielded no significant difference in production between workers who did not participate in decisions regarding the introduction of changes in work methods. Lawler and Porter (1967; 1975) indicated that rather than being a cause of performance, satisfaction is caused by it. If this is true then it becomes appropriate to be more concerned about which people and what kinds of needs are satisfied in the organization, rather than about how to maximise satisfaction generally. It is important to consider satisfaction levels in an organization because it has the power to influence psychological effects which studies have shown lead to social and economic costs, such as poor mental health, reduced longevity, higher incidence of coronary problems, high turnover and absenteeism, resistance to change, low product quality and labor/management problems (Work in America, 1973). Research has not only shown that certain job characteristics are related to desirable psychological and performance outcomes but that individual differences are an important moderator variable

(Blood and Hulin, 1967; Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Turner and Lawrence, 1965). It is suggested by Hackman and Lawler that employee motivation and satisfaction will be enhanced when the process of work allows satisfaction of the higher order needs; the individual has strong higher order needs; the individual experiences satisfaction of these needs as a result of his own effort; and the individual learns to expect such valued outcomes. It is further suggested that the satisfaction of higher order needs through work may, in fact, arouse these and other needs, rather than satiate them, thereby assuring continued motivation. They propose that jobs will provide higher order need satisfaction when workers feel personally responsible for a meaningful portion of the work; work outcomes are intrinsically meaningful; and feedback about performance is provided. Measures of variety, autonomy, task identity, and feedback were used to measure these job conditions and it was found that when jobs are high on these conditions, employees with strong higher order needs have higher job satisfaction, are absent from work less frequently, and are rated by supervisors as doing higher quality work then employees with weak or few higher order needs.

Differences between urban and small-town workers in terms of satisfaction to enriched jobs--where the

employee takes more responsibility--was found by Turner and Lawrence (1965). In support of this finding Hulin and Blood (1968), and Blood (1969), present evidence that the individual's degree of commitment to the Protestant Ethic (or Work Ethic) may influence his job satisfaction, and that the Protestant Ethic is higher in rural areas and lower in urban areas. This concept is not supported by Argyris (1976, p. 159) who points out that it is possible for workers to value the Protestant Ethic but not adhere to it in a specific situation or become more oriented toward it once work becomes meaningful. Following the studies of Goldthorpe, Lockwood, Bechhofer, and Platt (1968), Argyris (1976, p. 159) maintains that it should be clear many workers value challenging work and being involved if the work is worth becoming involved with. When it is not, they do not value that particular work nor do they become involved in it, even though they may prefer a work world where this were possible.

Employees can be satisfied for many different reasons: they can be satisfied if the job is monotonous or complex and varied, because the work is involving or non-involving. Korman (1971) has shown that it is possible for individuals performing repetitive work to have high job satisfaction because their self-acceptance is low while

others have low job satisfaction with the same job because their self-acceptance tends to be high.

DECISION MAKING AND THE TEACHER.

The amount of information available to a decision making group (such as a school's faculty) has been shown to effect the quality of decisions that the group makes (Shaw and Penrod, 1962), and research has shown (e.g. Bridges, 1964; Guest, 1960) that the decision making participation by teachers has its rewards but it is equally clear that excessive involvement of teachers can produce resentment and resistance. As reported by Bridges (1967) teachers want the administrator to settle his own problems and they do not want to be excessively tied up in committee work. For an administrator to confront teachers with a problem that they feel is within what Barnard (1938) terms his zone of indifference is to court irritation and resentment. It has been suggested that allowing participation in decisions over which participants exercise no control may be just as damaging as no participation at all (Lammers, 1967).

Ford (1969) suggested that the major effect of enrichment in the realm of attitudes might be to increase job involvement, one of the consequences of which is that the potential is greater for both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This suggests the existence of a differential

distribution of both the desire for participation and its relationship to satisfaction levels throughout the teaching profession. Within the teaching profession research has shown (Alutto and Belasco, 1971 and 1972) that the desire for increased participation in organizational decision-making is not equally and widely distributed throughout the population. Rather a certain substratum of teachers desire more participation than they currently enjoy, while others desire less participation, while still others desire no change in the current rate of participation. The personal and organizational characteristics of individuals experiencing each decisional participation state were discovered to be different. Decisionally deprived individuals tended to be young males in the rural district and decisionally saturated individuals tended to be older females teaching in the urban district. These findings tend to be supported by the research of Inkpen, Ponder, and Crocker (1975) in respect to the sex differential but it was reported that females desired more participation. None of the above was supported by Rozycki (1972) who found no significant difference in teachers' desire for participation in decision-making in relationship to biographical and organizational variables. Balantine (1968) and Inabit (1954) found that professional training and teaching experience revealed little

relationship with teachers' involvement in the decision-making process.

A study by Simpkins and Friesen (1970) revealed that teachers see themselves as important decision-makers, but in the classroom only. In their opinion decisions relating to curriculum and organizational matters were made by others in the school or school system, or else they were made by the Department of Education. Decisions concerning teaching methodology, achievement testing, and relationships with pupils were the only ones that teachers viewed as theirs to make. This falls in line with the model of a semi-professional organization propounded by Etzioni (1964) a central feature of which is that the discretionary powers of the organizational member rarely go beyond the confines of the immediate work setting. Owens(1970) maintains that the school is not a non-professionally staffed organization and, therefore, its staff will expect to be effectively involved in the professional questions which affect them.

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION.

Studies (Bridges, 1964; Chase, 1952) on the participation of teachers in decision making suggest that the extent and nature of participation affects (a) the satisfaction gained from teaching as a profession (b) the enthusiasm of the teacher for his particular school, and

(c) the attitude the teacher has toward his principal (Owens, 1970). Likert (1961) and Bennis (1967) have found that higher levels of satisfaction are associated with increased trust, more productivity, and in general a more effective organization. Corwin (1965) has similarly argued that satisfaction and role conflict are inversely related, while Kahn (Kahn et al., 1964) presented data which indicate that satisfaction is also inversely related to job tension. Thus, higher levels of satisfaction are often postulated as correlates of such desirable organizational outcomes as higher trust, lower role conflict, less job tension, and more positive attitudes toward the organization.

Satisfaction has been demonstrated to be differentially distributed throughout an organization population by Herzberg et al. (1959), Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960), Porter (1961), Blauner (1960), and Kornhauser (1965). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) defined job satisfaction as feelings of effective responses to the work situation. In addition, they posited that these responses are best explained by a discrepancy between the work motivation attitudes and the incentives offered by the organization. The basic postulate is that job satisfaction levels are related to the perceived difference between what is de-

sired and what is actually experienced in the job situation. Abbott (1965) hypothesized that as long as an educator elects to remain in a school system he will perform, to some extent, according to the way his position has been defined for him. In doing so he anticipates a relationship between the expected performance and the rewards the school district has to offer. If the anticipated rewards are not forthcoming, or if he perceives rewards as negative, a condition of dissonance or inequity exists. This suggests that there is a relationship between educators' job satisfaction level and the congruency between their realized and desired conditions of work. Therefore in this study the categorization of teachers as decisionally deprived, saturated, or at equilibrium will be made by means of a discrepancy model approach to their realized and desired participation in decisional situations. The instrument used will include decisional stiuations from the dimensions of classroom, school and district. In accordance with March and Simon (1958) who suggest that an organizationally relevant measure of employee satisfaction would be the willingness of an employee to remain within the organization this study will focus on this concept in its derivation of satisfaction categories. The job satisfaction categories will be (1) low, (2) moderate, and (3) high according to

the sum of the indices assigned to the responses to the instrument on job satisfaction.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION.

Is there a relationship between an individual's state of decisional participation and job satisfaction, as suggested above by Bridges (1964) and Chase (1952)?

SUBORDINATE QUESTIONS.

If such a relationship exists will its satisfaction, as suggested above by Smith et al (1969), be related to the perceived difference between desired and realized participation? Further, will job satisfaction and decisional participation states vary according to the individual's personal characteristics, as indicated above by Alutto and Belasco (1971 and 1972)?

RELATED QUESTION.

Will the measures of job satisfaction in urban and rural areas be different, as suggested by the findings of Turner and Lawrence (1965) above?

CHAPTER 3

THE STUDY

The questions to be answered by this study were as follows:

QUESTION 1.

Is there a systematic relationship between a teacher's state of decisional participation and his job satisfaction category?

QUESTION 2.

Is the distribution of job satisfaction throughout the teaching profession related to age, sex, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation?

QUESTION 3.

Is the distribution of decisional participation throughout the teaching profession related to age, sex, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation?

QUESTION 4.

Will job satisfaction measures be different in urban and rural areas?

In order to empirically test the above questions and the implied relationships the following hypotheses were developed:

MAJOR HYPOTHESIS.

There will be no significant difference between the three categories of job satisfaction (low, moderate, high) and the four categories of decisional participation (saturated, equilibrium positive, equilibrium negative, deprived).

SUBORDINATE HYPOTHESES.

Number 1: There will be no significant difference between males and females on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 2: There will be no significant difference between age levels on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 3: There will be no significant difference between age levels for males on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 4: There will be no significant difference between age levels for females on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 5: There will be no significant difference between the four teaching levels on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 6: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of experience on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 7: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of professional preparation on measures of job satisfaction.

Number 8: There will be no significant difference between males and females on measures of decisional participation.

Number 9: There will be no significant difference between age levels on measures of decisional participation.

Number 10: There will be no significant difference between age levels for males on measures of decisional participation.

Number 11: There will be no significant difference between age levels for females on measures of decisional participation.

Number 12: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of professional preparation on measures of decisional participation.

Number 13: There will be no significant difference between the four teaching levels on measures of decisional participation.

Number 14: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of experience on measures of decisional participation.

Number 15: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of job satisfaction and rural/urban location.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study was confined to two school districts in British Columbia, District #61 (Greater Victoria) and District #72 (Campbell River). The subjects were every teacher within these administrative units at both the

elementary and secondary level. In total 801 elementary and 816 secondary teachers were involved. Subjects were categorized according to the following system:

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES. The following data were taken directly from the questionnaire.

Contract Type:	Continuing, Temporary.
Sex:	Male or female
Age Categories:	(1) 20-34 years, (2) 35-49 years, and (3) 50-65 years.
Area(s) of Responsibility:	Classroom Teacher, Vice Principal, Principal, Counsellor, Other.
Teaching Level:	Primary, Intermediate, Junior High, Senior High.
Experience Categories:	The number of years spent as a public school teacher: (1) 1-5 years, (2) 6-15 years, and (3) more than 15 years.
Years of Teacher Education:	Levels classified according to (1) six or more, (2) four or five, (3) three or fewer.

Areas of responsibility were differentiated in order to separate classroom teachers from non-classroom teachers, and two contract types were indicated in order to

avoid any undue influence on the job satisfaction measure resulting from those teachers having a temporary contract.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES.

a) JOB SATISFACTION: Categories were assigned as (1) low, (2) moderate, and (3) high according to the indices assigned to the three types of answer (yes, definitely; uncertain; definitely not) to the questions concerning subjects' willingness to leave the organization.

b) DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION: Categories were assigned as (1) Deprivation, characterized by current participation less than desired; (2) positive equilibrium, characterized by desire to participate equal to realized participation, (3) negative equilibrium characterized by desire not to participate equal to realized participation and (4) saturation, characterized by current participation greater than desired.

These categories of decisional participation were arrived at through the use of a discrepancy approach (realized index subtracted from desired index). Previous studies (Alutto and Belasco, 1972; Alutto and Acito, 1974) failed to differentiate between subjects arriving at decisional equilibrium states for different reasons. It was considered prudent to separate those who were at equilibrium yet desirous of participation (equilibrium 'positive') from

those who were at equilibrium yet not desirous of participation (equilibrium 'negative').

PROCEDURE

PRELIMINARIES

In April 1978 permission to conduct the study was obtained from School Districts #61 and #72; and support was obtained from the Executive of the Teachers' Association in each district.

THE POPULATION

The population consisted of all elementary and secondary teachers in School Districts #61 and #72, Greater Victoria and Campbell River. By comparison these two districts may be categorized as urban and rural and be considered representative of typical districts within the Province of British Columbia. Sampling was non-random in that questionnaires were distributed to all teachers within each district.

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected by using a self-administered questionnaire on a voluntary basis. 1617 teachers were involved in total, 299 of these in District #72 where the distribution and collection of questionnaires was facilitated through the District Central Office. In District #61 the questionnaires were personally delivered to and

collected from each school. The percentages of responses in each district at the elementary and high school level are shown in Table 1.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF RETURNS BY DISTRICT

CAMPBELL RIVER:

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY
N = 155	N = 143
Return = 139 (89.5%)	Return = 109 (76.2%)

GREATER VICTORIA:

ELEMENTARY	SECONDARY
N = 646	N = 673
Return = 526 (81.4%)	Return = 463 (68.8%)

OVERALL

ELEMENTARY = 83.0% SECONDARY = 71.1%

PERCENTAGE RETURN OF TOTAL N = 76.5%

INSTRUMENTATION

JOB SATISFACTION

An index used by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), Belasco and Alutto (1972), utilizing the definition of satisfaction as the willingness of organizational members to leave the organization was constructed. The index was arrived at from answers to four questions focussing on the inducements necessary for a teacher to leave the employ of a school district.

Responses were coded 1, 2, and 3 respectively, consequently scores may range from a low of four (yes, definitely, in all four cases) to a high of twelve (no, definitely not, in all four cases). The higher the numerical score the higher the measure of satisfaction. Scores of 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12 categorize low, moderate, and high satisfaction respectively. Alutto and Hrebiniak (1975, p. 6) report the following stability measures (consistency of measurement over time) for Pay (0.84), Creativity (0.85), Status (0.79), Friendlier Co-Workers (0.78).

DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

An instrument used by Rozycki (1972) consisting of decision items in each of seven task areas was adapted for use. The adaptation consisted of a change of format

without loss of content in each area, and rather than using a Likert type response scale the subjects were asked to indicate (a) whether they currently participated in the decision making situation and (b) whether they wished to participate. The reliability and content validity of the Rozycki instrument were reported as 0.95 and 0.96 respectively (Rozycki, 1972, Appendices D and E). This instrument was adapted by Rozycki from the Decision Point Analysis Instrument refined and validated in 1966 by Lipham et al. and was first developed in 1957.

The task areas used were pupil personnel, school-community relations, physical facilities, staff personnel, finance and business management, curriculum development, and organization and structure. These resemble the task areas used by Simpkins and Friesen (1969, p.36), Inkpen et al (1975, p.2), and Alutto and Belasco (1972 p. 31), all of whom found that teachers felt they ought to be involved to a greater extent in the decision making process than they presently were. The instrument also closely resembles that developed from the same theoretical base by Knoop and O'Reilly (1977, p.3) which though containing twelve school-task activities operated on the same discrepancy principle applied in this study.

Each of the seven task areas contain details related to decisional situations in the classroom, school, and school district. Each subject was asked to indicate at each level (classroom, school, district) in each of the seven

areas whether he currently participated and whether he wished to participate. A check mark was assigned a score of one and no check mark a score of zero. By means of a computer program (Appendix A) the 'desired' participation score was subtracted from the 'realized' participation score. If the subject wished to participate and did in fact participate an index of 2 was assigned indicating 'equilibrium positive'. If the subject did not wish to participate and did not in fact participate an index of 3 was assigned indicating 'equilibrium negative'. If the subject wished to participate and did not in fact participate an index of 1 was assigned indicating 'deprived'. If the subject did not wish to participate but did in fact participate an index of 4 was assigned indicating 'saturated'.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The age, sex, areas of responsibility, teaching level, years of experience, years of teacher education, and contract type were taken directly from each subject's questionnaire. Areas of responsibility (Classroom Teacher, Vice-Principal, Principal, Counsellor, and Other) and contract type (Continuing, Temporary) were included in order to check if these had any significant relationship with the indices of job satisfaction (subsequent analysis indicated the absence of significance).

The complete instrument is to be found in Appendix B.

MODE OF ANALYSIS

SUMMARY OF INDICES FOR EACH SUBJECT

BIOGRAPHIC

Sex: 1. Male 2. Female

Age: 1. 20-34 years 2. 35-49 years

3. 50-65 years

Area of Responsibility: 1. Classroom Teacher

2. Vice-Principal 3. Principal 4. Counsellor

5. Other

Teaching Level: 1. Primary 2. Intermediate

3. Junior High 4. Senior High

Experience: 1. 1-5 years 2. 6-15 years 3. 15+ years

Years of Teacher Education: 1. 3 or fewer 2. 4 or 5

3. 6 or more

Contract Type: Continuing 2. Temporary

JOB SATISFACTION

1. Low 2. Moderate 3. High

DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

1. Deprived 2. Equilibrium Positive 3. Equilibrium Negative 4. Saturated

In order to explore the proposed relationships the hypotheses were subjected to a Chi-square test. The tests carried out are summarized in Table 2. In total 176 Chi-square tests were carried out. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE TESTS

VARIABLE	BY	VARIABLE
JOB SATISFACTION		1. Sex
		2. Age
		3. Age, controlling for sex
		4. Teaching Level
		5. Experience
		6. Education (Professional Preparation)
		7. School District

TABLE 2 (cont.)

VARIABLE	BY	VARIABLE
DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION* in decisions involving		
1. Pupil Personnel		1. Sex
2. School-Community Relations		2. Age
3. Physical Facilities		3. Age, controlling for sex
4. Staff Personnel		4. Teaching Level
5. Finance and Business Management		5. Experience
6. Curriculum Development		6. Education (Professional Preparation)
7. Organization and Structure		7. Job Satisfaction

* each of the variables in this column was at the three levels of classroom, school, and district.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The data from the 1237 completed questionnaires representing a 76.5% return were subjected to statistical analyses as indicated in Chapter 3.

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

MAJOR HYPOTHESIS

There will be no significant difference between the three categories of job satisfaction (low, moderate, high) and the four categories of decisional participation (saturated, equilibrium positive, equilibrium negative, deprived).

This global hypothesis consisted of 21 sub-components formed from seven task areas at the classroom, school, and district level. The hypothesis was rejected in 18 of the 21 instances. It was not rejected in the areas of pupil personnel decisions at the classroom level, school-community relations at the district level, and staff personnel decisions at the classroom level. Table 3 gives further details.

SUBORDINATE HYPOTHESES

Number 1: There will be no significant difference between males and females on measures of job satisfaction. (NOT REJECTED).

Number 2: There will be no significant difference between age levels on measures of job satisfaction. (REJECTED).

Number 3: There will be no significant difference between age levels for males on measures of job satisfaction. (REJECTED).

Number 4: There will be no significant difference between age levels for females on measures of job satisfaction. (REJECTED).

Number 5: There will be no significant difference between the four teaching levels on measures of job satisfaction. (REJECTED).

Number 6: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of experience on measures of job satisfaction. (REJECTED).

Number 7: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of professional preparation on measures of job satisfaction. (NOT REJECTED).

Number 8: There will be no significant difference between males and females on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis consisted of 21 sub-components formed from seven task areas at the classroom, school and district level. The hypothesis was rejected in 11 of the 21 instances. Table 4 gives further details.

TABLE 3

JOB SATISFACTION AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.		***	**
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	**	*	
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.	***	***	*
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.		***	*
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.	*	***	*
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.	**	***	*
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.	*	***	**

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

TABLE 4

SEX AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	*	***	**
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	**		
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.			*
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.		**	**
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.		***	**
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.		**	
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.		*	

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

Number 9: There will be no significant difference between age levels on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 13 of the 21 instances. Table 5 gives further details.

Number 10: There will be no significant difference between age levels for males on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 7 of the 21 instances. Table 6 gives further details.

Number 11: There will be no significant difference between age levels for females on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 8 of the 21 instances. Table 6 gives further details.

Number 12: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of professional preparation on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 14 of the 21 instances. Table 7 gives further details.

Number 13: There will be no significant difference between the four teaching levels on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 12 of the 21 instances. Table 8 gives further details.

TABLE 5

AGE AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	***	***	*
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	***	***	
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.	**		*
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.	***		
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.	**	*	
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.	***		
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.	***	**	

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

TABLE 6

AGE, SEX AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL			
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SEX
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	*			M
		**	*	F
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	*			M
		***		F
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.	*			M
				F
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.	**			M
		*		F
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.	*			M
		*		F
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.	**			M
	*			F
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.	**			M
	*	**		F

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

TABLE 7

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	*	***	***
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.		**	
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.		*	***
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.		**	***
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.		**	***
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.		***	***
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.		*	***

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

TABLE 8

TEACHING LEVELS AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	***		
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	***		
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.	**	***	
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.	***	*	*
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.	*	*	
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.	**	*	
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.	**		

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

TABLE 9

EXPERIENCE AND DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

TASK AREA	LEVEL		
	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions.	**	***	*
2. School-Community Relations Decisions.	***	***	
3. Physical Facilities Decisions.	***		
4. Staff Personnel Decisions.			*
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions.		*	
6. Curriculum Development Decisions.	***		
7. Organization and Structure Decisions.	**		

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

Number 14: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of experience on measures of decisional participation.

This hypothesis was rejected in 10 of the 21 instances. Table 9 gives further details.

Number 15: There will be no significant difference between the three levels of job satisfaction and rural/urban location. (REJECTED).

FINDINGS RELATED TO CENTRAL QUESTIONS

Answers to the four main questions posed are summarized below.

QUESTION 1

Is there a systematic association between a teacher's state of decisional participation and his job satisfaction category?

The findings suggest that with the exception of three areas a relationship exists between job satisfaction and decisional participation. The three exceptions are in the classroom concerning pupil personnel decisions and staff personnel decisions, and at the district level concerning school-community relations. See Appendix C.

QUESTION 2

Is the distribution of job satisfaction throughout the teaching profession related to age, sex, teaching level, years of experience and professional preparation?

The findings indicate that job satisfaction is related to all of the above with the exceptions of sex and professional preparation. Table 10 gives further details. See Appendix D.

TABLE 10

JOB SATISFACTION AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

SEX:	Not significant
AGE:	***
AGE/MALES:	***
AGE/FEMALES:	***
TEACHING LEVEL:	*
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:	***
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION:	Not significant

* Significant at the 0.05 level (Chi-square)
** Significant at the 0.01 level (Chi-square)
*** Significant at the 0.001 level (Chi-square)

QUESTION 3

Is the distribution of decisional participation throughout the teaching profession related to age, sex, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation?

The findings indicate that the distribution of decisional participation is related to all of the above to a degree, varying from 33% to 62% of the 21 given decision making situations. See Appendix C.

QUESTION 4

Will job satisfaction measures be different in urban and rural areas?

The findings indicate that the measure of job satisfaction is different in urban and rural areas. A greater percentage of teachers in the urban area were highly satisfied compared to the rural area, and a lesser percentage indicated low satisfaction in the urban area compared to the rural area. Details are given in Table II.

TABLE 11

JOB SATISFACTION AND URBAN/RURAL LOCATION

SATISFACTION	LOCATION	
	CAMPBELL RIVER	VICTORIA
HIGH	53.6%	64.4%
MODERATE	35.5%	27.3%
LOW	10.9%	8.3%

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Table 12 shows a breakdown by percentage of the total responses for the biographical data.

TABLE 12

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA : PERCENTAGES BY SEX, AGE, TEACHING LEVEL, YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

N = 1237

MALE:	48.7
FEMALE:	51.3

MALES:	AGE (YEARS)	FEMALES
35.9	20-34	45.2
41.9	35-49	36.1
22.3	50-65	18.7

TEACHING LEVEL

PRIMARY:	22.2
INTERMEDIATE:	31.5
JUNIOR HIGH:	23.6
SENIOR HIGH	22.6

EXPERIENCE

(YEARS)

1 - 5	:	21.7
6 -15	:	43.9
15 plus	:	34.4

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

(YEARS)

3 or less	:	20.0
4 or 5	:	60.2
6 or more	:	19.7

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter consists of three parts. Part A will treat the findings and their implications concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and the two school districts (Appendix E).

Part B will explore the findings relating job satisfaction to the biographical variables of sex, age, teaching level, years of experience and professional preparation (Appendix D).

Part C will treat findings and explore significant trends in the decisional participation task areas at the three levels of classroom, school, and district with regard to job satisfaction, sex, age, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation.

A. JOB SATISFACTION AND SCHOOL DISTRICT.

In the urban district a greater percentage of the teachers were highly satisfied compared to the rural district (Appendix E and Chapter 4 Table 11.) The data suggest that overall job satisfaction is higher in the urban than the rural district contrary to the evidence presented by Hulin and Blood (1968), and Blood (1969) that the individual's degree of commitment to the Protestant Ethic may influence his job satisfaction, and that the Protestant Ethic is

higher in rural areas and low in urban areas.

B. JOB SATISFACTION AND THE BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES (Appendix D).

AGE AND SEX

No significant difference between the sexes was seen on measures of job satisfaction but a significant difference between age levels for both sexes was apparent.

As Table 13 shows, in general job satisfaction appears to increase with age for both sexes.

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF MALES AND FEMALES BY AGE EXPRESSING a) LOW JOB SATISFACTION b) HIGH JOB SATISFACTION

	a) LOW JOB SATISFACTION		b) HIGH JOB SATISFACTION	
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
20-34	12.5	13.6	50.0	48.1
35-49	7.1	7.0	66.3	67.7
50-65	6.0	0.8	76.9	83.2

TEACHING LEVEL

Over 60% of the responses from each teaching level were in the high job satisfaction category with the exception of the junior high level (53.8%). Table 14 shows

the teaching level indicating the largest percentage in each job satisfaction category. In all instances the remaining teaching levels were spread fairly evenly among the other cells.

TABLE 14

TEACHING LEVEL BY HIGHEST PERCENTAGE IN EACH CATEGORY OF JOB SATISFACTION

CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE	TEACHING LEVEL
Low	34.9	Junior High
Moderate	30.4	Intermediate
High	33.0	Intermediate

EXPERIENCE

As years of experience increase an increase in job satisfaction was indicated.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

No significant relationship with job satisfaction was indicated.

C. DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION (Appendix C)

DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE IN DECISION MAKING

For each of the decisional situations Table 15 shows the responses indicating a participative desire as a percentage of the total responses. In parentheses are the respective male and female percentages. The

trend indicates a decrease of participative desire from the classroom to the district level. In the majority of instances male participative desire is greater than the female at the school and district level. The reverse is true at the classroom level.

DESIRE FOR DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION AND AGE

Table 16 shows the percentage of each age category indicating the desire for decisional participation in the task areas at the three levels of classroom, school, and district.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RESPONSES INDICATING A PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE AT CLASSROOM, SCHOOL, AND DISTRICT LEVEL IN EACH OF THE DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION SITUATIONS. (MALE/FEMALE SHOWN IN PARENTHESES)

SITUATION	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	80.2 (77.9/82.5)	75.3 (79.1/71.8)	24.6 (28.4/20.9)
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	70.6 (66.6/74.4)	73.9 (73.6/74.3)	10.4 (11.7/9.3)
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	71.7 (69.8/73.7)	69.0 (69.3/88.7)	15.9 (18.6/13.4)
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	66.0 (64.1/67.9)	70.0 (72.2/67.9)	20.4 (24.7/16.2)
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions	64.6 (65.4/63.8)	64.1 (69.0/59.4)	26.5 (29.1/24.1)
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	75.4 (73.5/77.3)	69.2 (71.6/69.9)	39.1 (41.7/36.6)
7. Organization & Structure Decisions	68.6 (67.3/69.9)	72.8 (72.9/72.6)	36.3 (37.2/34.2)

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE OF EACH AGE CATEGORY INDICATING DESIRE FOR DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

	SITUATION		CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1.	Pupil Personnel Decisions	A.	85.9	A. 78.0	A. 22.7
		B.	79.2	B. 75.4	B. 29.5
		C.	71.2	C. 69.9	C. 19.0
2.	School-Community Relations Decisions	A.	73.7	A. 75.2	A. 9.7
		B.	71.7	B. 75.7	B. 11.2
		C.	61.6	C. 68.4	C. 10.3
3.	Physical Facilities Decisions	A.	74.4	A. 69.8	A. 14.9
		B.	74.4	B. 71.5	B. 19.2
		C.	61.7	C. 67.6	C. 11.9
4.	Staff Personnel Decisions	A.	69.8	A. 72.2	A. 18.1
		B.	68.4	B. 70.7	B. 24.1
		C.	54.1	C. 64.4	C. 17.8
5.	Finance and Busin. Management Decisions	A.	68.6	A. 64.1	A. 24.9
		B.	65.3	B. 68.0	B. 29.9
		C.	55.3	C. 56.5	C. 23.3
6.	Curriculum Development Decisions	A.	78.3	A. 71.0	A. 37.2
		B.	75.5	B. 70.7	B. 43.5
		C.	69.5	C. 62.8	C. 34.4
7.	Organization and Structure Decisions	A.	72.2	A. 74.2	A. 35.0
		B.	70.7	B. 74.5	B. 40.4
		C.	57.8	C. 66.8	C. 31.3

(A) 20 - 34 years (B) 35-49 years (C) 50-65 years

A decrease in participative desire with increase of age is indicated at the classroom level where the age category exhibiting the greatest participative desire is the 20-34 year. At the district level the 35-49 year age

category shows the greatest participative desire. A sharp drop ensues after age 49. At the school level the desire for participation is strongest in the 20-34 year age category in decisions concerning Pupil Personnel, Staff Personnel, and Curriculum Development. The 35-49 year category has the strongest participatory desire concerning decisions in School-Community Relations, Physical Facilities, Finance and Business Management, and Organization and Structure.

Table 17 shows the age at which participative desire is greatest for males and females. Of the 21 decisional situations male participative desire is greatest in the 35-49 year age category in twice as many instances as female participative desire. Conversely female participative desire is greater in the 20-34 year age category. At the district level almost without exception the participative desire for both sexes resides at the 34-49 year age level. At the school level with the exception of Pupil Personnel Decisions male participative desire is greater at the 34-49 year age category. Female participative desire at this level is, with the exception of Staff Personnel Decisions, entirely in the 20-34 year age category. At the classroom level both male and female participative desire is largely at the 20-34 year age category. Two notable exceptions are in School-Community Relations Decisions and Staff Personnel Decisions

when males indicate the participative desire is greatest at the 35-49 year age category.

TABLE 17

AGE AT WHICH PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE IS GREATEST FOR MALES AND FEMALES

SITUATION	LEVEL					
	CLASSROOM		SCHOOL		DISTRICT	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	A	A	A	A	B	B
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	B	A	B	A	B	B
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	A	A/B	B	A	B	B
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	B	A	A/B	B	B	B
5. Finance & Business Management Decisions	A/B	A	B	A	B	A/B
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	A	A	B	A	B	B
7. Organization and Structure Decisions	A	A/B	B	A	B	B

(A) 20 - 34 years (B) 35 - 49 years (C) 50 - 65 years

UNREALIZED PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE

Table 18 shows the percentage of desired participation that is unrealized (deprivation) in each of the

decisional situations. It can be seen that with the exception of Staff Personnel, Finance and Business Management, and Organization and Structure decisions there is little deprivation at the classroom level. At the school level deprivation is considerably higher and at the district level it is extremely high.

DEPRIVATION AND AGE

As can be seen from Table 19 this deprivation occurs generally in the 35-49 year age category for males and in the 20-34 year age category for females. Notable exceptions for males are in Pupil Personnel Decisions at the School level (deprivation: 20-34 year age category) and School-Community Relations Decisions at the classroom level (deprivation: 20-34 year age category). For females notable exceptions are Staff Personnel Decisions at the district level (deprivation: 35-49 year age category) and Organization and Structure Decisions at the classroom level (deprivation: 35-49 year age category). For both sexes a notable exception is in Curriculum Development Decisions at the classroom level and concerns the 50-65 year age category.

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF THOSE DESIRING PARTICIPATION WHO EXPERIENCE DEPRIVATION (ACTUAL NUMBER DEPRIVED OF NUMBER DESIRING PARTICIPATION IN PARENTHESES)

SITUATION	CLASSROOM	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	1.0 (9 of 993)	22.9 (214 of 932)	89.4 (272 of 304)
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	10.8 (94 of 873)	26.0 (239 of 915)	91.5 (118 of 129)
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	11.5 (102 of 888)	44.7 (381 of 853)	92.4 (182 of 197)
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	27.4 (224 of 717)	50.1 (434 of 866)	94.0 (237 of 252)
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions	25.6 (230 of 799)	53.0 (420 of 792)	90.2 (296 of 328)
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	3.6 (34 of 933)	45.6 (390 of 856)	81.7 (394 of 483)
7. Organization and Structure Decisions	30.0 (255 of 849)	49.3 (444 of 900)	88.9 (399 of 449)

TABLE 19

AGE CATEGORY AT WHICH GREATEST DEPRIVATION OCCURS FOR MALES AND FEMALES

A : 20-34 years B : 35-49 years C : 50-65 years

SITUATION	LEVEL					
	CLASSROOM		SCHOOL		DISTRICT	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	B/C	B/C	A	A	B	A
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	A	A	B	A	B	A
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	A/B	A	B	A	B	A
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	B	A	B	A	B	B
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions	A/B	A	B	A	B	A
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	C	C	B	A	B	A
7. Organization and Structure Decisions	A/B	B	B	A	B	A

HIGH JOB SATISFACTION AND STATES OF DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

(Appendix C)

Table 20 compares the percentage of each decisional participation state that falls into the category of high job satisfaction.

In every instance at all three levels of classroom,

school, and district over 50% (over 60% in 18 out of 21 instances) of those at equilibrium (positive or negative) indicate high job satisfaction. While quite a large percentage of those deprived of decisional participation indicate high job satisfaction the figures are lower than for equilibrium. In less than half of the 21 situations the percentage of those indicating decisional saturation and high job satisfaction is lower than those indicating equilibrium. Most of the exceptions are at the school level.

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE OF EACH DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION STATE IN THE HIGH JOB SATISFACTION CATEGORY AT CLASSROOM (C), SCHOOL (S), AND DISTRICT (D) LEVELS

SITUATION	DEPRIVED	EQUILIBRIUM NEGATIVE	EQUILIBRIUM POSITIVE	SATURATED	
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	44.4	67.0	62.7	57.7	C
	45.8	59.7	66.2	71.8	S
	54.4	64.0	71.9	83.3	D
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	51.1	64.0	64.8	52.5	C
	53.6	61.6	64.6	66.9	S
	51.7	63.6	54.5	44.4	D
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	47.1	58.8	65.9	58.1	C
	53.8	65.8	66.9	61.6	S
	50.0	64.2	73.3	66.7	D
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	56.3	62.3	64.6	61.8	C
	52.1	66.3	67.4	74.7	S
	52.7	64.3	73.3	66.7	D
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions	56.5	65.2	64.3	54.3	C
	54.3	66.2	65.9	69.0	S
	55.4	64.8	62.5	33.3	D
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	50.0	64.3	64.4	52.0	C
	52.8	67.7	65.7	67.7	S
	55.6	65.2	64.0	73.1	D
7. Organization and Structure Decisions	56.5	61.9	65.2	60.8	C
	52.5	66.7	69.7	60.4	S
	54.1	66.6	60.0	60.0	D

LOW JOB SATISFACTION AND STATES OF DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

(Appendix C)

Table 21 compares the percentage of each decisional participation state in the low job satisfaction category. At the classroom level those decisionally saturated and those decisionally deprived always show a greater percentage than those at equilibrium positive, which with only two exceptions consistently shows a smaller percentage than equilibrium negative. At the school level decisional deprivation consistently has the greater percentage followed by either decisional saturation or decisional equilibrium (negative). At the district level decisional deprivation and saturation account for the larger percentage in all but two task areas (Staff Personnel Decisions and Finance and Business Decisions) where the greater percentage is accounted for by the equilibrium positive state.

PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE (Appendix C)

Where a trend is apparent the participative desire shows a lessening in the 15 plus years category of experience, at which point most respondents fall into the desire realized category. The desire for participation at the school level in School-Community Relations is greatest in the 1-5 years category of experience and thereafter the majority are in the desire realized category. At the school level the desire for participation in Finance and Business

Management Decisions is greatest after 5 years of experience after which point the majority of the 6-15 years category are deprived and the 15 plus category have realized the desire or are deprived.

At the district level in Pupil Personnel decisions participative desire is strongest after the 1-5 years category of experience. In both instances the majority are deprived.

In the classroom in School-Community Relations and Physical Facilities decisions the category of greatest participative desire is the 6-15 years and this desire is largely realized. After 15 years the decrease in desire is accounted for by an increase in realized non-participative desire.

TEACHING LEVELS AND PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE (Appendix C)

A few trends emerge. In the classroom the greatest participative desire is shown at the primary level. In Pupil Personnel Decisions the junior high level and the intermediate level show equal participative desire and at the intermediate level high interest is indicated in Physical Facilities and Staff Personnel decisions.

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE OF EACH DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION STATE IN THE LOW JOB SATISFACTION CATEGORY AT CLASSROOM (C), SCHOOL (S), AND DISTRICT (D) LEVELS

SITUATION	DEPRIVED	EQUILIBRIUM NEGATIVE	EQUILIBRIUM POSITIVE	SATURATED	
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions	11.1	5.7	8.6	11.5	C
	14.0	9.9	7.2	7.3	S
	13.6	7.8	0.0	0.0	D
2. School-Community Relations Decisions	14.9	8.4	7.1	15.1	C
	13.4	11.1	7.1	5.6	S
	14.4	8.3	0.0	11.1	D
3. Physical Facilities Decisions	13.7	11.0	6.7	13.2	C
	12.9	8.1	5.7	10.5	S
	14.3	7.9	6.7	0.0	D
4. Staff Personnel Decisions	12.5	9.4	6.9	9.8	C
	12.0	7.3	7.2	6.0	S
	12.2	8.0	13.3	0.0	D
5. Finance and Business Management Decisions	13.9	8.1	6.9	10.5	C
	13.3	8.0	5.4	4.8	S
	11.1	7.9	12.5	11.1	D
6. Curriculum Development Decisions	14.7	4.7	7.9	15.4	C
	12.3	6.0	7.1	11.1	S
	10.7	8.4	4.5	7.7	D
7. Organization and Structure Decisions	13.7	7.1	6.9	11.7	C
	12.8	7.7	5.3	9.9	S
	11.5	7.6	4.0	13.3	D

At the school level the highest participative desire is shown in Physical Facilities Decisions by the primary and intermediate levels and in Staff Personnel and

Curriculum Development decisions by the primary level.

At the level of the school district no significant differences are apparent except a greater participative desire in Organization and Structure Decisions from the primary level.

PARTICIPATIVE DESIRE AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION (Appendix C)

At the classroom level little can be seen in the way of a trend except in Pupil Personnel Decisions which shows a gradual decline with increased professional preparation.

At the school level participative desire shows a gradual increase as professional preparation increases. This also is the case at the district level except in the instance of School-Community Relations Decisions where no trend is apparent.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

It is apparent that the great majority of teachers of both sexes are desirous of participation in the decision making process in both the classroom and the school. Females appear to be more desirous of participation at the classroom level than males. A reverse trend is indicated at the school and district level. The participative desire at the district level is considerably lower than at other levels and over 80% of those indicating participative desire at the district level report being decisionally deprived. Between 20 and 50 percent of those desiring decisional participation at the school level report deprivation.

In general deprivation and the greatest desire for decisional participation occur in the 35-49 year age category for males and 20-34 year age category for females. Possibly after this point professional concerns are in competition with other concerns for females. Participative desire for both sexes in decision making generally declines after 49 years of age although in Curriculum Development Decisions at the classroom level those in the 50-65 year age category indicate the highest percentage of deprivation. Possibly these teachers, probably with many years of

experience, feel that they have a great deal to offer in this area.

A trend indicating decreased participative desire is apparent after 15 years of experience but the trend tends to be reversed at the school and district levels with increased professional preparation.It would appear that an increase in professional preparation beyond the three year category is a factor in increased participative desire in decision making at the school and district level.

While decisional participation seems to be related to all biographical variables to some extent job satisfaction only appears to be related in some degree to age, teaching level, and years of experience.

Of those respondents at equilibrium, either positive or negative, over 50% in any situation indicate high job satisfaction compared with less than 10% in most instances (less than 15% in some) indicating low job satisfaction. (Appendix C). There are less decisionally deprived in the high job satisfaction category than there are those at decisional equilibrium. It would appear therefore that realizing one's desire is related to high job satisfaction. In fact in any decisional situation the greatest single percentage group will be found at equilibrium in the high job satisfaction category.

Further inspection reveals that in two-thirds of the 21 situations there are less decisionally saturated

respondents in the high job satisfaction category than there are respondents decisionally at equilibrium. The exceptions are in Pupil Personnel, School-Community Relations, Physical Facilities, Staff-Personnel, and Finance and Business Management decisions, all at the school level; and Pupil Personnel, Physical Facilities, Staff Personnel, and Curriculum Development decisions at the district level. 65% of those expressing saturation in these areas fell into the high satisfaction category. It may well be that either saturation is not a factor in job satisfaction or it is looked upon as a necessary evil by these respondents.

In almost all instances a greater percentage of the low job satisfaction category is associated with equilibrium negative than equilibrium positive. This would seem to indicate that realizing one's desire not to participate may be less satisfying than the realization of one's desire to participate.

As may be seen from Table 13 in Chapter 5 and Appendix D job satisfaction increases with age quite uniformly for both sexes excepting that a slightly greater percentage of females express high job satisfaction in the 50-65 year age category. A similar increase in satisfaction with increase in experience may be seen from Appendix D.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The desire by both male and female teachers for participation in the decision making process is strong at the classroom and school level. Few teachers are desirous of participation in the decision making process at the district level, that is outside of their immediate school environment. The participative desire is particularly weak in the area of School-Community relations Decisions at the district level. In this age of public criticism of education it would seem important for teachers to be interested in this area.
2. At the district level participative desire in the decision making process is greatest among males.
3. Among those desirous of participation in the decision making process at the school and district level the desire is largely unrealized.
4. The age category at which deprivation most occurs is 35-49 years for males and 20-34 years for females.
5. The desire for participation in decision making generally declines with age, notably so after 49 years of age. It is worthy of mention that in the 50-65 years age category concerning Curriculum Development Decisions at the classroom level both sexes show decisional deprivation.

6. Realized desire for decisional participation goes a long way to providing the teacher with high job satisfaction and deprivation is similarly related to low job satisfaction.
7. At the classroom level the majority of those indicating low job satisfaction are at equilibrium positive. Realized desire therefore is not the only factor affecting job satisfaction.
8. At the school level the majority of those indicating low job satisfaction are decisionally deprived. Decisional deprivation appears to be an important factor at the school level in terms of job satisfaction.
9. Deprivation in the decision making process at the classroom and school level is seen particularly in Staff Personnel, Finance and Business Management, and Organization and Structure decisions.
10. At the district level deprivation in the decision making process is especially apparent in Pupil Personnel, Finance and Business Management, Curriculum Development, and Organization and Structure decisions.
11. Participation in decision making, unrealized either by desire or by deprivation, appears to be a factor which is related to low job satisfaction.
12. Desire for participation in decision making is in general at the classroom level in the 20-34 years age category

and at the school and district level in the 35-49 year age category.

13. As teaching experience passes the 15 year mark participative desire generally declines. The outstanding instances of increased desire in Finance and Business Decisions at the school level and Pupil Personnel and Staff Personnel decisions at the district level by those with over 5 years of experience are largely unrealized.
14. The participative desire generally increases at the school and district level as professional preparation increases. One might conclude that the more professionally prepared teacher feels a right to participate in professional matters outside of his classroom.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. EDUCATION IN GENERAL

For the teaching profession the implications are, perhaps, not as might have been expected in view of the poor desire exhibited for decisional participation at the district level. If members are to be looked upon as professionals it could be argued that it is important that involvement at this level be desired and that such involvement ought to be encouraged by the teachers' organizations.

It might also be argued that further professional development should also be encouraged as this seems to be related to the desire for participation in decision making outside of the teacher's immediate classroom environment. Professional development that leads to an understanding of the ramifications of decision making at the school and district level could be invaluable not only to the individual but to the school and district. Professional organizations and district administrators may have conflicting views in this respect.

B. EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR

The largely unrealized desire for participation in the decision making process beyond the classroom, particularly in Finance and Business Management Decisions and Organi-

zation and Structure Decisions, might be recognized and provision made for the realization of such desire. Again, teachers' professional organizations and the district administration may hold conflicting views here. The general decline of participative desire after the age of 49 years presents problems regarding the roles of heads of department who may no longer be able to provide the other members of the department with enlightened leadership and stimulation. A system by which after several years in a department a member becomes eligible for a term, say two or three years, as department head might be initiated. The rotation of the department head position could be left to member discretion.

A greater involvement of the old-and-tried (50-65 year age category) in Curriculum Development Decisions seems to be called for at the classroom level. In general, the provision for more teacher involvement is suggested in this area at all levels.

It is important that school administrators recognize and capitalize upon the participative desire of the males in the 35-49 year age category and females in the 20-34 year age category. Provision might be made for participation in Pupil Personnel Decisions at the district level and in Staff Personnel decisions at the district and school levels.

C. FURTHER RESEARCH

This thesis reports on survey type data which could be amplified by case studies and a phenomenological approach. Multivariate analysis techniques would be recommended for such research.

That job satisfaction is generally higher in the urban than in the rural area may be a subject for further investigation; also the finding of no significant difference between the sexes on measures of job satisfaction.

Contrary to the findings of Simpkins and Friesen (1970) it would appear that teachers do desire participation in the decision making process in Curriculum Development Decisions, and Organization and Structure Decisions. The reasons for this may deserve investigation as may the reasons for the trend of greater female participative desire in decision making being reversed outside of the classroom.

The existence of a difference in the job satisfaction levels between the two possible states of decisional equilibrium warrants further investigation. To what degree does the realized desire to participate relate to job satisfaction and to what degree does the

realized desire not to participate relate to job satisfaction?

Is the amount of participation and the type of participative procedure an important factor? Are many of those reporting the realized desire not to participate and at the same time expressing low job satisfaction attempting to rationalize their position or are they merely in a state of apathy? If the latter, what are the factors contributing to this condition?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, M.G. Intervening variables in organizational behaviour. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2, 1965, 1-13.

Alderfer, C.P. An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 4, 1969, 142-175.

Alderfer, C.P. Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Alutto, J. and Acito, F. Decisional Participation and Sources of Job Satisfaction: A Study of Manufacturing Personnel. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 1974, 160-167.

Alutto, J., and Belasco, J. Decisional deprivation, equilibrium and saturation as variables in educational research. Working Paper No. 93, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971.

Alutto,J., and Belasco, J. Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 8, (1), Winter 1972, 44-58.

Alutto, J.A., and Hrebiniak, L.G. Research on Commitment to Employing Organization Among Executives: Preliminary Findings on a Study of Managers Graduating from Engineering and MBA Programs. Working Paper No. 227. Presented at the "Symposium on Commitment to Work and Organization," 35th Annual Meeting, Academy of Management, New Orleans, 1975.

Alonzo, R. An analysis of commitment orientations among professional nurses. Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1970.

Argyris, C. Problems and New Directions for Industrial Psychology. In Marvin D. Drunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 151-184.

Balantine, R. G. A study of teacher participation in school policy formulation in New Jersey. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Rutgers-State University, 1968.

Barnard, C.I. The functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bavelas, A. Communication patterns in task oriented groups. Journal of the Accoustical Society of America, 22, 1950, 725-730.

Beer, M. The Teahnology of Organization Development. In Marvin D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rank McNally, 1976, 937-994.

Bennis, W. G. Beyond Bureaucracy. In Hollander, E. P. and Hunt R. G. (Eds.), Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, 1967.

Bergquist, H. E. A correlate of college satisfaction. Unpublished thesis, School of Education, University of Chicago, 1961.

Blauner, R. Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Scoiety. In Galenson, W., and Lipset, 1. (Eds.) Labour and Trade Unionism. New York: Wiley, 341-6.

Blood, M. R. Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, (6), 1969 456-459.

Blood, M. R., and Hulin, C.L. Alienation, environmental characteristics, and worker responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 1967, 284-290.

Brayfield, A. H., and Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 1955, 396-424.

Bridges, E.M. Teacher participation in decision making. The Administrator's Notebook. 12, May, 1964.

Bridges, E.M. A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, (1), Winter 1967, 51.

Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lowler, E.E. III, and Weick, K.E. Jr. Managerial behavior and human performance. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Campbell, J.P., and Pritchard, R.D. Motivation Theory in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In Marvin D. Dunnett (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 63-130.

Chase, F.S. Factors for satisfaction in teaching. The Phi Delta Kappan. 33, November, 1951, 127-132.

Clarke, P. Job Satisfaction for B.C. Educators. LEARN Newsletter, 9, (3), June 1977, 1-5

Coch, L., and French, J.R.P. Jr. Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1, 1948, 512-532.

Corwin, R. Professional persons in public organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1, 1-26.

Coughlan, R.J. Job satisfaction in relatively closed and open schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, (2), Spring 1971.

Drury, H. B. Scientific Management. New York: Columbia University Press, 1915.

Dubin, R. Theory building in applied sciences. In Marvin D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 17-40.

Fleishman, E.A. Attitude versus skill factors in work group productivity. Personnel Psychology, 18, 1965, 253-266.

Fleishman, E.A. Manual for the supervisory behavior description questionnaire. Washington, D.C. : American Institute for Research, 1972.

Follett, M.P. The Process of Control. L. Gulick and L. Urwick (Eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

Ford, R. N. The obstinate employee. Public Opinion Quarterly, 33, 1969, 301-310.

French, J.R.P. Jr., Israel, J. and As, D. An experiment on participation in a Norwegian factory. Human Relations, 13, 1960, 3-19.

Gilbreth, F.B. Science in management for the one best way to do work. In H. F. Merrill (Ed.), Classics in management. (Rev.ed.) New York: American Management Association, 1970, 217-263.

Goldthorpe, H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., and Platt, J. The affluent worker: Industrial attitudes and behavior. England: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Guest, R. H. Organization Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1960.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J.; and Feld, S.C., Americans view their mental health, Basic Books, 1960, 1948-151

Hackman, J.R., and Lawler, E.E. III. Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 1971, 259-286.

Halpin, A.W., and Winer, B.J. A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behaviour: Its description and measure. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 39-51.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.

Herzberg, F., Mansner, B., Peterson, R.O., and Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Homans, G.C. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1950.

Hulin, C.L., and Blood, M.R. Job enlargement, individual differences and workers resources. Psychological Bulletin, 69, (1), 1968, 41-55.

Hutchins, E.B., and Nonneman, A.J. Construct validity for an environmental assessment technique for medical schools. Technical Report No. L 661. Evanston, Ill.: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1966.

Inabit, D.J. Characteristics of teacher participation in decision-making functions of public-school administration. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Illinois, 1954.

Inkpen, W. E., Ponder, A.A., Crocker, R.K. Elementary teacher participation in educational decision-making in Newfoundland. The Canadian Administrator, 14, (4), January 1975.

Kahn, R.L.; Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J.D., and Rosenthal, R.A. Organizational Stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiquity. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Knoop, R. and O'Reilly R.R., Decision Making Procedures and Teacher Participation. The Canadian Administrator, 17, (3), Dec. 77.

Korman, A.K. Industrial and organizational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971

Kornhauser, A.W. Mental health of the industrial worker. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Kornhauser, A.W., and Sharp, A. Employee attitudes: Suggestions from a study in a factory. Personnel Journal, 10, 1932, 393-401.

Lammers, (source unidentified)

Lawler, E.E. III, and Porter, L.W. Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial performance. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 2, 1967, 122-143.

Lawler, E.E. III, and Porter, L.W. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Organizational Behaviour and Industrial Psychology. Oxford University Press, 1975, 32-39.

Lewin, K. Psychology of success and failure. In T. W. Costello and S. S. Zalkind (Eds.), Psychology in administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 67-72.

Likert, R. New patterns in management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, R. The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Lipham, J. et al. Relationships between instructional change and the extent to which school administration and teachers agree on the location of responsibilities for administrative decisions. Cooperative Research Project No. 5-0773. University of Wiscousins, 1966.

Locke, E.A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Marvin D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1297-1349.

March, J., and Simon, H. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Marrow, A.J., Bowers, D.G., and Seashore, S.E. Management by participation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954 (2nd ed., 1970).

Mayo, E. The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: Viking Press, 1960 (Originally published 1933).

Mayo, G.E. The first enquiry. In H. F. Merrill (Ed.), Classics in management. (Rev. ed.) New York: American Management Association, 1970, 379-388.

Miklos, E. Increasing participation in decision making. The Canadian Administrator. 9, (6), March 1970.

Owens, R. G. Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Payne, R., and Pugh, D.S. Organizational structure and climate. In Marvin D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally 1976, 1125-1173.

Porter, L.W. A study of the perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45, (1), Feb. 1961.

Rozycki, G.R. A study of the degree of Saskatchewan elementary school teachers' desire to participate in school-level decision=making. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1972.

Shaw, M.E., and Penrod, W.T. Jr. Does more information available to a group always improve group performances? Sociometry, 25, (4), Dec. 1962, 377-390.

Simpkins, W.S., and Friesen, D. Discretionary powers of classroom teachers. The Canadian Administrator, 9, (8), May 1970.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., Hulin, C.L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Stables, A.G. Staff Involvement in decision making. Superintendent's Bulletin, No. 11, April 10, 1978.

Stern, G.G. People in context: Measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Taylor, F.W. What is scientific management? In H. F. Merrill (Ed.), Classics in management. (Rev.ed.) New York: American Management Association, 1970, 67-71.

Turner, A.N., and Lawrence, P.R. Industrial jobs and the worker. Cambridge: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1965.

Vernon, H.N. Industrial fatigue and efficiency. New York: Dutton, 1921.

Vroom, V.H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Vroom, V.H. Leadership. In Marvin D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1527-1551.

Whyatt, S. Rest pauses in industry. (A review of the results obtained.) Industrial Fatigue Research Board, Great Britain, 1927, Report No. 42.

Whyte, W.F. Money and motivation. New York: Harper and Row, 1955.

Work in America. Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (U.S.A., 1973). Prepared under the Auspices of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX

A. Computer program assigning indices to job satisfaction and decisional participation

B. The complete questionnaire

C. Chi-square tables for decisional participation at the classroom, school, and district levels by job satisfaction, sex, age, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation

D. Chi-square tables for job satisfaction by sex, age, teaching level, years of experience, and professional preparation

E. Chi-square table for job satisfaction by school district

ABBREVIATIONS

SATISDEX: Job satisfaction index

EXPER : Years of experience

EDUC : Professional preparation

LEVEL : Teaching level

SCHOOL : The two school districts

DECI : Decisional Participation for a given situation (1-21)

C1. Pupil personnel decisions at the classroom level

C2. Pupil personnel decisions at the school level

C3. Pupil personnel decisions at the district level

APPENDIXES (continued)

APPENDICES (continued)

APPENDIX A

```
      $WATFIV (WIL/U0121/160/APPROX01)
      C   SEX: SEX
      C   AGE : AGE
      C   RESP  :  AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY
      C   LEVL  :  TEACHING LEVEL
      C   EXP   :  YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
      C   EDUC  :  YEARS OF TEACHER EDUCATION
      C   CONT  :  CONTRACT TYPE
      C
      C   SI   :  SATISFACTION INDEX
      C   DPI(21)  ::  DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION INDEX
      C
      C   DPCP(21)  :  DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION CURRENTLY PARTICIPATING
      C   DPWP(21)  :  DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION WISHES PARTICIPATION
      C   A,B,C,D   :  RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION INSTRUMENT
      C
      C   SCH :  SCHOOL #
      C   PER   :  RESPONDENT # IN THAT SCHOOL
 1          IMPLICIT INTEGER(A-Z)
 2          INTEGER DPI(21),DPCP(21),DPWP(21)
 3          IOUT=6
 4          DO 100 I=1, 10000
 5          READ(5,9,END=8)PER,SEX,AGE,RESP,LEVL,EXP,EDUC,CONT,A,B,C,D,(DPCP(J
           *),J=1,21),(DPWP(K),K=1,21),SCH
      C
      C
 6    9     FORMAT(3X,I2,2I1,I5,50I1,16X,I2)
      C
 7          SI=A+B+C+D
 8          IF(SI.GT.6)GO TO 268
 9          SI=1
10          GO TO 270
11    268   IF(SI.GT.9)GO TO 269
12          SI=2
13          GO TO 270
14    269   SI=3
15    270   CONTINUE
      C
16          DO 280 L=1,21
17          IF(DPWP(L).EQ.1) GO TO 220
18          IF(DPCP(L).EQ.1) GO TO 240
19          DPI(L) = 3
20          GO TO 280
21    240   DPI(L) = 4
```

```
22            GO TO 280
23     220    IF(DPCP(L).EQ.1) GO TO 250
24            DPI(L) = 1
25            GO TO 280
26     250    DPI(L) = 2
27     280    CONTINUE
       C FINISHED READING DATA AND CALCULATING INDICES
28            WRITE(ICUT,99)I,SCH,PER,SEX,AGE,RESP,LEVL,EXP,EDUC,CONT,SI,(DPI(K)
             *,K=1,21)
29     99     FORMAT(I4, 2(1X, I2), 3X, 2(I1, 1X), 1X, I5, 1X, 4(1X, I1), 2X, I2
             *.2X,21(1X,I1))
       C   ID COLS 1-10
       C   BIOGRAPHIC DATA COLS 11-32.
       C   SATISFACTION INDEX  COLS 35-36
       C   DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION INDEX  COLS 39-80
30     100    CONTINUE
31     8      STOP
32            END
```

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA RESEARCH PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME OR THE NAME OF YOUR SCHOOL ON ANY PART OF THIS MATERIAL

A. Please place a check mark ☑ in the appropriate boxes.

1. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age Range: 20–34 ☐ 35–49 ☐ 50–65 ☐

3. Area(s) of Responsibility:

   Classroom Teacher ☐ Vice-Principal ☐ Principal ☐

   Counsellor ☐ Other ☐ (please specify)_____

4. Teaching Level:

   Primary ☐ Intermediate ☐ Junior High ☐ Senior High ☐

5. Experience: 1–5 years ☐ 6–15 years ☐ 15+ years ☐

6. Years of TEACHER education: 3 or fewer (e.g. certificate) ☐ 4 or 5 (e.g. B.Ed.) ☐ 6 or more ☐

7. Contract type: Continuing ☐ Temporary ☐

B. Assume you were offered a position as a teacher with another school district. Other things being equal, would you leave your present district under any one of the following conditions? Please indicate by placing a check mark ☑ in the box under the appropriate heading *for each of the 4 questions.*

If the new position offered:	Yes, Definitely	Uncertain	No, Definitely Not
1. A slight increase in pay	☐	☐	☐
2. A slight increase in status	☐	☐	☐
3. A position allowing slightly more creativity	☐	☐	☐
4. A position in which individuals were slightly more friendly	☐	☐	☐

C. Listed below are 7 areas of decision-making in the school system. Please indicate those situations where you currently participate in decisions by placing a check mark [√] in the appropriate box, for your classroom, your whole school, or your school district *for each of the 7 areas.*

For example, in (1) Pupil Personnel Decisions, if you are involved in decision-making concerning:

- discipline in your classroom.
- promotion policy in your school
- but not in any aspects in the total school district – the checking would be as follows:

	Concerning my classroom(s)	Concerning the whole school	Concerning the total school district
1. Pupil Personnel Decisions (for example: discipline, promotion, reporting procedures, counselling and guidance.)	[√]	[√]	[ ]

Indicate those decision-making situations in which you *CURRENTLY PARTICIPATE* by placing a check [√] in the appropriate column(s).

Decision-Making Situation	Concerning my classroom(s)	Concerning the whole school	Concerning the total school district
1. *Pupil Personnel Decisions* (for example: discipline, promotion, reporting procedures, counselling and guidance.)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

2. *School-Community Relations Decisions*

(e.g., open-house days, volunteer assistance (mothers, etc.), Parent-Teacher Associations, school publications.)

3. *Physical Facilities Decisions*

(e.g. use of unscheduled open space (gym, library, etc.), arrangement and type of furniture, renovations, additions, supplies.)

4,. *Staff Personnel Decisions*

(e.g., extra-curricular assignments, staff performance supervisory policy, securing new personnel including use of non-professional staff.)

5. *Finance and Business Management Decisions*

(e.g. budget allocation, securing additional revenue, budget review and control.)

6. *Curriculum Development Decisions*

(e.g. deciding instructional objectives and methodology, instructional materials, assessment procedures.)



7. *Organization and Structure Decisions*

(e.g. deciding nature and degree of involvement in decision-making, extent and type of communication procedures between teachers, principals, and superintendents; grouping patterns (team-teaching, split-grade, etc.), pupil-teacher ratio, length of instructional periods, workshops and inservice, etc.)



D. Listed below are the same 7 areas of decision-making. Please indicate those situations in which you *WISH to participate* regardless of whether or not you actually do so (use a check mark ☑ in the appropriate column(s)).

Decision-Making Situation	Concerning my classroom(s)	Concerning the whole school	Concerning the total school district
1. *Pupil Personnel Decisions* (for example: discipline, promotion, reporting procedures, counselling and guidance.)	☐	☐	☐
2. *School-Community Relations Decisions* (e.g., open-house days, volunteer assistance (mothers, etc.), Parent-Teacher Associations, school publications.)	☐	☐	☐
3. *Physical Facilities Decisions* (e.g. use of unscheduled open space (gym, library, etc.), arrangement and type of furniture, renovations, additions, supplies.)	☐	☐	☐
4. *Staff Personnel Decisions* (e.g., extra-curricular assignments, staff performance supervisory policy, securing new personnel including use of non-professional staff.)	☐	☐	☐

5. *Finance and Business Management Decisions*

(e.g. budget allocation, securing additional revenue, budget review and control.)



6. *Curriculum Development Decisions*

(e.g. deciding instructional objectives and methodology, instructional materials, assessment procedures.)



7. *Organization and Structure Decisions*

(e.g. deciding nature and degree of involvement in decision-making, extent and type of communication procedures between teachers, principals, and superintendents; grouping patterns (team-teaching, split-grade, etc.), pupil-teacher ratio, length of instructional periods, workshops and inservice, etc.)



APPENDIX C

SATISDEX BY DECI1

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI1 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	1 0.9 11.1 0.1	85 78.0 8.6 6.9	5 4.6 5.7 0.4	18 16.5 11.5 1.5	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	4 1.1 44.4 0.3	282 78.8 28.7 22.8	24 6.7 27.3 1.9	48 13.4 30.8 3.9	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	4 0.5 44.4 0.3	617 80.1 62.7 49.9	59 7.7 67.0 4.8	90 11.7 57.7 7.3	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	9 0.7	984 79.5	88 7.1	156 12.6	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.75818 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.5752

SEX BY DECIL

SEX		DECIL 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	2	467	54	79	602
		0.3	77.6	9.0	13.1	48.7
		22.2	47.5	61.4	50.6	
		0.2	37.8	4.4	6.4	
FEMALE	2.	7	517	34	77	635
		1.1	81.4	5.4	12.1	51.3
		77.8	52.5	38.6	49.4	
		0.6	41.8	2.7	6.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		9	984	88	156	1237
		0.7	79.5	7.1	12.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.01557 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0291

AGE BY DECIL

AGE		DECIL 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	5	429	22	49	503
		0.6	85.3	4.4	9.7	40.7
		55.5	43.6	25.0	31.4	
		0.2	34.7	1.8	4.0	
35-49	2.	4	377	36	64	481
		0.8	78.4	7.5	13.3	38.9
		44.4	38.3	40.9	41.0	
		0.3	30.5	2.9	5.2	
50-65	3.	2	176	30	43	253
		0.8	70.4	11.9	17.0	20.5
		22.2	18.1	34.1	27.6	
		0.2	14.4	2.4	3.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	9	984	88	156	1237
		0.7	79.5	7.1	12.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.78845 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

AGE BY DECI1

CONTROLLING FOR..

SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DECI1 → COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	180 83.3 38.5 29.9	12 5.6 22.2 2.0	24 11.1 30.4 4.0	216 35.9
35-49	2.	1 0.4 50.0 0.2	197 78.2 42.2 32.7	21 8.3 38.9 3.5	33 13.1 41.8 5.5	252 41.9
50-65	3.	1 0.7 50.0 0.2	90 67.2 19.3 15.0	21 15.7 38.9 3.5	22 16.4 27.8 3.7	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	2 0.3	467 77.6	54 9.0	79 13.1	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.65323 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0157

AGE BY DECIL1
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECIL1 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	3	249	10	25	287
		1.0	86.8	3.5	8.7	45.2
		42.9	48.2	29.4	32.5	
		0.5	39.2	1.6	3.9	
35-49	2.	3	180	15	31	229
		1.3	78.6	6.6	13.5	36.1
		42.9	34.8	44.1	40.3	
		0.5	28.3	2.4	4.9	
50-65	3.	1	88	9	21	119
		0.8	73.9	7.6	17.6	18.7
		14.3	17.0	26.5	27.3	
		0.2	13.9	1.4	3.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	7	517	34	77	635
		1.1	81.4	5.4	12.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.91445 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0639

LEVEL BY DECI1

* *

LEVEL	DECI1 → COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	3 1.1 33.3 0.2	237 86.2 24.1 19.2	6 2.2 6.8 0.5	29 10.5 18.6 2.3	275 22.2
INTERMED	2.	2 0.5 22.2 0.2	304 77.9 30.9 24.6	44 11.3 50.0 3.6	40 10.3 25.6 3.2	390 31.5
JUNHIGH	3.	3 1.0 33.3 0.2	239 81.8 24.3 19.3	14 4.8 15.9 1.1	36 12.3 23.1 2.9	292 23.6
SENHIGH	4.	1 0.4 11.1 0.1	204 72.9 20.7 16.5	24 8.6 27.3 1.9	51 18.2 32.7 4.1	280 22.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	9 0.7	984 79.5	88 7.1	156 12.6	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 36.65804 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

EXPER BY DECI1

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI1 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	1	227	12	29	269
		0.4	84.4	4.5	10.8	21.7
		11.1	23.1	13.6	18.6	
		0.1	18.4	1.0	2.3	
6-15	2.	5	447	29	62	543
		0.9	82.3	5.3	11.4	43.9
		55.6	45.4	33.0	39.7	
		0.4	36.1	2.3	5.0	
15PLUS	3.	3	310	47	65	425
		0.7	72.9	11.1	15.3	34.4
		33.3	31.5	53.4	41.7	
		0.2	25.1	3.8	5.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	9	984	88	156	1237
		0.7	79.5	7.1	12.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.50996 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010

EDUC BY DECIL

EDUC		DECIL 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
30R LESS	1.	1	207	14	26	248
		0.4	83.5	5.6	10.5	20.0
		11.1	21.0	15.9	16.7	
		0.1	16.7	1.1	2.1	
40R5	2.	6	594	45	100	745
		0.8	79.7	6.0	13.4	60.2
		66.7	60.4	51.1	64.1	
		0.5	48.0	3.6	8.1	
60R MORE	3.	2	183	29	30	244
		0.8	75.0	11.9	12.3	19.7
		22.2	18.6	33.0	19.2	
		0.2	14.8	2.3	2.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	9	984	88	156	1237
		0.7	79.5	7.1	12.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.63153 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0493

SATISDEX BY DECI2

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI2 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	30	52	18	9	109
		27.5	47.7	16.5	8.3	8.8
		14.0	7.2	9.9	7.3	
		2.4	4.2	1.5	0.7	
MODERATE	2.	86	191	55	26	358
		24.0	53.4	15.4	7.3	28.9
		40.2	26.6	30.4	21.0	
		7.0	15.4	4.4	2.1	
HIGH	3.	98	475	108	89	770
		12.7	61.7	14.0	11.6	62.2
		45.8	66.2	59.7	71.8	
		7.9	38.4	8.7	7.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	214	718	181	124	1237
		17.3	58.0	14.6	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 35.82867 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SEX BY DEC12

* *

SEX	DEC12 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	103 17.1 48.1 8.3	373 62.0 51.9 30.2	63 10.5 34.8 5.1	63 10.5 50.8 5.1	602 48.7
FEMALE	2.	111 17.5 51.9 9.0	345 54.3 48.1 27.9	118 18.6 65.2 9.5	61 9.6 49.2 4.9	635 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	214 17.3	718 58.0	181 14.6	124 10.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.26787 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0006

AGE BY DECI2

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI2 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	109	283	78	33	503
		21.7	56.3	15.5	6.6	40.7
		50.9	39.4	43.1	26.6	
		8.8	22.9	6.3	2.7	
35-49	2.	69	294	61	57	481
		14.3	61.1	12.7	11.9	38.9
		32.2	40.9	33.7	46.0	
		5.6	23.8	4.9	4.6	
50-65	3.	36	141	42	34	253
		14.2	55.7	16.6	13.4	20.5
		16.8	19.6	23.2	27.4	
		2.9	11.4	3.4	2.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	214	718	181	124	1237
		17.3	58.0	14.6	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.39838 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0007

AGE BY DEC12

CONTROLLING FOR.. SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC12 1.	DEC12 2.	DEC12 3.	DEC12 4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	47	129	24	16	216
		21.8	59.7	11.1	7.4	35.9
		45.6	34.6	38.1	25.4	
		7.8	21.4	4.0	2.7	
35-49	2.	35	162	26	29	252
		13.9	64.3	10.3	11.5	41.9
		34.0	43.4	41.3	46.0	
		5.8	26.9	4.3	4.8	
50-65	3.	21	82	13	18	134
		15.7	61.2	9.7	13.4	22.3
		20.4	22.0	20.6	28.6	
		3.5	13.6	2.2	3.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	103	373	63	63	602
		17.1	62.0	10.5	10.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.31170 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2161

SEX — VALUE = 2. FEMALE

DEC12

AGE		1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW PCT					
	COL PCT					
	TOT PCT					
20-34	1.	62	154	54	17	287
		21.6	53.7	18.8	5.9	45.2
		55.9	44.6	45.8	27.9	
		9.8	24.3	8.5	2.7	
35-49	2.	34	132	35	28	229
		14.8	57.6	15.3	12.2	36.1
		30.6	38.3	29.7	45.9	
		5.4	20.8	5.5	4.4	
50-65	3.	15	59	29	16	119
		12.6	49.6	24.4	13.4	18.7
		13.5	17.1	24.6	26.2	
		2.4	9.3	4.6	2.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	111	345	118	61	635
		17.5	54.3	18.6	9.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.30666 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0082

LEVEL BY DEC12

* *

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC12 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	35 12.7 16.4 2.8	154 56.0 21.4 12.4	56 20.4 30.9 4.5	30 10.9 24.2 2.4	275 22.2
INTERMED	2.	68 17.4 31.8 5.5	236 60.5 32.9 19.1	54 13.8 29.8 4.4	32 8.2 25.8 2.6	390 31.5
JUNHIGH	3.	56 19.2 26.2 4.5	169 57.9 23.5 13.7	35 12.0 19.3 2.8	32 11.0 25.8 2.6	292 23.6
SENHIGH	4.	55 19.6 25.7 4.4	159 56.8 22.1 12.9	36 12.9 19.9 2.9	30 10.7 24.2 2.4	280 22.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	214 17.3	718 58.0	181 14.6	124 10.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.72517 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0728

EXPER BY DECI2

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI2 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	68	137	49	15	269
		25.3	50.9	18.2	5.6	21.7
		31.8	19.1	27.1	12.1	
		5.5	11.1	4.0	1.2	
6-15	2.	84	328	75	56	543
		15.5	60.4	13.8	10.3	43.9
		39.3	45.7	41.4	45.2	
		6.8	26.5	6.1	4.5	
15PLUS	3.	62	253	57	53	425
		14.6	59.5	13.4	12.5	34.4
		29.0	35.2	31.5	42.7	
		5.0	20.5	4.6	4.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	214	718	181	124	1237
		17.3	58.0	14.6	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.72052 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

EDUC BY DECI2

DECI2

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. 30R LESS		41	130	50	27	248
		16.5	52.4	20.2	10.9	20.0
		19.2	18.1	27.6	21.8	
		3.3	10.5	4.0	2.2	
2. 40R5		149	416	108	72	745
		20.0	55.8	14.5	9.7	60.2
		69.6	57.9	59.7	58.1	
		12.0	33.6	8.7	5.8	
3. 60R MORE		24	172	23	25	244
		9.8	70.5	9.4	10.2	19.7
		11.2	24.0	12.7	20.2	
		1.9	13.9	1.9	2.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		214	718	181	124	1237
		17.3	58.0	14.6	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 29.57324 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

1

SATISDEX BY DECIS

SATISDEX		DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	37	0	72	0	109
		33.9	0.0	66.1	0.0	8.8
		13.6	0.0	7.8	0.0	
		3.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	
MODERATE	2.	87	9	260	2	358
		24.3	2.5	72.6	0.6	28.9
		32.0	28.1	28.2	16.7	
		7.0	0.7	21.0	0.2	
HIGH	3.	148	23	589	10	770
		19.2	3.0	76.5	1.3	62.2
		54.4	71.9	64.0	83.3	
		12.0	1.9	47.6	0.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	272	32	921	12	1237
		22.0	2.6	74.5	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.10658 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0060

SEX by DECIS

DECIS

SEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. MALE		148	23	423	8	602
		24.6	3.8	70.3	1.3	48.7
		54.4	71.9	45.9	66.7	
		12.0	1.9	34.2	0.6	
2. FEMALE		124	9	498	4	635
		19.5	1.4	78.4	0.6	51.3
		45.6	28.1	54.1	33.3	
		10.0	0.7	40.3	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		272	32	921	12	1237
		22.0	2.6	74.5	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.81364 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0020

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSES

FILE DAVIS (CREATION DATE = 05/25/78)

* C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N
AGE BY DECIS
* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	104	10	387	2	503
		20.7	2.0	76.9	0.4	40.7
		38.2	31.3	42.0	16.7	
		8.4	0.8	31.3	0.2	
35-49	2.	127	15	339	6	481
		26.4	3.1	69.2	1.2	38.9
		46.7	46.9	36.2	50.0	
		10.3	1.2	26.9	0.5	
50-65	3.	41	7	201	4	253
		16.2	2.8	79.4	1.6	20.5
		15.1	21.9	21.8	33.3	
		3.3	0.6	16.2	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		272	32	921	12	1237
		22.0	2.6	74.5	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.84046 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0146

AGE BY DFC13
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

AGE	DFC13 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	45	6	164	1	216
		20.8	2.8	75.9	0.5	35.9
		30.4	26.1	38.8	12.5	
		7.5	1.0	27.2	0.2	
35-49	2.	73	11	163	5	252
		29.0	4.4	64.7	2.0	41.9
		49.3	47.8	38.5	62.5	
		12.1	1.8	27.1	0.8	
50-65	3.	30	6	96	2	134
		22.4	4.5	71.6	1.5	22.3
		20.3	26.1	22.7	25.0	
		5.0	1.0	15.9	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	148	23	423	8	602
		24.6	3.8	70.3	1.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.62966 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1955

AGE BY DEC13
CONTROLLING FOR.. SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

AGE		DEC13 1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	59	4	223	1	287
		20.6	1.4	77.7	0.3	45.2
		47.6	44.4	44.8	25.0	
		9.3	0.6	35.1	0.2	
35-49	2.	54	4	170	1	229
		23.6	1.7	74.2	0.4	36.1
		43.5	44.4	34.1	25.0	
		8.5	0.6	26.8	0.2	
50-65	3.	11	1	105	2	119
		9.2	0.8	88.2	1.7	18.7
		8.9	11.1	21.1	50.0	
		1.7	0.2	16.5	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		124	9	498	4	635
		19.5	1.4	78.4	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.55778 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0350

LEVEL BY DECI3

LEVEL		DECI3 1.	DECI3 2.	DECI3 3.	DECI3 4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	61	4	209	1	275
		22.2	1.5	76.0	0.4	22.2
		22.4	12.5	22.7	8.3	
		4.9	0.3	16.9	0.1	
INTERMED	2.	86	12	287	5	390
		22.1	3.1	73.6	1.3	31.5
		31.6	37.5	31.2	41.7	
		7.0	1.0	23.2	0.4	
JUNHIGH	3.	64	9	217	2	292
		21.9	3.1	74.3	0.7	23.6
		23.5	28.1	23.6	16.7	
		5.2	0.7	17.5	0.2	
SENHIGH	4.	61	7	208	4	280
		21.8	2.5	74.3	1.4	22.6
		22.4	21.9	22.6	33.3	
		4.9	0.6	16.8	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		272	32	921	12	1237
		22.0	2.6	74.5	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.43597 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.8805

EXPER BY DECIS

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	49	2	218	0	269
		18.2	0.7	81.0	0.0	21.7
		18.0	6.3	23.7	0.0	
		4.0	0.2	17.6	0.0	
6-15	2.	129	14	395	5	543
		23.8	2.6	72.7	0.9	43.9
		47.4	43.8	42.9	41.7	
		10.4	1.1	31.9	0.4	
15PLUS	3.	94	16	308	7	425
		22.1	3.8	72.5	1.6	34.4
		34.6	50.0	33.4	58.3	
		7.6	1.3	24.9	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		272	32	921	12	1237
		22.0	2.6	74.5	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.96594 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0205

EDUC BY DECI3

* *

EDUC	DECI3 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	37 14.9 13.6 3.0	4 1.6 12.5 0.3	205 82.7 22.3 16.6	2 0.8 16.7 0.2	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	170 22.8 62.5 13.7	9 1.2 28.1 0.7	560 75.2 60.8 45.3	6 0.8 50.0 0.5	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	65 26.6 23.9 5.3	19 7.8 59.4 1.5	156 63.9 16.9 12.6	4 1.6 33.3 0.3	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	272 22.0	32 2.6	921 74.5	12 1.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 47.48369 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI4

* *

SATISDEX	DECI4 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	14	55	19	21	109
		12.8	50.5	17.4	19.3	8.8
		14.9	7.1	8.4	15.1	
		1.1	4.4	1.5	1.7	
MODERATE	2.	32	219	62	45	358
		8.9	61.2	17.3	12.6	28.9
		34.0	28.1	27.6	32.4	
		2.6	17.7	5.0	3.6	
HIGH	3.	48	505	144	73	770
		6.2	65.6	18.7	9.5	62.2
		51.1	64.8	64.0	52.5	
		3.9	40.8	11.6	5.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	94	779	225	139	1237
		7.6	63.0	18.2	11.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.63673 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0032

SEX BY DECI4

SEX		DECI4 1.	DECI4 2.	DECI4 3.	DECI4 4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW PCT					
	COL PCT					
	TOT PCT					
MALE	1.	39	362	134	67	602
		6.5	60.1	22.3	11.1	48.7
		41.5	46.5	59.6	48.2	
		3.2	29.3	10.8	5.4	
FEMALE	2.	55	417	91	72	635
		8.7	65.7	14.3	11.3	51.3
		58.5	53.5	40.4	51.8	
		4.4	33.7	7.4	5.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		94	779	225	139	1237
		7.6	63.0	18.2	11.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.13394 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027

AGE BY DECI4

DECI4

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	43	329	72	59	503
		8.5	65.4	14.3	11.7	40.7
		45.7	42.2	32.0	42.4	
		3.5	26.6	5.8	4.8	
35-49	2.	35	310	81	55	481
		7.3	64.4	16.8	11.4	38.9
		37.2	39.8	36.0	39.6	
		2.8	25.1	6.5	4.4	
50-65	3.	16	140	72	25	253
		6.3	55.3	28.5	9.9	20.5
		17.0	18.0	32.0	18.0	
		1.3	11.3	5.8	2.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		94	779	225	139	1237
		7.6	63.0	18.2	11.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.02866 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

AGE BY DECI4
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI4 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	18 8.3 46.2 3.0	132 61.1 36.5 21.9	40 18.5 29.9 6.6	26 12.0 38.8 4.3	216 35.9
35-49	2.	15 6.0 38.5 2.5	161 63.9 44.5 26.7	49 19.4 36.6 8.1	27 10.7 40.3 4.5	252 41.9
50-65	3.	6 4.5 15.4 1.0	69 51.5 19.1 11.5	45 33.6 33.6 7.5	14 10.4 20.9 2.3	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	39 6.5	362 60.1	134 22.3	67 11.1	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.59980 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0236
CRAMER'S V = 0.11012

AGE BY DECI4
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

AGE		DECI4 1.1	2.I	3.I	4.I	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	25	197	32	33	287
		8.7	68.6	11.1	11.5	45.2
		45.5	47.2	35.2	45.8	
		3.9	31.0	5.0	5.2	
35-49	2.	20	149	32	28	229
		8.7	65.1	14.0	12.2	36.1
		36.4	35.7	35.2	38.9	
		3.1	23.5	5.0	4.4	
50-65	3.	10	71	27	11	119
		8.4	59.7	22.7	9.2	18.7
		18.2	17.0	29.7	15.3	
		1.6	11.2	4.3	1.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	55	417	91	72	635
		8.7	65.7	14.3	11.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.53797 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1455

LEVEL BY DECI4

LEVEL		DECI4 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	16	207	19	33	275
		5.8	75.3	6.9	12.0	22.2
		17.0	26.6	8.4	23.7	
		1.3	16.7	1.5	2.7	
INTERMED	2.	32	249	77	32	390
		8.2	63.8	19.7	8.2	31.5
		34.0	32.0	34.2	23.0	
		2.6	20.1	6.2	2.6	
JUNHIGH	3.	26	160	66	40	292
		8.9	54.8	22.6	13.7	23.6
		27.7	20.5	29.3	28.8	
		2.1	12.9	5.3	3.2	
SENHIGH	4.	20	163	63	34	280
		7.1	58.2	22.5	12.1	22.6
		21.3	20.9	28.0	24.5	
		1.6	13.2	5.1	2.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		94	779	225	139	1237
		7.6	63.0	18.2	11.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 43.68420 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

EDUC BY DECI4

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI4 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
30R LESS	1.	22	168	34	24	248
		8.9	67.7	13.7	9.7	20.0
		23.4	21.6	15.1	17.3	
		1.8	13.6	2.7	1.9	
40RS	2.	55	471	134	85	745
		7.4	63.2	18.0	11.4	60.2
		58.5	60.5	59.6	61.2	
		4.4	38.1	10.8	6.9	
60R MORE	3.	17	140	57	30	244
		7.0	57.4	23.4	12.3	19.7
		18.1	18.0	25.3	21.6	
		1.4	11.3	4.6	2.4	
COLUMN TOTAL		94	779	225	139	1237
		7.6	63.0	18.2	11.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.95828 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1264

SATISDEX BY DECIS

DECIS

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	32	48	22	7	109
		29.4	44.0	20.2	6.4	8.8
		13.4	7.1	11.1	5.6	
		2.6	3.9	1.8	0.6	
MODERATE	2.	79	191	54	34	358
		22.1	53.4	15.1	9.5	28.9
		33.1	28.3	27.3	27.4	
		6.4	15.4	4.4	2.7	
HIGH	3.	128	437	122	83	770
		16.6	56.8	15.8	10.8	62.2
		53.6	64.6	61.6	66.9	
		10.3	35.3	9.9	6.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.30016 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0122

SEX BY DEC15

* *

SEX	DEC15 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	110	333	94	65	602
		18.3	55.3	15.6	10.8	48.7
		46.0	49.3	47.5	52.4	
		8.9	26.9	7.6	5.3	
FEMALE	2.	129	343	104	59	635
		20.3	54.0	16.4	9.3	51.3
		54.0	50.7	52.5	47.6	
		10.4	27.7	8.4	4.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.57453 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6652

AGE BY DECIS

DECIS

AGE		1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1. COUNT	116	252	91	34	503
	ROW PCT	23.1	52.1	18.1	6.8	40.7
	COL PCT	48.5	38.8	46.0	27.4	
	TOT PCT	9.4	21.2	7.4	2.7	
35-49	2. COUNT	87	277	65	52	481
	ROW PCT	18.1	57.6	13.5	10.8	38.9
	COL PCT	36.4	41.0	32.8	41.9	
	TOT PCT	7.0	22.4	5.3	4.2	
50-65	3. COUNT	36	137	42	38	253
	ROW PCT	14.2	54.2	16.6	15.0	20.5
	COL PCT	15.1	20.3	21.2	30.6	
	TOT PCT	2.9	11.1	3.4	3.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.02563 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

```
     AGE                                                          BY  DECIS
CONTROLLING FOR..
     SEX                                                          VALUE =          1.  MALE
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

                     DECIS
             COUNT  I
             ROW PCT I                                                 ROW
             COL PCT I                                                 TOTAL
             TOT PCT I      1.I       2.I       3.I       4.I
AGE          --------I--------I---------I---------I---------I
                 1.  I    44  I   109   I    42   I    21   I    216
  20-34              I  20.4  I  50.5   I  19.4   I   9.7   I   35.9
                     I  40.0  I  32.7   I  44.7   I  32.3   I
                     I   7.3  I  18.1   I   7.0   I   3.5   I
                    -I--------I---------I---------I---------I
                 2.  I    47  I   147   I    34   I    24   I    252
  35-49              I  18.7  I  58.3   I  13.5   I   9.5   I   41.9
                     I  42.7  I  44.1   I  36.2   I  36.9   I
                     I   7.8  I  24.4   I   5.6   I   4.0   I
                    -I--------I---------I---------I---------I
                 3.  I    19  I    77   I    18   I    20   I    134
  50-65              I  14.2  I  57.5   I  13.4   I  14.9   I   22.3
                     I  17.3  I  23.1   I  19.1   I  30.8   I
                     I   3.2  I  12.8   I   3.0   I   3.3   I
                    -I--------I---------I---------I---------I
             COLUMN      110       333        94        65       602
             TOTAL      18.3      55.3      15.6      10.8     100.0

CHI SQUARE =     9.10401 WITH    6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM   SIGNIFICANCE =  0.1678
```

AGE BY DECIS
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	72 25.1 55.8 11.3	153 53.3 44.6 24.1	49 17.1 47.1 7.7	13 4.5 22.0 2.0	287 45.2
35-49	2.	40 17.5 31.0 6.3	130 56.8 37.9 20.5	31 13.5 29.8 4.9	28 12.2 47.5 4.4	229 36.1
50-65	3.	17 14.3 13.2 2.7	60 50.4 17.5 9.4	24 20.2 23.1 3.8	18 15.1 30.5 2.8	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	129 20.3	343 54.0	104 16.4	59 9.3	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.63835 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0009

7

EXPER BY DECIS

EXPER	DECIS	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	75	132	53	9	269
		27.9	49.1	19.7	3.3	21.7
		31.4	19.5	26.8	7.3	
		6.1	10.7	4.3	0.7	
6-15	2.	99	297	92	55	543
		18.2	54.7	16.9	10.1	43.9
		41.4	43.9	46.5	44.4	
		8.0	24.0	7.4	4.4	
15PLUS	3.	65	247	53	60	425
		15.3	58.1	12.5	14.1	34.4
		27.2	36.5	26.8	48.4	
		5.3	20.0	4.3	4.9	
COLUMN TOTAL		239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 41.56166 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

EDUC BY DECIS

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. 30R LESS		47	120	56	25	248
		19.0	48.4	22.6	10.1	20.0
		19.7	17.8	28.3	20.2	
		3.8	9.7	4.5	2.0	
2. 40R5		159	399	113	74	745
		21.3	53.6	15.2	9.9	60.2
		66.5	59.0	57.1	59.7	
		12.9	32.3	9.1	6.0	
3. 60R MORE		33	157	29	25	244
		13.5	64.3	11.9	10.2	19.7
		13.8	23.2	14.6	20.2	
		2.7	12.7	2.3	2.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.80663 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

LEVEL BY DECIS

LEVEL		DECIS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	55	150	46	24	275
		20.0	54.5	16.7	8.7	22.2
		23.0	22.2	23.2	19.4	
		4.4	12.1	3.7	1.9	
INTERMED	2.	86	213	57	34	390
		22.1	54.6	14.6	8.7	31.5
		36.0	31.5	28.8	27.4	
		7.0	17.2	4.6	2.7	
JUNHIGH	3.	45	168	51	30	292
		14.7	57.5	17.5	10.3	23.6
		18.0	24.9	25.8	24.2	
		3.5	13.6	4.1	2.4	
SENHIGH	4.	55	145	44	36	280
		19.6	51.8	15.7	12.9	22.6
		23.0	21.4	22.2	29.0	
		4.4	11.7	3.6	2.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	239	676	198	124	1237
		19.3	54.6	16.0	10.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.99111 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3512

SATISDEX BY DEC16

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC16 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	17	0	91	1	109
		15.6	0.0	83.5	0.9	8.8
		14.4	0.0	8.3	11.1	
		1.4	0.0	7.4	0.1	
MODERATE	2.	40	5	309	4	358
		11.2	1.4	86.3	1.1	28.9
		33.9	45.5	28.1	44.4	
		3.2	0.4	25.0	0.3	
HIGH	3.	61	6	699	4	770
		7.9	0.8	90.8	0.5	62.2
		51.7	54.5	63.6	44.4	
		4.9	0.5	56.5	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.61036 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0712

AGE BY DEC16

DEC16

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	46	3	449	5	503
		9.1	0.6	89.3	1.0	40.7
		39.0	27.3	40.9	55.6	
		3.7	0.2	36.3	0.4	
35-49	2.	48	6	425	2	481
		10.0	1.2	88.4	0.4	38.9
		40.7	54.5	38.7	22.2	
		3.9	0.5	34.4	0.2	
50-65	3.	24	2	225	2	253
		9.5	0.8	88.9	0.8	20.5
		20.3	18.2	20.5	22.2	
		1.9	0.2	18.2	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.55715 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.8620

SEX BY DECI6

SEX		DECI6 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	66	6	527	5	602
	ROW PCT	11.0	0.7	87.5	0.8	48.7
	COL PCT	55.9	54.4	48.0	55.6	
	TOT PCT	5.3	0.3	42.6	0.4	
FEMALE	2.	52	7	572	4	635
	ROW PCT	8.2	1.1	90.1	0.6	51.3
	COL PCT	44.1	63.6	52.0	44.4	
	TOT PCT	4.2	0.6	46.2	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.55506 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3137

AGE BY DEC16
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC16 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	23	1	190	2	216
		10.6	0.5	88.0	0.9	35.9
		34.8	25.0	36.1	40.0	
		3.8	0.2	31.6	0.3	
35-49	2.	28	3	219	2	252
		11.1	1.2	86.9	0.8	41.9
		42.4	75.0	41.6	40.0	
		4.7	0.5	36.4	0.3	
50-65	3.	15	0	118	1	134
		11.2	0.0	88.1	0.7	22.3
		22.7	0.0	22.4	20.0	
		2.5	0.0	19.6	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	66	4	527	5	602
		11.0	0.7	87.5	0.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.16226 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.9042

AGE BY DECI6
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI6 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	23	2	259	3	287
20-34		8.0	0.7	90.2	1.0	45.2
		44.2	28.6	45.3	75.0	
		3.6	0.3	40.8	0.5	
	2.	20	3	206	0	229
35-49		8.7	1.3	90.0	0.0	36.1
		38.5	42.9	36.0	0.0	
		3.1	0.5	32.4	0.0	
	3.	9	2	107	1	119
50-65		7.6	1.7	89.9	0.8	18.7
		17.3	28.6	18.7	25.0	
		1.4	0.3	16.9	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	52	7	572	4	635
		8.2	1.1	90.1	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.34320 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.7647

LEVEL BY DEC16

LEVEL		DEC16 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	22	2	251	0	275
		8.0	0.7	91.3	0.0	22.2
		18.6	18.2	22.8	0.0	
		1.8	0.2	20.3	0.0	
INTERMED	2.	44	2	342	2	390
		11.3	0.5	87.7	0.5	31.5
		37.3	18.2	31.1	22.2	
		3.6	0.2	27.6	0.2	
JUNHIGH	3.	27	2	260	3	292
		9.2	0.7	89.0	1.0	23.6
		22.9	18.2	23.7	33.3	
		2.2	0.2	21.0	0.2	
SENHIGH	4.	25	5	246	4	280
		8.9	1.8	87.9	1.4	22.6
		21.2	45.5	22.4	44.4	
		2.0	0.4	19.9	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.20337 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3343

EXPER BY DECIL

EXPER		DECIL 1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	25	1	240	3	269
		9.3	0.4	89.2	1.1	21.7
		21.2	9.1	21.8	33.3	
		2.0	0.1	19.4	0.2	
6-15	2.	46	8	485	4	543
		8.5	1.5	89.3	0.7	43.9
		39.0	72.7	44.1	44.4	
		3.7	0.6	39.2	0.3	
15PLUS	3.	47	2	374	2	425
		11.1	0.5	88.0	0.5	34.4
		39.8	18.2	34.0	22.2	
		3.8	0.2	30.2	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.41970 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3779

EDUC BY DECI6

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI6 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	15	1	231	1	248
		6.0	0.4	93.1	0.4	20.0
		12.7	9.1	21.0	11.1	
		1.2	0.1	18.7	0.1	
4OR5	2.	77	8	653	7	745
		10.3	1.1	87.7	0.9	60.2
		65.3	72.7	59.4	77.8	
		6.2	0.6	52.8	0.6	
6OR MORE	3.	26	2	215	1	244
		10.7	0.8	88.1	0.4	19.7
		22.0	18.2	19.6	11.1	
		2.1	0.2	17.4	0.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	118	11	1099	9	1237
		9.5	0.9	88.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.74755 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3448

SATISDEX BY DECIT

* *

SATISDEX		DECIT 1.	DECIT 2.	DECIT 3.	DECIT 4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	14	53	20	22	109
		12.8	48.6	18.3	20.2	8.8
		13.7	6.7	11.0	13.2	
		1.1	4.3	1.6	1.8	
MODERATE	2.	40	215	55	48	358
		11.2	60.1	15.4	13.4	28.9
		39.2	27.4	30.2	28.7	
		3.2	17.4	4.4	3.9	
HIGH	3.	48	518	107	97	770
		6.2	67.3	13.9	12.6	62.2
		47.1	65.9	58.8	58.1	
		3.9	41.9	8.6	7.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		102	786	182	167	1237
		8.2	63.5	14.7	13.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.98969 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0012

SEX BY DEC17

* *

SEX	DEC17 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	48	372	97	85	602
		8.0	61.8	16.1	14.1	48.7
		47.1	47.3	53.3	50.9	
		3.9	30.1	7.8	6.9	
FEMALE	2.	54	414	85	82	635
		8.5	65.2	13.4	12.9	51.3
		52.9	52.7	46.7	49.1	
		4.4	33.5	6.9	6.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	102	786	182	167	1237
		8.2	63.5	14.7	13.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.56378 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4639

AGE BY DEC17

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC17 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	40 8.0 39.2 3.2	334 66.4 42.5 27.0	63 12.5 34.6 5.1	66 13.1 39.5 5.3	503 40.7
35-49	2.	38 7.9 37.3 3.1	320 66.5 40.7 25.9	63 13.1 34.6 5.1	60 12.5 35.9 4.9	481 38.9
50-65	3.	24 9.5 23.5 1.9	132 52.2 16.8 10.7	56 22.1 30.8 4.5	41 16.2 24.6 3.3	253 20.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	102 8.2	786 63.5	182 14.7	167 13.5	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.82324 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0020

AGE BY DECI7
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI7 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	18	139	28	31	216
		8.3	64.4	13.0	14.4	35.9
		37.5	37.4	28.9	36.5	
		3.0	23.1	4.7	5.1	
35-49	2.	17	167	34	34	252
		6.7	66.3	13.5	13.5	41.9
		35.4	44.9	35.1	40.0	
		2.8	27.7	5.6	5.6	
50-65	3.	13	66	35	20	134
		9.7	49.3	26.1	14.9	22.3
		27.1	17.7	36.1	23.5	
		2.2	11.0	5.8	3.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	48	372	97	85	602
		8.0	61.8	16.1	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.34047 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0120

AGE   BY OEC17
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX   VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	OEC17: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	22 7.7 40.7 3.5	195 67.9 47.1 30.7	35 12.2 41.2 5.5	35 12.2 42.7 5.5	287 45.2
35-49	2.	21 9.2 38.9 3.3	153 66.8 37.0 24.1	29 12.7 34.1 4.6	26 11.4 31.7 4.1	229 36.1
50-65	3.	11 9.2 20.4 1.7	66 55.5 15.9 10.4	21 17.6 24.7 3.3	21 17.6 25.6 3.3	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	54 8.5	414 65.2	85 13.4	82 12.9	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.20538 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3023

LEVEL BY DEC17

* *

LEVEL	DEC17: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	19	195	26	35	275
		6.9	70.9	9.5	12.7	22.2
		18.6	24.8	14.3	21.0	
		1.5	15.8	2.1	2.8	
INTERMED	2.	31	252	73	34	390
		7.9	64.6	18.7	8.7	31.5
		30.4	32.1	40.1	20.4	
		2.5	20.4	5.9	2.7	
JUNHIGH	3.	26	175	42	49	292
		8.9	59.9	14.4	16.8	23.6
		25.5	22.3	23.1	29.3	
		2.1	14.1	3.4	4.0	
SENHIGH	4.	26	164	41	49	280
		9.3	58.6	14.6	17.5	22.6
		25.5	20.9	22.5	29.3	
		2.1	13.3	3.3	4.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		102	786	182	167	1237
		8.2	63.5	14.7	13.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 27.08235 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

EXPER BY DECI7

* *

EXPER	DECI7 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	19 7.1 18.6 1.5	173 64.3 22.0 14.0	38 14.1 20.9 3.1	39 14.5 23.4 3.2	269 21.7
6-15	2.	45 8.3 44.1 3.6	368 67.8 46.8 29.7	55 10.1 30.2 4.4	75 13.8 44.9 6.1	543 43.9
15PLUS	3.	38 8.9 37.3 3.1	245 57.6 31.2 19.8	89 20.9 48.9 7.2	53 12.5 31.7 4.3	425 34.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	102 8.2	786 63.5	182 14.7	167 13.5	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.17935 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

EDUC BY DECI7

* *

EDUC	DECI7 — COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	23 9.3 22.5 1.9	163 65.7 20.7 13.2	33 13.3 18.1 2.7	29 11.7 17.4 2.3	248 20.0
4ORS	2.	54 7.2 52.9 4.4	480 64.4 61.1 38.8	105 14.1 57.7 8.5	106 14.2 63.5 8.6	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	25 10.2 24.5 2.0	143 58.6 18.2 11.6	44 18.0 24.2 3.6	32 13.1 19.2 2.6	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	102 8.2	786 63.5	182 14.7	167 13.5	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.88878 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3313

SATISDEX BY DEC18

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC18 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	49 45.0 12.9 4.0	27 24.8 5.7 2.2	24 22.0 8.1 1.9	9 8.3 10.5 0.7	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	127 35.5 33.3 10.3	129 36.0 27.3 10.4	78 21.8 26.2 6.3	24 6.7 27.9 1.9	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	205 26.6 53.8 16.6	316 41.0 66.9 25.5	196 25.5 65.8 15.8	53 6.9 61.6 4.3	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	381 30.8	472 38.2	298 24.1	86 7.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.09003 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0008

AGE * BY DEC18

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC18 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	167	189	117	30	503
		33.2	37.6	23.3	6.0	40.7
		43.8	40.0	39.3	34.9	
		13.5	15.3	9.5	2.4	
35-49	2.	144	193	110	34	481
		29.9	40.1	22.9	7.1	38.9
		37.8	40.9	36.9	39.5	
		11.6	15.6	8.9	2.7	
50-65	3.	70	90	71	22	253
		27.7	35.6	28.1	8.7	20.5
		18.4	19.1	23.8	25.6	
		5.7	7.3	5.7	1.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	381	472	298	86	1237
		30.8	38.2	24.1	7.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.75970 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3436

SEX BY DEC18

* *

SEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC18 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	169 / 28.1 / 44.4 / 13.7	248 / 41.2 / 52.5 / 20.0	144 / 23.9 / 48.3 / 11.6	41 / 6.8 / 47.7 / 3.3	602 / 48.7
FEMALE	2.	212 / 33.4 / 55.6 / 17.1	224 / 35.3 / 47.5 / 18.1	154 / 24.3 / 51.7 / 12.4	45 / 7.1 / 52.3 / 3.6	635 / 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	381 / 30.8	472 / 38.2	298 / 24.1	86 / 7.0	1237 / 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.71868 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1261

AGE BY DECI8
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE (DECI8: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)		1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	60	88	55	13	216
		27.8	40.7	25.5	6.0	35.9
		35.5	35.5	38.2	31.7	
		10.0	14.6	9.1	2.2	
35-49	2.	77	105	53	17	252
		30.6	41.7	21.0	6.7	41.9
		45.6	42.3	36.8	41.5	
		12.8	17.4	8.8	2.8	
50-65	3.	32	55	36	11	134
		23.9	41.0	26.9	8.2	22.3
		18.9	22.2	25.0	26.8	
		5.3	9.1	6.0	1.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	169	248	144	41	602
		28.1	41.2	23.9	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.58920 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.7321

AGE BY DECIB
CONTROLLING FOR.. SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

AGE		DECIB 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT	107	101	62	17	287
20-34	ROW PCT	37.3	35.2	21.6	5.9	45.2
	COL PCT	50.5	45.1	40.3	37.8	
	TOT PCT	16.9	15.9	9.8	2.7	
	COUNT	67	88	57	17	229
35-49	ROW PCT	29.3	38.4	24.9	7.4	36.1
	COL PCT	31.6	39.3	37.0	37.8	
	TOT PCT	10.6	13.9	9.0	2.7	
	COUNT	38	35	35	11	119
50-65	ROW PCT	31.9	29.4	29.4	9.2	18.7
	COL PCT	17.9	15.6	22.7	24.4	
	TOT PCT	6.0	5.5	5.5	1.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		212	224	154	45	635
		33.4	35.3	24.3	7.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.89643 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2458

LEVEL BY DECIB

LEVEL		DECIB 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW PCT					
	COL PCT					
	TOT PCT					
PRIMARY	1.	96	107	50	22	275
		34.9	38.9	18.2	8.0	22.2
		25.2	22.7	16.8	25.6	
		7.8	8.6	4.0	1.8	
INTERMED	2.	99	196	64	29	390
		25.4	50.3	16.4	7.4	31.5
		26.0	41.9	21.5	33.7	
		8.0	16.0	5.2	2.3	
JUNHIGH	3.	90	94	90	18	292
		30.8	32.2	30.8	6.2	23.6
		23.6	19.9	30.2	20.9	
		7.3	7.6	7.3	1.5	
SENHIGH	4.	96	73	94	17	280
		34.3	26.1	33.6	6.1	22.6
		25.2	15.5	31.5	19.8	
		7.8	5.9	7.6	1.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	381	472	298	86	1237
		30.8	38.2	24.1	7.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 66.67874 with 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

EXPER BY DECI8

* *

EXPER		COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI8 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	COUNT	93	102	63	11	269
		ROW PCT	34.6	37.9	23.4	4.1	21.7
		COL PCT	24.4	21.6	21.1	12.8	
		TOT PCT	7.5	8.2	5.1	0.9	
6-15	2.	COUNT	175	194	134	40	543
		ROW PCT	32.2	35.7	24.7	7.4	43.9
		COL PCT	45.9	41.1	45.0	46.5	
		TOT PCT	14.1	15.7	10.8	3.2	
15PLUS	3.	COUNT	113	176	101	35	425
		ROW PCT	26.6	41.4	23.8	8.2	34.4
		COL PCT	29.7	37.3	33.9	40.7	
		TOT PCT	9.1	14.2	8.2	2.8	
		COLUMN TOTAL	381	472	298	86	1237
			30.8	38.2	24.1	7.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.53287 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1039

EDUC BY DECI8

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI8 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	77	80	68	23	248
		31.0	32.3	27.4	9.3	20.0
		20.2	16.9	22.8	26.7	
		6.2	6.5	5.5	1.9	
4ORS	2.	244	279	174	48	745
		32.8	37.4	23.4	6.4	60.2
		64.0	59.1	58.4	55.8	
		19.7	22.6	14.1	3.9	
6OR MORE	3.	60	113	56	15	244
		24.6	46.3	23.0	6.1	19.7
		15.7	23.9	18.8	17.4	
		4.9	9.1	4.5	1.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	381	472	298	86	1237
		30.8	38.2	24.1	7.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.46041 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0249

SATISDEX BY DEC19

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	26	1	82	0	109
		23.9	0.9	75.2	0.0	8.8
		14.3	6.7	7.9	0.0	
		2.1	0.1	6.6	0.0	
MODERATE	2.	65	3	289	1	358
		18.2	0.8	80.7	0.3	28.9
		35.7	20.0	27.9	33.3	
		5.3	0.2	23.4	0.1	
HIGH	3.	91	11	666	2	770
		11.8	1.4	86.5	0.3	62.2
		50.0	73.3	64.2	66.7	
		7.4	0.9	53.8	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.56729 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0110

SEX BY DEC19

* *

SEX	DEC19 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	100	12	489	1	602
		16.6	2.0	81.2	0.2	48.7
		54.9	80.0	47.2	33.3	
		8.1	1.0	39.5	0.1	
FEMALE	2.	82	3	548	2	635
		12.9	0.5	86.3	0.3	51.3
		45.1	20.0	52.8	66.7	
		6.6	0.2	44.3	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.99712 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0186

AGE BY DECI9

AGE		DECI9 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	72	3	425	3	503
		14.3	0.6	84.5	0.6	40.7
		39.6	20.0	41.0	100.0	
		5.8	0.2	34.4	0.2	
35-49	2.	83	9	389	0	481
		17.3	1.9	80.9	0.0	38.9
		45.6	60.0	37.5	0.0	
		6.7	0.7	31.4	0.0	
50-65	3.	27	3	223	0	253
		10.7	1.2	88.1	0.0	20.5
		14.8	20.0	21.5	0.0	
		2.2	0.2	18.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.73958 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0327

AGE BY DEC19
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE (COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)	DEC19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. 20-34	35	2	178	1	216
	16.2	0.9	82.4	0.5	35.9
	35.0	16.7	36.4	100.0	
	5.8	0.3	29.6	0.2	
2. 35-49	50	7	195	0	252
	19.8	2.8	77.4	0.0	41.9
	50.0	58.3	39.9	0.0	
	8.3	1.2	32.4	0.0	
3. 50-65	15	3	116	0	134
	11.2	2.2	86.6	0.0	22.3
	15.0	25.0	23.7	0.0	
	2.5	0.5	19.3	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL	100	12	489	1	602
	16.6	2.0	81.2	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.77809 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1864

AGE BY DEC19
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	37	1	247	2	287
		12.9	0.3	86.1	0.7	45.2
		45.1	33.3	45.1	100.0	
		5.8	0.2	38.9	0.3	
35-49	2.	33	2	194	0	229
		14.4	0.9	84.7	0.0	36.1
		40.2	66.7	35.4	0.0	
		5.2	0.3	30.6	0.0	
50-65	3.	12	0	107	0	119
		10.1	0.0	89.9	0.0	18.7
		14.6	0.0	19.5	0.0	
		1.9	0.0	16.9	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	82	3	548	2	635
		12.9	0.5	86.3	0.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.24383 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.5129

LEVEL BY DEC19

* *

LEVEL	DEC19 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	36	2	237	0	275
		13.1	0.7	86.2	0.0	22.2
		19.8	13.3	22.9	0.0	
		2.9	0.2	19.2	0.0	
INTERMED	2.	65	8	317	0	390
		16.7	2.1	81.3	0.0	31.5
		35.7	53.3	30.6	0.0	
		5.3	0.6	25.6	0.0	
JUNHIGH	3.	41	3	247	1	292
		14.0	1.0	84.6	0.3	23.6
		22.5	20.0	23.8	33.3	
		3.3	0.2	20.0	0.1	
SENHIGH	4.	40	2	236	2	280
		14.3	0.7	84.3	0.7	22.6
		22.0	13.3	22.8	66.7	
		3.2	0.2	19.1	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.89327 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3592

EXPER BY DEC19

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	40	1	227	1	269
		14.9	0.4	84.4	0.4	21.7
		22.0	6.7	21.9	33.3	
		3.2	0.1	18.4	0.1	
6-15	2.	80	4	457	2	543
		14.7	0.7	84.2	0.4	43.9
		44.0	26.7	44.1	66.7	
		6.5	0.3	36.9	0.2	
15PLUS	3.	62	10	353	0	425
		14.6	2.4	83.1	0.0	34.4
		34.1	66.7	34.0	0.0	
		5.0	0.8	28.5	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.76710 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1871

EDUC BY DECI9

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI9 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
8UR LESS	1.	22	2	224	0	248
		8.9	0.8	90.3	0.0	20.0
		12.1	13.3	21.6	0.0	
		1.8	0.2	18.1	0.0	
4UR5	2.	119	2	622	2	745
		16.0	0.3	83.5	0.3	60.2
		65.4	13.3	60.0	66.7	
		9.6	0.2	50.3	0.2	
6UR MURE	3.	41	11	191	1	244
		16.8	4.5	78.3	0.4	19.7
		22.5	73.3	18.4	33.3	
		3.3	0.9	15.4	0.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	182	15	1037	3	1237
		14.7	1.2	83.8	0.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 38.00769 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI10

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI10 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	28	41	30	10	109
		25.7	37.6	27.5	9.2	8.8
		12.5	6.9	9.4	9.8	
		2.3	3.3	2.4	0.8	
MODERATE	2.	70	169	90	29	358
		19.6	47.2	25.1	8.1	28.9
		31.3	28.5	28.3	28.4	
		5.7	13.7	7.3	2.3	
HIGH	3.	126	383	198	63	770
		16.4	49.7	25.7	8.2	62.2
		56.3	64.6	62.3	61.8	
		10.2	31.0	16.0	5.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	224	593	318	102	1237
		18.1	47.9	25.7	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.46169 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2062

SEX BY DECI10

* *

SEX	DECI10 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	96 15.9 42.9 7.8	290 48.2 48.9 23.4	168 27.9 52.8 13.6	48 8.0 47.1 3.9	602 48.7
FEMALE	2.	128 20.2 57.1 10.3	303 47.7 51.1 24.5	150 23.6 47.2 12.1	54 8.5 52.9 4.4	635 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	224 18.1	593 47.9	318 25.7	102 8.2	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.35168 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1478

AGE BY DEC110

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC110 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	93	256	110	42	503
		18.5	51.3	21.9	8.3	40.7
		41.5	43.5	34.6	41.2	
		7.5	20.9	8.9	3.4	
35-49	2.	92	237	113	39	481
		19.1	49.3	23.5	8.1	38.9
		41.1	40.0	35.5	38.2	
		7.4	19.2	9.1	3.2	
50-65	3.	39	98	95	21	253
		15.4	38.7	37.5	8.3	20.5
		17.4	16.5	29.9	20.6	
		3.2	7.9	7.7	1.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	224	593	318	102	1237
		18.1	47.9	25.7	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.77861 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

AGE BY DECI10
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI10 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	38 17.6 39.6 6.3	108 50.0 37.2 17.9	53 24.5 31.5 8.8	17 7.9 35.4 2.8	216 35.9
35-49	2.	43 17.1 44.8 7.1	132 52.4 45.5 21.9	57 22.6 33.9 9.5	20 7.9 41.7 3.3	252 41.9
50-65	3.	15 11.2 15.6 2.5	50 37.3 17.2 8.3	58 43.3 34.5 9.6	11 8.2 22.9 1.8	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	96 15.9	290 48.2	168 27.9	48 8.0	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.58807 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

AGE BY DECI10

CONTROLLING FOR..

SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI10 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	55 19.2 43.0 8.7	150 52.3 49.5 23.6	57 19.9 38.0 9.0	25 8.7 46.3 3.9	287 45.2
35-49	2.	49 21.4 38.3 7.7	105 45.9 34.7 16.5	56 24.5 37.3 8.8	19 8.3 35.2 3.0	229 36.1
50-65	3.	24 20.2 18.8 3.8	48 40.3 15.8 7.6	37 31.1 24.7 5.8	10 8.4 18.5 1.6	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	128 20.2	303 47.7	150 23.6	54 8.5	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.70970 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2602

LEVEL BY DECILE

LEVEL		DECILE 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	50	155	47	23	275
		18.2	56.4	17.1	8.4	22.2
		22.3	26.1	14.8	22.5	
		4.0	12.5	3.8	1.9	
INTERMED	2.	57	201	109	23	390
		14.6	51.5	27.9	5.9	31.5
		25.4	33.9	34.3	22.5	
		4.6	16.2	8.8	1.9	
JUNHIGH	3.	60	119	91	22	292
		20.5	40.8	31.2	7.5	23.6
		26.8	20.1	28.6	21.6	
		4.9	9.6	7.4	1.8	
SENHIGH	4.	57	118	71	34	280
		20.4	42.1	25.4	12.1	22.6
		25.4	19.9	22.3	33.3	
		4.6	9.5	5.7	2.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	224	593	318	102	1237
		18.1	47.9	25.7	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 34.65216 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

EXPER BY DECILO

* *

EXPER		DECILO 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	54	124	69	22	269
		20.1	46.1	25.7	8.2	21.7
		24.1	20.9	21.7	21.6	
		4.4	10.0	5.6	1.8	
6-15	2.	93	283	119	48	543
		17.1	52.1	21.9	8.8	43.9
		41.5	47.7	37.4	47.1	
		7.5	22.9	9.6	3.9	
15PLUS	3.	77	186	130	32	425
		18.1	43.8	30.6	7.5	34.4
		34.4	31.4	40.9	31.4	
		6.2	15.0	10.5	2.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		224	593	318	102	1237
		18.1	47.9	25.7	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.05073 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0608

EDUC BY DECILE

EDUC		DECILE 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	59	111	58	20	248
30K LESS		23.8	44.8	23.4	8.1	20.0
		26.3	18.7	18.2	19.6	
		4.8	9.0	4.7	1.6	
	2.	121	375	190	59	745
40RS		16.2	50.3	25.5	7.9	60.2
		54.0	63.2	59.7	57.8	
		9.8	30.3	15.4	4.8	
	3.	44	107	70	23	244
60K MORE		18.0	43.9	28.7	9.4	19.7
		19.6	18.0	22.0	22.5	
		3.6	8.6	5.7	1.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	224	593	318	102	1237
		18.1	47.9	25.7	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.01538 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1240

SATISDEX BY DEC111

* *

SATISDEX	DEC111 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	52 47.7 12.0 4.2	31 28.4 7.2 2.5	21 19.3 7.3 1.7	5 4.6 6.0 0.4	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	156 43.6 35.9 12.6	110 30.7 25.5 8.9	76 21.2 26.4 6.1	16 4.5 19.3 1.3	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	226 29.4 52.1 18.3	291 37.8 67.4 23.5	191 24.8 66.3 15.4	62 8.1 74.7 5.0	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	434 35.1	432 34.9	288 23.3	83 6.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 32.10161 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

AGE BY DECI11

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI11 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	190 37.8 43.8 15.4	173 34.4 40.0 14.0	114 22.7 39.6 9.2	26 5.2 31.3 2.1	503 40.7
35-49	2.	163 33.9 37.6 13.2	177 36.8 41.0 14.3	102 21.2 35.4 8.2	39 8.1 47.0 3.2	481 38.9
50-65	3.	81 32.0 18.7 6.5	82 32.4 19.0 6.6	72 28.5 25.0 5.8	18 7.1 21.7 1.5	253 20.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	434 35.1	432 34.9	288 23.3	83 6.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.02191 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1237

SEX BY DECI11

* *

SEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI11 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	194	241	123	44	602
		32.2	40.0	20.4	7.3	48.7
		44.7	55.8	42.7	53.0	
		15.7	19.5	9.9	3.6	
FEMALE	2.	240	191	165	39	635
		37.8	30.1	26.0	6.1	51.3
		55.3	44.2	57.3	47.0	
		19.4	15.4	13.3	3.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	434	432	288	83	1237
		35.1	34.9	23.3	6.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.21999 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010

AGE BY DECI11
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DECI11 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	75 34.7 38.7 12.5	81 37.5 33.6 13.5	46 21.3 37.4 7.6	14 6.5 31.8 2.3	216 35.9
35-49	2.	82 32.5 42.3 13.6	103 40.9 42.7 17.1	48 19.0 39.0 8.0	19 7.5 43.2 3.2	252 41.9
50-65	3.	37 27.6 19.1 6.1	57 42.5 23.7 9.5	29 21.6 23.6 4.8	11 8.2 25.0 1.8	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	194 32.2	241 40.0	123 20.4	44 7.3	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.69166 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.8464

AGE BY DECI11
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECI11: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	115 40.1 47.9 18.1	92 32.1 48.2 14.5	68 23.7 41.2 10.7	12 4.2 30.8 1.9	287 45.2
35-49	2.	81 35.4 33.8 12.8	74 32.3 38.7 11.7	54 23.6 32.7 8.5	20 8.7 51.3 3.1	229 36.1
50-65	3.	44 37.0 18.3 6.9	25 21.0 13.1 3.9	43 36.1 26.1 6.8	7 5.9 17.9 1.1	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	240 37.8	191 30.1	165 26.0	39 6.1	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.89948 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0211

LEVEL BY DECI11

* *

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI11 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	95	93	65	22	275
		34.5	33.8	23.6	8.0	22.2
		21.9	21.5	22.6	26.5	
		7.7	7.5	5.3	1.8	
INTERMED	2.	130	164	75	21	390
		33.3	42.1	19.2	5.4	31.5
		30.0	38.0	26.0	25.3	
		10.5	13.3	6.1	1.7	
JUNHIGH	3.	113	91	68	20	292
		38.7	31.2	23.3	6.8	23.6
		26.0	21.1	23.6	24.1	
		9.1	7.4	5.5	1.6	
SENHIGH	4.	96	84	80	20	280
		34.3	30.0	28.6	7.1	22.6
		22.1	19.4	27.8	24.1	
		7.8	6.8	6.5	1.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	434	432	288	83	1237
		35.1	34.9	23.3	6.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.31506 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0317

EXPER BY DEC111

EXPER		DEC111 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	102	92	63	12	269
		37.9	34.2	23.4	4.5	21.7
		23.5	21.3	21.9	14.5	
		8.2	7.4	5.1	1.0	
6-15	2.	196	184	124	39	543
		36.1	33.9	22.8	7.2	43.9
		45.2	42.6	43.1	47.0	
		15.8	14.9	10.0	3.2	
15PLUS	3.	136	156	101	32	425
		32.0	36.7	23.8	7.5	34.4
		31.3	36.1	35.1	38.6	
		11.0	12.6	8.2	2.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		434	432	288	83	1237
		35.1	34.9	23.3	6.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.24548 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.5127

EDUC BY DEC111

* *

EDUC	DEC111 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	92 37.1 21.2 7.4	62 25.0 14.4 5.0	76 30.6 26.4 6.1	18 7.3 21.7 1.5	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	266 35.7 61.3 21.5	267 35.8 61.8 21.6	164 22.0 56.9 13.3	48 6.4 57.8 3.9	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	76 31.1 17.5 6.1	103 42.2 23.8 8.3	48 19.7 16.7 3.9	17 7.0 20.5 1.4	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	434 35.1	432 34.9	288 23.3	83 6.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.20026 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0026

SATISDEX BY DECI12

* *

SATISDEX	DECI12 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	29 26.6 12.2 2.3	2 1.8 13.3 0.2	78 71.6 8.0 6.3	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	83 23.2 35.0 6.7	2 0.6 13.3 0.2	270 75.4 27.7 21.8	3 0.8 33.3 0.2	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	125 16.2 52.7 10.1	11 1.4 73.3 0.9	628 81.6 64.3 50.8	6 0.8 66.7 0.5	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	237 19.2	15 1.2	976 78.9	9 0.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.39329 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0255

[illegible]

AGE BY DECI12

DECI12

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	88	3	409	3	503
		17.5	0.6	81.3	0.6	40.7
		37.1	20.0	41.9	33.3	
		7.1	0.2	33.1	0.2	
35-49	2.	106	10	362	3	481
		22.0	2.1	75.3	0.6	38.9
		44.7	66.7	37.1	33.3	
		8.6	0.8	29.3	0.2	
50-65	3.	43	2	205	3	253
		17.0	0.8	81.0	1.2	20.5
		18.1	13.3	21.0	33.3	
		3.5	0.2	16.6	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	237	15	976	9	1237
		19.2	1.2	78.9	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.59313 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1018

SEX BY DECI12

* *

SEX	DECI12 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	138 22.9 58.2 11.2	11 1.8 73.3 0.9	448 74.4 45.9 36.2	5 0.8 55.6 0.4	602 48.7
FEMALE	2.	99 15.6 41.8 8.0	4 0.6 26.7 0.3	528 83.1 54.1 42.7	4 0.6 44.4 0.3	635 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	237 19.2	15 1.2	976 78.9	9 0.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.48351 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

AGE BY DEC112
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DEC112 (COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	47 21.8 34.1 7.8	2 0.9 18.2 0.3	166 76.9 37.1 27.6	1 0.5 20.0 0.2	216 35.9
35-49	2.	61 24.2 44.2 10.1	7 2.8 63.6 1.2	182 72.2 40.6 30.2	2 0.8 40.0 0.3	252 41.9
50-65	3.	30 22.4 21.7 5.0	2 1.5 18.2 0.3	100 74.6 22.3 16.6	2 1.5 40.0 0.3	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	138 22.9	11 1.8	448 74.4	5 0.8	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.01245 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6750

AGE   BY DECI12
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX   VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI12 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	41	1	243	2	287
		14.3	0.3	84.7	0.7	45.2
		41.4	25.0	46.0	50.0	
		6.5	0.2	38.3	0.3	
35-49	2.	45	3	180	1	229
		19.7	1.3	78.6	0.4	36.1
		45.5	75.0	34.1	25.0	
		7.1	0.5	28.3	0.2	
50-65	3.	13	0	105	1	119
		10.9	0.0	88.2	0.8	18.7
		13.1	0.0	19.9	25.0	
		2.0	0.0	16.5	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	99	4	528	4	635
		15.6	0.6	83.1	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.44790 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2071

LEVEL BY DECI12

* *

LEVEL	DECI12: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	44	1	230	0	275
		16.0	0.4	83.6	0.0	22.2
		18.6	6.7	23.6	0.0	
		3.6	0.1	18.6	0.0	
INTERMED	2.	78	10	301	1	390
		20.0	2.6	77.2	0.3	31.5
		32.9	66.7	30.8	11.1	
		6.3	0.8	24.3	0.1	
JUNHIGH	3.	60	2	226	4	292
		20.5	0.7	77.4	1.4	23.6
		25.3	13.3	23.2	44.4	
		4.9	0.2	18.3	0.3	
SENHIGH	4.	55	2	219	4	280
		19.6	0.7	78.2	1.4	22.6
		23.2	13.3	22.4	44.4	
		4.4	0.2	17.7	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	237	15	976	9	1237
		19.2	1.2	78.9	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.42354 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0306

EXPER BY DEC112

DEC112

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	37	1	229	2	269
		13.8	0.4	85.1	0.7	21.7
		15.6	6.7	23.5	22.2	
		3.0	0.1	18.5	0.2	
6-15	2.	124	5	410	4	543
		22.8	0.9	75.5	0.7	43.9
		52.3	33.3	42.0	44.4	
		10.0	0.4	33.1	0.3	
15PLUS	3.	76	9	337	3	425
		17.9	2.1	79.3	0.7	34.4
		32.1	60.0	34.5	33.3	
		6.1	0.7	27.2	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	237	15	976	9	1237
		19.2	1.2	78.9	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.24338 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0184

EDUC BY DECI12

* *

EDUC	DECI12 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. 3OR LESS		29 11.7 12.2 2.3	2 0.8 13.3 0.2	215 86.7 22.0 17.4	2 0.8 22.2 0.2	248 20.0
2. 4ORS		145 19.5 61.2 11.7	3 0.4 20.0 0.2	593 79.6 60.8 47.9	4 0.5 44.4 0.3	745 60.2
3. 6OR MORE		63 25.8 26.6 5.1	10 4.1 66.7 0.8	168 68.9 17.2 13.6	3 1.2 33.3 0.2	244 19.7
COLUMN TOTAL		237 19.2	15 1.2	976 78.9	9 0.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 40.33960 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI13

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI13 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW	COUNT	32	39	27	11	109
	ROW PCT	29.4	35.8	24.8	10.1	8.8
	COL PCT	13.9	6.9	8.1	10.5	
	TOT PCT	2.6	3.2	2.2	0.9	
2. MODERATE	COUNT	68	164	89	37	358
	ROW PCT	19.0	45.8	24.9	10.3	28.9
	COL PCT	29.6	28.8	26.7	35.2	
	TOT PCT	5.5	13.3	7.2	3.0	
3. HIGH	COUNT	130	366	217	57	770
	ROW PCT	16.9	47.5	28.2	7.4	62.2
	COL PCT	56.5	64.3	65.2	54.3	
	TOT PCT	10.5	29.6	17.5	4.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		230	569	333	105	1237
		18.6	46.0	26.9	8.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.95087 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0206

SEX BY DECILS

SEX		DECILS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	103	291	158	50	602
		17.1	48.3	26.2	8.3	48.7
		44.8	51.1	47.4	47.6	
		8.3	23.5	12.8	4.0	
FEMALE	2.	127	278	175	55	635
		20.0	43.8	27.6	8.7	51.3
		55.2	48.9	52.6	52.4	
		10.3	22.5	14.1	4.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	230	569	333	105	1237
		18.6	46.0	26.9	8.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.02912 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3872

AGE BY DEC113

* *

AGE	DEC113 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	102	243	119	39	503
		20.3	48.3	23.7	7.8	40.7
		44.3	42.7	35.7	37.1	
		8.2	19.6	9.6	3.2	
35-49	2.	83	231	121	46	481
		17.3	48.0	25.2	9.6	38.9
		36.1	40.6	36.3	43.8	
		6.7	18.7	9.8	3.7	
50-65	3.	45	95	93	20	253
		17.8	37.5	36.8	7.9	20.5
		19.6	16.7	27.9	19.0	
		3.6	7.7	7.5	1.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	230	569	333	105	1237
		18.6	46.0	26.9	8.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.97801 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0042

AGE BY DEC113
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC113 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	40 18.5 38.8 6.6	108 50.0 37.1 17.9	52 24.1 32.9 8.6	16 7.4 32.0 2.7	216 35.9
35-49	2.	39 15.5 37.9 6.5	133 52.8 45.7 22.1	55 21.8 34.8 9.1	25 9.9 50.0 4.2	252 41.9
50-65	3.	24 17.9 23.3 4.0	50 37.3 17.2 8.3	51 38.1 32.3 8.5	9 6.7 18.0 1.5	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	103 17.1	291 48.3	158 26.2	50 8.3	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.01274 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0137

AGE BY DECI13
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECI13 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	62 21.6 48.8 9.8	135 47.0 48.6 21.3	67 23.3 38.3 10.6	23 8.0 41.8 3.6	287 45.2
35-49	2.	44 19.2 34.6 6.9	98 42.8 35.3 15.4	66 28.8 37.7 10.4	21 9.2 38.2 3.3	229 36.1
50-65	3.	21 17.6 16.5 3.3	45 37.8 16.2 7.1	42 35.3 24.0 6.6	11 9.2 20.0 1.7	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	127 20.0	278 43.8	175 27.6	55 8.7	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.30185 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2938

LEVEL BY DEC113

DEC113

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. PRIMARY		64	130	58	23	275
		23.3	47.3	21.1	8.4	22.2
		27.8	22.8	17.4	21.9	
		5.2	10.5	4.7	1.9	
2. INTERMED		73	166	125	26	390
		18.7	42.6	32.1	6.7	31.5
		31.7	29.2	37.5	24.8	
		5.9	13.4	10.1	2.1	
3. JUNHIGH		51	140	77	24	292
		17.5	47.9	26.4	8.2	23.6
		22.2	24.6	23.1	22.9	
		4.1	11.3	6.2	1.9	
4. SENHIGH		42	133	73	32	280
		15.0	47.5	26.1	11.4	22.6
		18.3	23.4	21.9	30.5	
		3.4	10.8	5.9	2.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		230	569	333	105	1237
		18.6	46.0	26.9	8.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.66052 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0282

EXPER BY DECI13

EXPER		DECI13 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	49	127	72	21	269
		18.2	47.2	26.8	7.8	21.7
		21.3	22.3	21.6	20.0	
		4.0	10.3	5.8	1.7	
6-15	2.	102	263	127	51	543
		18.8	48.4	23.4	9.4	43.9
		44.3	46.2	38.1	48.6	
		8.2	21.3	10.3	4.1	
15PLUS	3.	79	179	134	33	425
		18.6	42.1	31.5	7.8	34.4
		34.3	31.5	40.2	31.4	
		6.4	14.5	10.8	2.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	230	569	333	105	1237
		18.6	46.0	26.9	8.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.01388 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1728

EDUC BY DECI13

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI13 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	42 16.9 18.3 3.4	111 44.8 19.5 9.0	79 31.9 23.7 6.4	16 6.5 15.2 1.3	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	147 19.7 63.9 11.9	353 47.4 62.0 28.5	179 24.0 53.8 14.5	66 8.9 62.9 5.3	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	41 16.8 17.8 3.3	105 43.0 18.5 8.5	75 30.7 22.5 6.1	23 9.4 21.9 1.9	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	230 18.6	569 46.0	333 26.9	105 8.5	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.63242 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1410

SATISDEX BY DECI14

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI14 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW	COUNT	56	20	29	4	109
	ROW PCT	51.4	18.3	26.6	3.7	8.8
	COL PCT	13.3	5.4	8.0	4.8	
	TOT PCT	4.5	1.6	2.3	0.3	
2. MODERATE	COUNT	136	107	93	22	358
	ROW PCT	38.0	29.9	26.0	6.1	28.9
	COL PCT	32.4	28.8	25.8	26.2	
	TOT PCT	11.0	8.6	7.5	1.8	
3. HIGH	COUNT	228	245	239	58	770
	ROW PCT	29.6	31.8	31.0	7.5	62.2
	COL PCT	54.3	65.9	66.2	69.0	
	TOT PCT	18.4	19.8	19.3	4.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		420	372	361	84	1237
		34.0	30.1	29.2	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.33008 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

AGE BY DECI14

* *

AGE	DECI14 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1. COUNT	177	145	153	28	503
	ROW PCT	35.2	28.8	30.4	5.6	40.7
	COL PCT	42.1	39.0	42.4	33.3	
	TOT PCT	14.3	11.7	12.4	2.3	
35-49	2. COUNT	165	162	121	33	481
	ROW PCT	34.3	33.7	25.2	6.9	38.9
	COL PCT	39.3	43.5	33.5	39.3	
	TOT PCT	13.3	13.1	9.8	2.7	
50-65	3. COUNT	78	65	87	23	253
	ROW PCT	30.8	25.7	34.4	9.1	20.5
	COL PCT	18.6	17.5	24.1	27.4	
	TOT PCT	6.3	5.3	7.0	1.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	420	372	361	84	1237
		34.0	30.1	29.2	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.29412 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0386

SEX BY DEC114

DEC114

SEX		1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	205	210	137	50	602
	ROW PCT	34.1	34.9	22.8	8.3	48.7
	COL PCT	48.8	56.5	38.0	59.5	
	TOT PCT	16.6	17.0	11.1	4.0	
FEMALE	2.	215	162	224	34	635
	ROW PCT	33.9	25.5	35.3	5.4	51.3
	COL PCT	51.2	43.5	62.0	40.5	
	TOT PCT	17.4	13.1	18.1	2.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		420	372	361	84	1237
		34.0	30.1	29.2	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 29.58667 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

```
    AGE                                                                          BY  DECI14
CONTROLLING FOR..
    SEX                                                                          VALUE =          1.  MALE
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
```

AGE	DECI14 (COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	77	63	61	15	216
		35.6	29.2	28.2	6.9	35.9
		37.6	30.0	44.5	30.0	
		12.8	10.5	10.1	2.5	
35-49	2.	87	99	44	22	252
		34.5	39.3	17.5	8.7	41.9
		42.4	47.1	32.1	44.0	
		14.5	16.4	7.3	3.7	
50-65	3.	41	48	32	13	134
		30.6	35.8	23.9	9.7	22.3
		20.0	22.9	23.4	26.0	
		6.8	8.0	5.3	2.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	205	210	137	50	602
		34.1	34.9	22.8	8.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.99121 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0886

AGE BY DEC114
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

DEC114

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	100 34.8 46.5 15.7	82 28.6 50.6 12.9	92 32.1 41.1 14.5	13 4.5 38.2 2.0	287 45.2
35-49	2.	78 34.1 36.3 12.3	63 27.5 38.9 9.9	77 33.6 34.4 12.1	11 4.8 32.4 1.7	229 36.1
50-65	3.	37 31.1 17.2 5.8	17 14.3 10.5 2.7	55 46.2 24.6 8.7	10 8.4 29.4 1.6	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	215 33.9	162 25.5	224 35.3	34 5.4	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.26474 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0183

LEVEL BY DEC114

LEVEL		DEC114 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	94	76	89	16	275
		34.2	27.6	32.4	5.8	22.2
		22.4	20.4	24.7	19.0	
		7.6	6.1	7.2	1.3	
INTERMED	2.	113	142	110	25	390
		29.0	36.4	28.2	6.4	31.5
		26.9	38.2	30.5	29.8	
		9.1	11.5	8.9	2.0	
JUNHIGH	3.	115	71	86	20	292
		39.4	24.3	29.5	6.8	23.6
		27.4	19.1	23.8	23.8	
		9.3	5.7	7.0	1.6	
SENHIGH	4.	98	83	76	23	280
		35.0	29.6	27.1	8.2	22.6
		23.3	22.3	21.1	27.4	
		7.9	6.7	6.1	1.9	
COLUMN TOTAL		420	372	361	84	1237
		34.0	30.1	29.2	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.25650 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0449

EXPER BY DECI14

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI14 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	90 33.5 21.4 7.3	71 26.4 19.1 5.7	95 35.3 26.3 7.7	13 4.8 15.5 1.1	269 21.7
6-15	2.	197 36.3 46.9 15.9	163 30.0 43.8 13.2	153 28.2 42.4 12.4	30 5.5 35.7 2.4	543 43.9
15PLUS	3.	133 31.3 31.7 10.8	138 32.5 37.1 11.2	113 26.6 31.3 9.1	41 9.6 48.8 3.3	425 34.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	420 34.0	372 30.1	361 29.2	84 6.8	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.33607 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0121

EDUC BY DECI14

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI14 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	76	66	88	18	248
		30.6	26.6	35.5	7.3	20.0
		18.1	17.7	24.4	21.4	
		6.1	5.3	7.1	1.5	
4ORS	2.	263	212	221	49	745
		35.3	28.5	29.7	6.6	60.2
		62.6	57.0	61.2	58.3	
		21.3	17.1	17.9	4.0	
6OR MORE	3.	81	94	52	17	244
		33.2	38.5	21.3	7.0	19.7
		19.3	25.3	14.4	20.2	
		6.5	7.6	4.2	1.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	420	372	361	84	1237
		34.0	30.1	29.2	6.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.42429 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0078

SATISDEX BY DECI15

SATISDEX		DECI15 1.	DECI15 2.	DECI15 3.	DECI15 4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	33	4	71	1	109
		30.3	3.7	65.1	0.9	8.8
		11.1	12.5	7.9	11.1	
		2.7	0.3	5.7	0.1	
MODERATE	2.	99	8	246	5	358
		27.7	2.2	68.7	1.4	28.9
		33.4	25.0	27.3	55.6	
		8.0	0.6	19.9	0.4	
HIGH	3.	164	20	583	3	770
		21.3	2.6	75.7	0.4	62.2
		55.4	62.5	64.8	33.3	
		13.3	1.6	47.1	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		296	32	900	9	1237
		23.9	2.6	72.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.86717 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0452

AGE BY DECILS

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECILS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	116	9	374	4	503
		23.1	1.8	74.4	0.8	40.7
		39.2	28.1	41.6	44.4	
		9.4	0.7	30.2	0.3	
35-49	2.	127	17	332	5	481
		26.4	3.5	69.0	1.0	38.9
		42.9	53.1	36.9	55.6	
		10.3	1.4	26.8	0.4	
50-65	3.	53	6	194	0	253
		20.9	2.4	76.7	0.0	20.5
		17.9	18.8	21.6	0.0	
		4.3	0.5	15.7	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	296	32	900	9	1237
		23.9	2.6	72.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.42823 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1509

SEX BY DECI15

* *

SEX (COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)	DECI15 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. MALE	150 24.9 50.7 12.1	25 4.2 78.1 2.0	421 69.9 46.8 34.0	6 1.0 66.7 0.5	602 48.7
2. FEMALE	146 23.0 49.3 11.8	7 1.1 21.9 0.6	479 75.4 53.2 38.7	3 0.5 33.3 0.2	635 51.3
COLUMN TOTAL	296 23.9	32 2.6	900 72.8	9 0.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.04648 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0028

AGE BY DEC115

CONTROLLING FOR..

SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DEC115 (COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	51 23.6 34.0 8.5	4 1.9 16.0 0.7	159 73.6 37.8 26.4	2 0.9 33.3 0.3	216 35.9
35-49	2.	71 28.2 47.3 11.8	15 6.0 60.0 2.5	162 64.3 38.5 26.9	4 1.6 66.7 0.7	252 41.9
50-65	3.	28 20.9 18.7 4.7	6 4.5 24.0 1.0	100 74.6 23.8 16.6	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	150 24.9	25 4.2	421 69.9	6 1.0	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.06136 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0865

AGE BY DECI15
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECI15 → COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	65 22.6 44.5 10.2	5 1.7 71.4 0.8	215 74.9 44.9 33.9	2 0.7 66.7 0.3	287 45.2
35-49	2.	56 24.5 38.4 8.8	2 0.9 28.6 0.3	170 74.2 35.5 26.8	1 0.4 33.3 0.2	229 36.1
50-65	3.	25 21.0 17.1 3.9	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	94 79.0 19.6 14.8	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	146 23.0	7 1.1	479 75.4	3 0.5	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.04575 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6705

LEVEL BY DECI15

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI15 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	72	1	201	1	275
		26.2	0.4	73.1	0.4	22.2
		24.3	3.1	22.3	11.1	
		5.8	0.1	16.2	0.1	
INTERMED	2.	90	17	282	1	390
		23.1	4.4	72.3	0.3	31.5
		30.4	53.1	31.3	11.1	
		7.3	1.4	22.8	0.1	
JUNHIGH	3.	67	7	213	5	292
		22.9	2.4	72.9	1.7	23.6
		22.6	21.9	23.7	55.6	
		5.4	0.6	17.2	0.4	
SENHIGH	4.	67	7	204	2	280
		23.9	2.5	72.9	0.7	22.6
		22.6	21.9	22.7	22.2	
		5.4	0.6	16.5	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	296	32	900	9	1237
		23.9	2.6	72.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.45723 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0579

EXPER BY DECILS

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECILS 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	56	5	207	1	269
		20.8	1.9	77.0	0.4	21.7
		18.9	15.6	23.0	11.1	
		4.5	0.4	16.7	0.1	
6-15	2.	134	12	391	6	543
		24.7	2.2	72.0	1.1	43.9
		45.3	37.5	43.4	66.7	
		10.8	1.0	31.6	0.5	
15PLUS	3.	106	15	302	2	425
		24.9	3.5	71.1	0.5	34.4
		35.8	46.9	33.6	22.2	
		8.6	1.2	24.4	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		296	32	900	9	1237
		23.9	2.6	72.8	0.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.48413 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3712

EDUC BY DECI15

* *

EDUC	DECI15 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	43 17.3 14.5 3.5	3 1.2 9.4 0.2	202 81.5 22.4 16.3	0 0.0 0.0 0.0	248 20.0
4ORS	2.	183 24.6 61.8 14.8	14 1.9 43.8 1.1	543 72.9 60.3 43.9	5 0.7 55.6 0.4	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	70 28.7 23.6 5.7	15 6.1 46.9 1.2	155 63.5 17.2 12.5	4 1.6 44.4 0.3	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	296 23.9	32 2.6	900 72.8	9 0.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 32.21761 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI16

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI16 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	5	71	6	27	109
		4.6	65.1	5.5	24.8	8.8
		14.7	7.9	4.7	15.4	
		0.4	5.7	0.5	2.2	
MODERATE	2.	12	249	40	57	358
		3.4	69.6	11.2	15.9	28.9
		35.3	27.7	31.0	32.6	
		1.0	20.1	3.2	4.6	
HIGH	3.	17	579	83	91	770
		2.2	75.2	10.8	11.8	62.2
		50.0	64.4	64.3	52.0	
		1.4	46.8	6.7	7.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	34	899	129	175	1237
		2.7	72.7	10.4	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.89883 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0029

AGE BY DECI16

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI16 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	10 2.0 29.4 0.8	384 76.3 42.7 31.0	35 7.0 27.1 2.8	74 14.7 42.3 6.0	503 40.7
35-49	2.	9 1.9 26.5 0.7	354 73.6 39.4 28.6	52 10.8 40.3 4.2	66 13.7 37.7 5.3	481 38.9
50-65	3.	15 5.9 44.1 1.2	161 63.6 17.9 13.0	42 16.6 32.6 3.4	35 13.8 20.0 2.8	253 20.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	34 2.7	899 72.7	129 10.4	175 14.1	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 30.85764 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SEX BY DEC116

* *

SEX (rows) / DEC116 (columns): COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. MALE	10	432	68	92	602
	1.7	71.8	11.3	15.3	48.7
	29.4	48.1	52.7	52.6	
	0.8	34.9	5.5	7.4	
2. FEMALE	24	467	61	83	635
	3.8	73.5	9.6	13.1	51.3
	70.6	51.9	47.3	47.4	
	1.9	37.8	4.9	6.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	34	899	129	175	1237
	2.7	72.7	10.4	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.09473 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0689

AGE BY DEC116

CONTROLLING FOR.. SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

DEC116

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	3	165	12	36	216
		1.4	76.4	5.6	16.7	35.9
		30.0	38.2	17.6	39.1	
		0.5	27.4	2.0	6.0	
35-49	2.	2	185	31	34	252
		0.8	73.4	12.3	13.5	41.9
		20.0	42.8	45.6	37.0	
		0.3	30.7	5.1	5.6	
50-65	3.	5	82	25	22	134
		3.7	61.2	18.7	16.4	22.3
		50.0	19.0	36.8	23.9	
		0.8	13.6	4.2	3.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	10	432	68	92	602
		1.7	71.8	11.3	15.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.38745 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0016

AGE BY DECI16
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECI16 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	7	219	23	38	287
		2.4	76.3	8.0	13.2	45.2
		29.2	46.9	37.7	45.8	
		1.1	34.5	3.6	6.0	
35-49	2.	7	169	21	32	229
		3.1	73.8	9.2	14.0	36.1
		29.2	36.2	34.4	38.6	
		1.1	26.6	3.3	5.0	
50-65	3.	10	79	17	13	119
		8.4	66.4	14.3	10.9	18.7
		41.7	16.9	27.9	15.7	
		1.6	12.4	2.7	2.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	24	467	61	83	635
		3.8	73.5	9.6	13.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.62535 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0341

LEVEL BY DEC116

* *

LEVEL	DEC116 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	6	217	20	32	275
		2.2	78.9	7.3	11.6	22.2
		17.6	24.1	15.5	18.3	
		0.5	17.5	1.6	2.6	
INTERMED	2.	14	274	57	45	390
		3.6	70.3	14.6	11.5	31.5
		41.2	30.5	44.2	25.7	
		1.1	22.2	4.6	3.6	
JUNHIGH	3.	9	214	24	45	292
		3.1	73.3	8.2	15.4	23.6
		26.5	23.8	18.6	25.7	
		0.7	17.3	1.9	3.6	
SENHIGH	4.	5	194	28	53	280
		1.8	69.3	10.0	18.9	22.6
		14.7	21.6	21.7	30.3	
		0.4	15.7	2.3	4.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	34	899	129	175	1237
		2.7	72.7	10.4	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.18410 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0058

EXPER BY DECI16

* *

EXPER	DECI16: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	6	203	28	32	269
		2.2	75.5	10.4	11.9	21.7
		17.6	22.6	21.7	18.3	
		0.5	16.4	2.3	2.6	
6-15	2.	12	406	37	88	543
		2.2	74.8	6.8	16.2	43.9
		35.3	45.2	28.7	50.3	
		1.0	32.8	3.0	7.1	
15PLUS	3.	16	290	64	55	425
		3.8	68.2	15.1	12.9	34.4
		47.1	32.3	49.6	31.4	
		1.3	23.4	5.2	4.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	34	899	129	175	1237
		2.7	72.7	10.4	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.76924 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0009

EDUC . . . . BY DECI16

* *

EDUC	DECI16 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3 OR LESS	1.	9	188	28	23	248
		3.6	75.8	11.3	9.3	20.0
		26.5	20.9	21.7	13.1	
		0.7	15.2	2.3	1.9	
4 OR 5	2.	20	543	70	112	745
		2.7	72.9	9.4	15.0	60.2
		58.8	60.4	54.3	64.0	
		1.6	43.9	5.7	9.1	
6 OR MORE	3.	5	168	31	40	244
		2.0	68.9	12.7	16.4	19.7
		14.7	18.7	24.0	22.9	
		0.4	13.6	2.5	3.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	34	899	129	175	1237
		2.7	72.7	10.4	14.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.57195 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1439

SATISDEX BY DEC117

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC117 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	48	33	17	11	109
		44.0	30.3	15.6	10.1	8.8
		12.3	7.1	6.0	11.1	
		3.9	2.7	1.4	0.9	
MODERATE	2.	136	127	74	21	358
		38.0	35.5	20.7	5.9	28.9
		34.9	27.3	26.2	21.2	
		11.0	10.3	6.0	1.7	
HIGH	3.	206	306	191	67	770
		26.8	39.7	24.8	8.7	62.2
		52.8	65.7	67.7	67.7	
		16.7	24.7	15.4	5.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	390	466	282	99	1237
		31.5	37.7	22.8	8.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.29117 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

AGE BY DEC117

* *

AGE	DEC117	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW PCT					
	COL PCT					
	TOT PCT					
20-34	1.	162	195	108	38	503
		32.2	38.8	21.5	7.6	40.7
		41.5	41.8	38.3	38.4	
		13.1	15.8	8.7	3.1	
35-49	2.	165	175	104	37	481
		34.3	36.4	21.6	7.7	38.9
		42.3	37.6	36.9	37.4	
		13.3	14.1	8.4	3.0	
50-65	3.	63	96	70	24	253
		24.9	37.9	27.7	9.5	20.5
		16.2	20.6	24.8	24.2	
		5.1	7.8	5.7	1.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	390	466	282	99	1237
		31.5	37.7	22.8	8.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.34250 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1552

SEX BY DECI17

* *

SEX	DECI17 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	184	247	115	56	602
		30.6	41.0	19.1	9.3	48.7
		47.2	53.0	40.8	56.6	
		14.9	20.0	9.3	4.5	
FEMALE	2.	206	219	167	43	635
		32.4	34.5	26.3	6.8	51.3
		52.8	47.0	59.2	43.4	
		16.7	17.7	13.5	3.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	390	466	282	99	1237
		31.5	37.7	22.8	8.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.34830 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0039

AGE BY DECI17
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI17 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	69 31.9 37.5 11.5	84 38.9 34.0 14.0	43 19.9 37.4 7.1	20 9.3 35.7 3.3	216 35.9
35-49	2.	88 34.9 47.8 14.6	98 38.9 39.7 16.3	46 18.3 40.0 7.6	20 7.9 35.7 3.3	252 41.9
50-65	3.	27 20.1 14.7 4.5	65 48.5 26.3 10.8	26 19.4 22.6 4.3	16 11.9 28.6 2.7	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	184 30.6	247 41.0	115 19.1	56 9.3	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.48662 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1056

AGE BY DFCI17
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DFCI17 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	93 32.4 45.1 14.6	111 38.7 50.7 17.5	65 22.6 38.9 10.2	18 6.3 41.9 2.8	287 45.2
35-49	2.	77 33.6 37.4 12.1	77 33.6 35.2 12.1	58 25.3 34.7 9.1	17 7.4 39.5 2.7	229 36.1
50-65	3.	36 30.3 17.5 5.7	31 26.1 14.2 4.9	44 37.0 26.3 6.9	8 6.7 18.6 1.3	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	206 32.4	219 34.5	167 26.3	43 6.8	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.18419 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0828

LEVEL BY DEC117

* *

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC117 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	89	93	78	15	275
		32.4	33.8	28.4	5.5	22.2
		22.8	20.0	27.7	15.2	
		7.2	7.5	6.3	1.2	
INTERMED	2.	137	153	71	29	390
		35.1	39.2	18.2	7.4	31.5
		35.1	32.8	25.2	29.3	
		11.1	12.4	5.7	2.3	
JUNHIGH	3.	86	115	68	23	292
		29.5	39.4	23.3	7.9	23.6
		22.1	24.7	24.1	23.2	
		7.0	9.3	5.5	1.9	
SENHIGH	4.	78	105	65	32	280
		27.9	37.5	23.2	11.4	22.6
		20.0	22.5	23.0	32.3	
		6.3	8.5	5.3	2.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	390	466	282	99	1237
		31.5	37.7	22.8	8.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.72205 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0277

EXPER BY DEC117

*

EXPER	DEC117 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	90 33.5 23.1 7.3	96 35.7 20.6 7.8	67 24.9 23.8 5.4	16 5.9 16.2 1.3	269 21.7
6-15	2.	184 33.9 47.2 14.9	197 36.3 42.3 15.9	119 21.9 42.2 9.6	43 7.9 43.4 3.5	543 43.9
15PLUS	3.	116 27.3 29.7 9.4	173 40.7 37.1 14.0	96 22.6 34.0 7.8	40 9.4 40.4 3.2	425 34.4
	COLUMN TOTAL	390 31.5	466 37.7	282 22.8	99 8.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.48717 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2045

EDUC BY DECI17

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI17 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	61 24.6 15.6 4.9	90 36.3 19.3 7.3	76 30.6 27.0 6.1	21 8.5 21.2 1.7	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	263 35.3 67.4 21.3	257 34.5 55.2 20.8	167 22.4 59.2 13.5	58 7.8 58.6 4.7	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	66 27.0 16.9 5.3	119 48.8 25.5 9.6	39 16.0 13.8 3.2	20 8.2 20.2 1.6	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	390 31.5	466 37.7	282 22.8	99 8.0	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 30.63394 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI18

* *

SATISDEX	DECI18 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	42 38.5 10.7 3.4	4 3.7 4.5 0.3	61 56.0 8.4 4.9	2 1.8 7.7 0.2	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	133 37.2 33.8 10.8	28 7.8 31.5 2.3	192 53.6 26.4 15.5	5 1.4 19.2 0.4	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	219 28.4 55.6 17.7	57 7.4 64.0 4.6	475 61.7 65.2 38.4	19 2.5 73.1 1.5	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	394 31.9	89 7.2	728 58.9	26 2.1	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.85775 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0313

SEX BY DECI18

* *

SEX	DECI18 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	200 33.2 50.8 16.2	51 8.5 57.3 4.1	336 55.8 46.2 27.2	15 2.5 57.7 1.2	602 48.7
FEMALE	2.	194 30.6 49.2 15.7	38 6.0 42.7 3.1	392 61.7 53.8 31.7	11 1.7 42.3 0.9	635 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	394 31.9	89 7.2	728 58.9	26 2.1	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.03726 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1098

AGE BY DEC11B

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC11B 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	151	36	306	10	503
		30.0	7.2	60.8	2.0	40.7
		38.3	40.4	42.0	38.5	
		12.2	2.9	24.7	0.8	
35-49	2.	173	36	263	9	481
		36.0	7.5	54.7	1.9	38.9
		43.9	40.4	36.1	34.6	
		14.0	2.9	21.3	0.7	
50-65	3.	70	17	159	7	253
		27.7	6.7	62.8	2.8	20.5
		17.8	19.1	21.8	26.9	
		5.7	1.4	12.9	0.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	394	89	728	26	1237
		31.9	7.2	58.9	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.74495 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2574

AGE BY DECI18
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT (DECI18)	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	68	20	124	4	216
		31.5	9.3	57.4	1.9	35.9
		34.0	39.2	36.9	26.7	
		11.3	3.3	20.6	0.7	
35-49	2.	93	19	134	6	252
		36.9	7.5	53.2	2.4	41.9
		46.5	37.3	39.9	40.0	
		15.4	3.2	22.3	1.0	
50-65	3.	39	12	78	5	134
		29.1	9.0	58.2	3.7	22.3
		19.5	23.5	23.2	33.3	
		6.5	2.0	13.0	0.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	200	51	336	15	602
		33.2	8.5	55.8	2.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.10728 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6622

* * * * * C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N O F * * * * *

AGE BY DECI18

CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI18 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	83 28.9 42.8 13.1	16 5.6 42.1 2.5	182 63.4 46.4 28.7	6 2.1 54.5 0.9	287 45.2
35-49	2.	80 34.9 41.2 12.6	17 7.4 44.7 2.7	129 56.3 32.9 20.3	3 1.3 27.3 0.5	229 36.1
50-65	3.	31 26.1 16.0 4.9	5 4.2 13.2 0.8	81 68.1 20.7 12.8	2 1.7 18.2 0.3	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	194 30.6	38 6.0	392 61.7	11 1.7	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 6.42146 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3777

LEVEL BY DEC118

* *

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC118 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	79	16	176	4	275
		28.7	5.8	64.0	1.5	22.2
		20.1	18.0	24.2	15.4	
		6.4	1.3	14.2	0.3	
INTERMED	2.	135	30	220	5	390
		34.6	7.7	56.4	1.3	31.5
		34.3	33.7	30.2	19.2	
		10.9	2.4	17.8	0.4	
JUNHIGH	3.	92	21	172	7	292
		31.5	7.2	58.9	2.4	23.6
		23.4	23.6	23.6	26.9	
		7.4	1.7	13.9	0.6	
SENHIGH	4.	88	22	160	10	280
		31.4	7.9	57.1	3.6	22.6
		22.3	24.7	22.0	38.5	
		7.1	1.8	12.9	0.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	394	89	728	26	1237
		31.9	7.2	58.9	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.39998 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4012

EXPER . . . . C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N   O F . . . BY DECI18

* *

EXPER	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI18 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	72	22	172	3	269
		26.8	8.2	63.9	1.1	21.7
		18.3	24.7	23.6	11.5	
		5.8	1.8	13.9	0.2	
6-15	2.	192	31	306	14	543
		35.4	5.7	56.4	2.6	43.9
		48.7	34.8	42.0	53.8	
		15.5	2.5	24.7	1.1	
15PLUS	3.	130	36	250	9	425
		30.6	8.5	58.8	2.1	34.4
		33.0	40.4	34.3	34.6	
		10.5	2.9	20.2	0.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	394	89	728	26	1237
		31.9	7.2	58.9	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.07616 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0861

EDUC BY DEC118

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC118 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	57 23.0 14.5 4.6	16 6.5 18.0 1.3	171 69.0 23.5 13.8	4 1.6 15.4 0.3	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	252 33.8 64.0 20.4	42 5.6 47.2 3.4	437 58.7 60.0 35.3	14 1.9 53.8 1.1	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	85 34.8 21.6 6.9	31 12.7 34.8 2.5	120 49.2 16.5 9.7	8 3.3 30.8 0.6	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	394 31.9	89 7.2	728 58.9	26 2.1	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 30.96117 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY DECI19

* *

SATISDEX	DECI19 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	35 32.1 13.7 2.8	41 37.6 6.9 3.3	19 17.4 7.1 1.5	14 12.8 11.7 1.1	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	76 21.2 29.8 6.1	166 46.4 27.9 13.4	83 23.2 31.0 6.7	33 9.2 27.5 2.7	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	144 18.7 56.5 11.6	387 50.3 65.2 31.3	166 21.6 61.9 13.4	73 9.5 60.8 5.9	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	255 20.6	594 48.0	268 21.7	120 9.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.40762 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0254

SEX BY DEC119

* *

SEX	DEC119 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. MALE	COUNT	121	284	142	55	602
	ROW PCT	20.1	47.2	23.6	9.1	48.7
	COL PCT	47.5	47.8	53.0	45.8	
	TOT PCT	9.8	23.0	11.5	4.4	
2. FEMALE	COUNT	134	310	126	65	635
	ROW PCT	21.1	48.8	19.8	10.2	51.3
	COL PCT	52.5	52.2	47.0	54.2	
	TOT PCT	10.8	25.1	10.2	5.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		255	594	268	120	1237
		20.6	48.0	21.7	9.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.71092 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4384

AGE BY DECI19

* *

AGE		DECI19 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	COUNT	98	265	97	43	503
		ROW PCT	19.5	52.7	19.3	8.5	40.7
		COL PCT	38.4	44.6	36.2	35.8	
		TOT PCT	7.9	21.4	7.8	3.5	
35-49	2.	COUNT	105	235	90	51	481
		ROW PCT	21.8	48.9	18.7	10.6	38.9
		COL PCT	41.2	39.6	33.6	42.5	
		TOT PCT	8.5	19.0	7.3	4.1	
50-65	3.	COUNT	52	94	81	26	253
		ROW PCT	20.6	37.2	32.0	10.3	20.5
		COL PCT	20.4	15.8	30.2	21.7	
		TOT PCT	4.2	7.6	6.5	2.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL		255	594	268	120	1237
			20.6	48.0	21.7	9.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.16917 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

```
    AGE                                                                                  BY   DECI19
CONTROLLING FOR..
    SEX                                                                                  VALUE =         1.   MALE
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
```

AGE (DECI19 → COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT)		1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	48 22.2 39.7 6.0	109 50.5 38.4 18.1	43 19.9 30.3 7.1	16 7.4 29.1 2.7	216 35.9
35-49	2.	47 18.7 38.8 7.8	128 50.8 45.1 21.3	52 20.6 36.6 8.6	25 9.9 45.5 4.2	252 41.9
50-65	3.	26 19.4 21.5 4.3	47 35.1 16.5 7.8	47 35.1 33.1 7.8	14 10.4 25.5 2.3	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	121 20.1	284 47.2	142 23.6	55 9.1	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.92929 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0095

AGE BY DEC119
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE
* *

DEC119

AGE		COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	COUNT	50	156	54	27	287
		ROW PCT	17.4	54.4	18.8	9.4	45.2
		COL PCT	37.3	50.3	42.9	41.5	
		TOT PCT	7.9	24.6	8.5	4.3	
35-49	2.	COUNT	58	107	38	26	229
		ROW PCT	25.3	46.7	16.6	11.4	36.1
		COL PCT	43.3	34.5	30.2	40.0	
		TOT PCT	9.1	16.9	6.0	4.1	
50-65	3.	COUNT	26	47	34	12	119
		ROW PCT	21.8	39.5	28.6	10.1	18.7
		COL PCT	19.4	15.2	27.0	18.5	
		TOT PCT	4.1	7.4	5.4	1.9	
COLUMN TOTAL			134	310	126	65	635
			21.1	48.8	19.8	10.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 14.35238 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0259

LEVEL BY DECI19

* *

LEVEL	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	54	153	40	28	275
		19.6	55.6	14.5	10.2	22.2
		21.2	25.8	14.9	23.3	
		4.4	12.4	3.2	2.3	
INTERMED	2.	71	196	94	29	390
		18.2	50.3	24.1	7.4	31.5
		27.8	33.0	35.1	24.2	
		5.7	15.8	7.6	2.3	
JUNHIGH	3.	77	120	69	26	292
		26.4	41.1	23.6	8.9	23.6
		30.2	20.2	25.7	21.7	
		6.2	9.7	5.6	2.1	
SENHIGH	4.	53	125	65	37	280
		18.9	44.6	23.2	13.2	22.6
		20.8	21.0	24.3	30.8	
		4.3	10.1	5.3	3.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	255	594	268	120	1237
		20.6	48.0	21.7	9.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 27.82870 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010

EXPER BY DEC119

* *

EXPER	DEC119	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT					
1. 1-5	COUNT	61	135	53	20	269
	ROW PCT	22.7	50.2	19.7	7.4	21.7
	COL PCT	23.9	22.7	19.8	16.7	
	TOT PCT	4.9	10.9	4.3	1.6	
2. 6-15	COUNT	109	281	94	59	543
	ROW PCT	20.1	51.7	17.3	10.9	43.9
	COL PCT	42.7	47.3	35.1	49.2	
	TOT PCT	8.8	22.7	7.6	4.8	
3. 15PLUS	COUNT	85	178	121	41	425
	ROW PCT	20.0	41.9	28.5	9.6	34.4
	COL PCT	33.3	30.0	45.1	34.2	
	TOT PCT	6.9	14.4	9.8	3.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		255	594	268	120	1237
		20.6	48.0	21.7	9.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 22.37839 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010

EDUC BY DECI19

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI19 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	59 23.8 23.1 4.8	125 50.4 21.0 10.1	49 19.8 18.3 4.0	15 6.0 12.5 1.2	248 20.0
4OR5	2.	149 20.0 58.4 12.0	362 48.6 60.9 29.3	153 20.5 57.1 12.4	81 10.9 67.5 6.5	745 60.2
6OR MORE	3.	47 19.3 18.4 3.8	107 43.9 18.0 8.6	66 27.0 24.6 5.3	24 9.8 20.0 1.9	244 19.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	255 20.6	594 48.0	268 21.7	120 9.7	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.38061 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0773

SATISDEX BY DEC120

* *

SATISDEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC120 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	57 52.3 12.8 4.6	24 22.0 5.3 1.9	19 17.4 7.7 1.5	9 8.3 9.9 0.7	109 8.8
MODERATE	2.	154 43.0 34.7 12.4	114 31.8 25.0 9.2	63 17.6 25.6 5.1	27 7.5 29.7 2.2	358 28.9
HIGH	3.	233 30.3 52.5 18.8	318 41.3 69.7 25.7	164 21.3 66.7 13.3	55 7.1 60.4 4.4	770 62.2
	COLUMN TOTAL	444 35.9	456 36.9	246 19.9	91 7.4	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 35.34013 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SEX BY DECI20

* *

SEX	DECI20 COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	214 35.5 48.2 17.3	225 37.4 49.3 18.2	106 17.6 43.1 8.6	57 9.5 62.6 4.6	602 48.7
FEMALE	2.	230 36.2 51.8 18.6	231 36.4 50.7 18.7	140 22.0 56.9 11.3	34 5.4 37.4 2.7	635 51.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	444 35.9	456 36.9	246 19.9	91 7.4	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.29488 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0162

AGE BY DEC120

DEC120

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	196	177	103	27	503
		39.0	35.2	20.5	5.4	40.7
		44.1	38.8	41.9	29.7	
		15.8	14.3	8.3	2.2	
35-49	2.	171	187	78	45	481
		35.6	38.9	16.2	9.4	38.9
		38.5	41.0	31.7	49.5	
		13.8	15.1	6.3	3.6	
50-65	3.	77	92	65	19	253
		30.4	36.4	25.7	7.5	20.5
		17.3	20.2	26.4	20.9	
		6.2	7.4	5.3	1.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	444	456	246	91	1237
		35.9	36.9	19.9	7.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.32700 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0082

AGE BY DECI20
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DECI20 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	83 38.4 38.8 13.8	72 33.3 32.0 12.0	47 21.8 44.3 7.8	14 6.5 24.6 2.3	216 35.9
35-49	2.	90 35.7 42.1 15.0	97 38.5 43.1 16.1	37 14.7 34.9 6.1	28 11.1 49.1 4.7	252 41.9
50-65	3.	41 30.6 19.2 6.8	56 41.8 24.9 9.3	22 16.4 20.8 3.7	15 11.2 26.3 2.5	134 22.3
	COLUMN TOTAL	214 35.5	225 37.4	106 17.6	57 9.5	602 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.77807 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1343

CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY DEC120

CONTROLLING FOR.. SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

AGE		DEC120 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	COUNT	113	105	56	13	287
	ROW PCT	39.4	36.6	19.5	4.5	45.2
	COL PCT	49.1	45.5	40.0	38.2	
	TOT PCT	17.8	16.5	8.8	2.0	
35-49	COUNT	81	90	41	17	229
	ROW PCT	35.4	39.3	17.9	7.4	36.1
	COL PCT	35.2	39.0	29.3	50.0	
	TOT PCT	12.8	14.2	6.5	2.7	
50-65	COUNT	36	36	43	4	119
	ROW PCT	30.3	30.3	36.1	3.4	18.7
	COL PCT	15.7	15.6	30.7	11.8	
	TOT PCT	5.7	5.7	6.8	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		230 36.2	231 36.4	140 22.0	34 5.4	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.18185 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0026

LEVEL BY DEC120

* *

LEVEL	DEC120 — COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	102 37.1 23.0 8.2	102 37.1 22.4 8.2	55 20.0 22.4 4.4	16 5.8 17.6 1.3	275 22.2
INTERMED	2.	139 35.6 31.3 11.2	159 40.8 34.9 12.9	66 16.9 26.8 5.3	26 6.7 28.6 2.1	390 31.5
JUNHIGH	3.	106 36.3 23.9 8.6	100 34.2 21.9 8.1	63 21.6 25.6 5.1	23 7.9 25.3 1.9	292 23.6
SENHIGH	4.	97 34.6 21.8 7.8	95 33.9 20.8 7.7	62 22.1 25.2 5.0	26 9.3 28.6 2.1	280 22.6
	COLUMN TOTAL	444 35.9	456 36.9	246 19.9	91 7.4	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.58731 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4762

EXPER BY DEC120

* *

EXPER	DEC120: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1. COUNT	102	99	56	12	269
	ROW PCT	37.9	36.8	20.8	4.5	21.7
	COL PCT	23.0	21.7	22.8	13.2	
	TOT PCT	8.2	8.0	4.5	1.0	
6-15	2. COUNT	206	193	106	38	543
	ROW PCT	37.9	35.5	19.5	7.0	43.9
	COL PCT	46.4	42.3	43.1	41.8	
	TOT PCT	16.7	15.6	8.6	3.1	
15PLUS	3. COUNT	136	164	84	41	425
	ROW PCT	32.0	38.6	19.8	9.6	34.4
	COL PCT	30.6	36.0	34.1	45.1	
	TOT PCT	11.0	13.3	6.8	3.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	444	456	246	91	1237
		35.9	36.9	19.9	7.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.68271 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1387

EDUC BY DEC120

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC120 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	83	85	62	18	248
		33.5	34.3	25.0	7.3	20.0
		18.7	18.6	25.2	19.8	
		6.7	6.9	5.0	1.5	
4ORS	2.	280	266	150	49	745
		37.6	35.7	20.1	6.6	60.2
		63.1	58.3	61.0	53.8	
		22.6	21.5	12.1	4.0	
6OR MORE	3.	81	105	34	24	244
		33.2	43.0	13.9	9.8	19.7
		18.2	23.0	13.8	26.4	
		6.5	8.5	2.7	1.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	444	456	246	91	1237
		35.9	36.9	19.9	7.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.02375 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0201

SATISDEX BY DECI21

* *

SATISDEX	DECI21 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	46	2	59	2	109
		42.2	1.8	54.1	1.8	8.8
		11.5	4.0	7.6	13.3	
		3.7	0.2	4.8	0.2	
MODERATE	2.	137	18	199	4	358
		38.3	5.0	55.6	1.1	28.9
		34.3	36.0	25.7	26.7	
		11.1	1.5	16.1	0.3	
HIGH	3.	216	30	515	9	770
		28.1	3.9	66.9	1.2	62.2
		54.1	60.0	66.6	60.0	
		17.5	2.4	41.6	0.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	399	50	773	15	1237
		32.3	4.0	62.5	1.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.50371 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0023

SEX BY DEC121

* *

SEX	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DEC121 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	197	27	370	8	602
		32.7	4.5	61.5	1.3	48.7
		49.4	54.0	47.9	53.3	
		15.9	2.2	29.9	0.6	
FEMALE	2.	202	23	403	7	635
		31.8	3.6	63.5	1.1	51.3
		50.6	46.0	52.1	46.7	
		16.3	1.9	32.6	0.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	399	50	773	15	1237
		32.3	4.0	62.5	1.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.97846 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.8065

AGE BY DFCI21

* *

AGE	DFCI21 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	157 31.2 39.3 12.7	19 3.8 38.0 1.5	322 64.0 41.7 26.0	5 1.0 33.3 0.4	503 40.7
35-49	2.	171 35.6 42.9 13.8	23 4.8 46.0 1.9	281 58.4 36.4 22.7	6 1.2 40.0 0.5	481 38.9
50-65	3.	71 28.1 17.8 5.7	8 3.2 16.0 0.6	170 67.2 22.0 13.7	4 1.6 26.7 0.3	253 20.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	399 32.3	50 4.0	773 62.5	15 1.2	1237 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.23486 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2997

AGE BY DECI21
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

AGE	DECI21: COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	66	9	139	2	216
		30.6	4.2	64.4	0.9	35.9
		33.5	33.3	37.6	25.0	
		11.0	1.5	23.1	0.3	
35-49	2.	88	12	149	3	252
		34.9	4.8	59.1	1.2	41.9
		44.7	44.4	40.3	37.5	
		14.6	2.0	24.8	0.5	
50-65	3.	43	6	82	3	134
		32.1	4.5	61.2	2.2	22.3
		21.8	22.2	22.2	37.5	
		7.1	1.0	13.6	0.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	197	27	370	8	602
		32.7	4.5	61.5	1.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.44406 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.8747

AGE BY DECI21
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	DECI21 COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	91	10	183	3	287
		31.7	3.5	63.8	1.0	45.2
		45.0	43.5	45.4	42.9	
		14.3	1.6	28.8	0.5	
35-49	2.	83	11	132	3	229
		36.2	4.8	57.6	1.3	36.1
		41.1	47.8	32.8	42.9	
		13.1	1.7	20.8	0.5	
50-65	3.	28	2	88	1	119
		23.5	1.7	73.9	0.8	18.7
		13.9	8.7	21.8	14.3	
		4.4	0.3	13.9	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	202	23	403	7	635
		31.8	3.6	63.5	1.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.57832 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1436

LEVEL BY DEC121

LEVEL		DEC121 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
PRIMARY	1.	90	11	174	0	275
		32.7	4.0	63.3	0.0	22.2
		22.6	22.0	22.5	0.0	
		7.3	0.9	14.1	0.0	
INTERMED	2.	139	20	228	3	390
		35.6	5.1	58.5	0.8	31.5
		34.8	40.0	29.5	20.0	
		11.2	1.6	18.4	0.2	
JUNHIGH	3.	85	11	188	8	292
		29.1	3.8	64.4	2.7	23.6
		21.3	22.0	24.3	53.3	
		6.9	0.9	15.2	0.6	
SENHIGH	4.	85	8	183	4	280
		30.4	2.9	65.4	1.4	22.6
		21.3	16.0	23.7	26.7	
		6.9	0.6	14.8	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	399	50	773	15	1237
		32.3	4.0	62.5	1.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.04623 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0659

EXPER BY DECI21

EXPER		DECI21 1.	DECI21 2.	DECI21 3.	DECI21 4.	ROW TOTAL
1-5	1.	76	13	178	2	269
		28.3	4.8	66.2	0.7	21.7
		19.0	26.0	23.0	13.3	
		6.1	1.1	14.4	0.2	
6-15	2.	187	15	335	6	543
		34.4	2.8	61.7	1.1	43.9
		46.9	30.0	43.3	40.0	
		15.1	1.2	27.1	0.5	
15PLUS	3.	136	22	260	7	425
		32.0	5.2	61.2	1.6	34.4
		34.1	44.0	33.6	46.7	
		11.0	1.8	21.0	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		399	50	773	15	1237
		32.3	4.0	62.5	1.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 8.07293 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.2328

EDUC BY DECI21

* *

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	DECI21 1.	2.	3.	4.	ROW TOTAL
3OR LESS	1.	56	12	178	2	248
		22.6	4.8	71.8	0.8	20.0
		14.0	24.0	23.0	13.3	
		4.5	1.0	14.4	0.2	
4ORS	2.	250	20	466	9	745
		33.6	2.7	62.6	1.2	60.2
		62.7	40.0	60.3	60.0	
		20.2	1.6	37.7	0.7	
6OR MORE	3.	93	18	129	4	244
		38.1	7.4	52.9	1.6	19.7
		23.3	36.0	16.7	26.7	
		7.5	1.5	10.4	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	399	50	773	15	1237
		32.3	4.0	62.5	1.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 28.42441 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

APPENDIX D

SEX BY SATISDEX

SEX	SATISDEX	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
MALE	1.	55	171	378	602
		9.1	28.4	62.8	48.7
		48.6	47.8	49.1	
		4.5	13.8	30.6	
FEMALE	2.	56	187	392	635
		8.8	29.4	61.7	51.3
		51.4	52.2	50.9	
		4.5	15.1	31.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		109	358	770	1237
		8.8	28.9	62.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.17197 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.9176

AGE BY SATISDEX

SATISDEX

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	LOW 1.	MODERATE 2.	HIGH 3.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	66	191	246	503
		13.1	38.0	48.9	40.7
		60.6	53.4	31.9	
		5.3	15.4	19.9	
35-49	2.	34	125	322	481
		7.1	26.0	66.9	38.9
		31.2	34.9	41.8	
		2.7	10.1	26.0	
50-65	3.	9	42	202	253
		3.6	16.6	79.8	20.5
		8.3	11.7	26.2	
		0.7	3.4	16.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	109	358	770	1237
		8.8	28.9	62.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 77.79323 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

AGE BY SATISDEX
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 1. MALE

* *

SATISDEX

AGE	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	LOW 1.	MODERATE 2.	HIGH 3.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	27	81	108	216
		12.5	37.5	50.0	35.9
		50.9	47.4	28.6	
		4.5	13.5	17.9	
35-49	2.	16	67	167	252
		7.1	26.6	66.3	41.9
		34.0	39.2	44.2	
		3.0	11.1	27.7	
50-65	3.	8	23	103	134
		6.0	17.2	76.9	22.3
		15.1	13.5	27.2	
		1.3	3.8	17.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	53	171	378	602
		8.8	28.4	62.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 28.24901 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

AGE BY SATISDEX
CONTROLLING FOR..
SEX VALUE = 2. FEMALE

* *

AGE	SATISDEX COUNT ROW PCT COL PCT TOT PCT	LOW 1.	MODERATE 2.	HIGH 3.	ROW TOTAL
20-34	1.	39 13.6 69.6 6.1	110 38.3 58.8 17.3	138 48.1 35.2 21.7	287 45.2
35-49	2.	16 7.0 28.6 2.5	58 25.3 31.0 9.1	155 67.7 39.5 24.4	229 36.1
50-65	3.	1 0.8 1.8 0.2	19 16.0 10.2 3.0	99 83.2 25.3 15.6	119 18.7
	COLUMN TOTAL	56 8.8	187 29.4	392 61.7	635 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 52.06837 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

SATISDEX BY LEVEL

SATISDEX		LEVEL 1. PRIMARY	2. INTERMED JR/HIGH	3. SR/HIGH	4.	ROW TOTAL
1. Low	COUNT	21	27	38	23	109
	ROW PCT	19.3	24.8	34.9	21.1	8.8
	COL PCT	7.6	6.9	13.0	8.2	
	TOT PCT	1.7	2.2	3.1	1.9	
2. MODERATE	COUNT	78	109	97	74	358
	ROW PCT	21.8	30.4	27.1	20.7	28.9
	COL PCT	28.4	27.9	33.2	26.4	
	TOT PCT	6.3	8.8	7.8	6.0	
3. HIGH	COUNT	176	254	157	183	770
	ROW PCT	22.9	33.0	20.4	23.8	62.2
	COL PCT	64.0	65.1	53.8	65.4	
	TOT PCT	14.2	20.5	12.7	14.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		275	390	292	280	1237
		22.2	31.5	23.6	22.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 15.06023 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0198

EXPER BY SATISDEX

		SATISDEX			
	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	LOW 1.	MODERATE 2.	HIGH 3.	ROW TOTAL
EXPER					
1-5	1.	58	92	139	289
		14.1	34.2	51.7	21.7
		34.9	25.7	18.1	
		3.1	7.4	11.2	
6-15	2.	46	167	328	543
		8.8	30.8	60.4	43.9
		44.0	46.6	42.6	
		3.9	13.5	26.5	
15PLUS	3.	23	99	303	425
		5.4	23.3	71.3	34.4
		21.1	27.7	39.4	
		1.9	8.0	24.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	109	358	770	1237
		8.8	28.9	62.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 32.78645 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

EDUC BY SATISDEX

EDUC	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	SATISDEX LOW (1.)	MODERATE (2.)	HIGH (3.)	ROW TOTAL
30R LESS	1.	19	59	176	248
		7.7	23.8	68.5	20.0
		17.4	16.5	22.1	
		1.5	4.8	13.7	
40RS	2.	73	222	450	745
		9.8	29.8	60.4	60.2
		67.0	62.0	58.4	
		5.9	17.9	36.4	
60R MURE	3.	17	77	150	244
		7.0	31.6	61.5	19.7
		15.6	21.5	19.5	
		1.4	6.2	12.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	109	358	770	1237
		8.8	28.9	62.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.19038 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1262

APPENDIX E

SCHOOL BY SATISFX

SATISFX

SCHOOL	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	1. LOW	2. MODERATE	3. HIGH	Row Total
1.		27	88	133	248
		10.9	35.5	53.6	20.0
		24.8	24.6	17.3	
		2.2	7.1	10.8	
2.		82	270	637	989
		8.3	27.3	64.4	80.0
		75.2	75.4	82.7	
		6.6	21.8	51.5	
Column Total		109	358	770	1237
		8.8	28.9	62.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.80589 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0074

VITA

Surname: DAVIS Given Names: Brian Kenneth

Place of Birth: LEICESTER, U.K. Date of Birth: October 20, 1942

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION	1962	to 1965
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.	1971	to 1974
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, B.C.	1977	to 1978

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

Diploma	1965	Newcastle-Upon-Tyne Institute of Education
B.Ed. (First Class)		University of Victoria

Honors and Awards:

University of Victoria Supplement, 1977/78

Publications:

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis

Teacher Job Satisfaction and Decisional Participation in the Public Schools of British Columbia

Author [redacted]

Signature

Brian Kenneth Davis

9 June 1978

Date