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Chapter 1

Introduction

Teachers held approximately 4.0 million jobs in elementary and secondary U.S. public and private schools in 2006, with an expected increase of 12 percent between 2006 and 2012 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, 2008). Nationally, in an average school year, approximately 1,000 teachers quit each school day, and on an average school day an additional 1,000 migrate from one school to another. Additional research indicates that a third of newly hired teachers leave during their first three years, and almost half leave during the first five years (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future [NCTAF], 2003; Theobald & Michael, 2001).

According to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction in 2007, over 850,000 students attended public and private schools in Wisconsin with over 60,000 teachers serving these students (Fischer & Swanger, 2007). Theobald and Michael’s study (2001) found that turnover in small school districts in Wisconsin was nearly 50% after five years. Secondary teachers were more likely than elementary teachers to leave teaching, with career and technical education (CTE) teachers among the most likely to leave the profession altogether. Data from a national survey of secondary family and consumer sciences (FCS) education programs that focused on the 2002-2003 academic year revealed that the field continued to experience a serious shortage of teachers (Werhan & Way, 2006). The survey targeted the national supply and demand of FCS teachers; most states indicated a shortage of teachers to work with the number of students enrolled in their programs. Total numbers of secondary FCS teachers in the state of Wisconsin and five of its bordering states clearly illustrated this shortage (see Table 1). According to the US Department of Education, the Wisconsin CTE
area of FCS educators remains a critical shortage area for the 2010-2011 school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States reporting</th>
<th>Number of Students Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>FCS Teacher availability status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>43,951</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>Shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>Shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>37,628</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>Shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>336,665</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Oversupply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>112,321</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>252,493</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Shortage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Werhan & Way, 2006, p.21)

Along with other states, Wisconsin school districts are also beginning to face increasing retirements of “baby boom” teachers, and these increasing teacher retirements create the conditions that could lead to diminishing instructional quality at a time when the economic future of Wisconsin depends on a highly educated work force. There is no doubt demand for teachers will continue to increase over the next decade. Increased enrollments of students caused by the “baby boom echo” and immigration, paired with a large population of retirees and the turnover of younger teachers, have created the largest growth demand for teachers in America’s history (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Johnson & The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, 2004).

Research is clear that a high quality, highly trained teacher is one of the most important ingredients in improving student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Heilig 2005). Recruiting and retaining these education professionals is critical to our future. High turnover creates lack of continuity and stability for students, difficulty in building cohesion of instructors, and lowers student performance.
(NCTAF, 2003; Theobald & Michael, 2001). NCTAF (2003) argued the case that teacher turnover is driving teacher shortages, which undermine our ability to create and maintain strong learning communities. No teacher supply strategy will keep our schools staffed with quality teachers unless we reverse turnover rates.

There are many reasons why teachers leave the teaching profession. The demand for new teachers is mainly due to teachers moving from one position to another or leaving their current position (Feng, 2005; Ingersoll, 2001). The research reflects that one factor of teacher retention appears to be job satisfaction. Many different factors lead teachers to leave their jobs or to leave teaching altogether, but dissatisfaction with their jobs is one of the most important (Ingersoll, 2001). In a study conducted by Ingersoll and Smith (2003), about two thirds of all beginning teacher attrition was linked to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction has been frequently researched and holds great import for teacher retention and job performance, and warrants further study to improve retention and quality of educators. Ingersoll (2001) stated in a review of literature that teacher turnover is important to school performance in that it links performance and effectiveness in the school system. Employees tend to be more committed, have greater productivity and have higher retention rates when satisfied with their jobs (Evans, 2001; Locke & Sirota, 1976; Shann, 1998; Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), 2009; Weiss, 1999). Job dissatisfaction may cause a reduction in the level of effort or even job avoidance; actions which affect schools, other teachers, and students. Job dissatisfaction has been associated with increased turnover rates and absenteeism (Dawis & Loftquist, 1981; SHRM, 2009). Teacher absences may reduce student achievement through the disruption of the regular routines and procedures of the classroom, the low skill levels of substitute teachers, and substitutes’ lack
of knowledge of students’ skill levels, which make it difficult for them to addresses the needs of individual students (Miller, Murnane and Willett, 2008). According to Futernick (2007), “teacher turnover negatively affects the educational experience of students due to loss of continuity, experience, and expertise” (p. 12). Ultimately students may be forced to attend classes taught by inexperienced or underprepared teachers until qualified replacements can be found. Teacher turnover provides staffing challenges, as significant numbers of new teachers pass through what amounts to a revolving door in and out of classrooms, particularly in hard-to-staff schools where a stable learning environment with quality teachers is essential. Research has shown a strong link between the presence of certified teachers and student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Wenglinsky, 2000; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). Achievement problems will persist where often the only replacements are substitute teachers, teachers with emergency permits or novice teachers, leaving students to be taught by a string of teachers who are likely to be less effective than experienced teachers. Job dissatisfaction will ultimately cost the learning environment in terms of low performance and decreased productivity along with additional expenditures to recruit and replace teachers. A pilot study conducted by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future used actual costs of teacher turnover in five school districts. Representing a range of communities, large and small, urban and rural, the monetary cost per teacher turnover ranged from $4,366 to $17,872 (Barnes, Crowe & Schaefer, 2007).

If factors that contribute to job satisfaction can be identified, then programs can be developed and put in place to help support teachers, which in turn may reduce turnover rates (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). According to Dainty and Belcher (2008), identifying and
understanding factors of job satisfaction that influence the retention of quality teachers is vital for the continued sustainability and growth of career and technical education.

Although there are a number of studies on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (e.g. Johnson, Berg & Donaldson, 2005; Cano, 1990; Cox-McNeil, 2003); few have been specific to the area of career and technical education and even fewer to the area of family and consumer sciences education (FCS). The findings of the study of job satisfaction will likely be helpful in developing policies geared toward attracting and retaining FCS educators, which are important in building and retaining a strong teacher workforce and retaining teachers in the workplace.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to investigate and describe the levels of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers who are currently teaching FCS. Previous research findings indicate a connection between job satisfaction and teacher turnover rates (Johnson, et al., 2005; Weiss, 1999). Research studying teacher retention is useful in developing teacher programming and policies geared toward attracting and retaining educators. Induction and mentoring programs that focus on improving instruction and teacher effectiveness have been proven to increase retention and improve student achievement (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004).

The issue of job satisfaction in this study is focused around the following research questions:

Research Question 1:

What was the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form?
Research Question 2:

What level of job satisfaction did FCS teachers report on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?

Research Question 3:

Was there a relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used in this study.

1. Job satisfaction: “the result of the worker’s appraisal of the extent to which the work environment fulfills the individual’s needs… a pleasurable affective condition resulting from one’s appraisal of the way the experienced job situation meets one’s needs, values and expectations” (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p.72).

2. Motivation-Hygiene Theory: this two-factor theory attributed to Herzberg and his associates concluded that specific factors provide job satisfaction for the worker and other factors dissatisfy the worker. Job satisfiers are referred to as “motivators” and job dissatisfiers are referred to as “hygiene” (Gawel, 1997).

3. Intrinsic job factors: (job satisfiers) are factors associated with the job content---what a person does in his/her job. Factors may include achievement, recognition, and advancement (Herzberg, Mauser & Snyderman, 1959).

4. Extrinsic job factors: (job dissatisfiers) are factors associated with the job context---aspects of a person’s work environment. Factors may include salary, interpersonal relations, and supervision (Herzberg, et al., 1959).
5. Teacher turnover: movement from one school to another or exiting the profession altogether (Ingersoll, 2001).

6. Web-based survey: “generally defined as survey instruments that physically reside on a network server (connected to either an organization’s intranet or the Internet), and that can be accessed only through a web browser” (Jansen, Corley, & Jansen, 2007, p. 2).


Significance of the Study

A shortage of FCS teachers due to turnover and an aging workforce continues to be a concern for many school districts (Werhan & Way, 2006). The turnover of teaching staff keeps school administrators scrambling, particularly in hard-to-find curriculum areas such as FCS. High turnover rates, due in part to job dissatisfaction, undercut the ability of schools to build and sustain professional teaching communities needed to support current education reform. Job dissatisfaction will ultimately cost school districts in terms of low school performance and decreased productivity along with additional expenditures to recruit and replace teachers; money that could be spent in other areas for educational improvement.

Previous research suggests that identifying and understanding factors of job satisfaction that influence the retention of teachers is vital for the continued sustainability and growth of education (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). It is also helpful in developing teacher programming and policies geared toward attracting and retaining FCS teachers. Results of this study will provide evidence concerning which aspects of the job provide satisfaction or
dissatisfaction for FCS teachers and the level of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction. With a better understanding of the factors that provide satisfaction to teachers, those involved (e.g. school district administrators, higher education teacher preparation programs, and related professional organizations) can begin to more effectively address dissatisfaction and meet the satisfaction needs of teachers. Improving job satisfaction and decreasing job dissatisfaction of FCS teachers may reduce turnover, which may help to maintain or improve and strengthen FCS programs without disruption.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are made in the planning of this study:

FCS teachers will provide truthful and complete answers to the teacher profile portion and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) survey; and their responses will accurately reflect their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Limitations of the Study

This study will be subject to certain limitations, including the following:

1. The accessible population - the researcher’s intent is to survey the Wisconsin public teaching workforce from grades 6 though 12 who hold a Family and Consumer Sciences teaching license and are currently teaching FCS.

2. The results may be generalized to FCS teachers in other states only to the extent that they are similar to those in the sample.

3. The study is limited to the respondents’ responses on the twenty given dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The study is limited to the factors included in the MSQ, therefore other specific areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction may not be revealed.
4. The findings will be limited by the accuracy of the responses provided by the participating teachers. FCS teachers’ level of interest in the study and their willingness to respond to the questionnaire may affect responses.

Summary

Teacher turnover occurs on a wide scale in our nation’s schools and the cost to students and schools are considerable. There are many reasons why teachers leave the profession; dissatisfaction with their jobs is one of the most important (Ingersoll, 2001). Job dissatisfaction among the teaching profession has been associated with increased turnover and absenteeism, which negatively affects the educational experience of students. Teaching vacancies filled with inexperienced or underprepared teacher’s lowers student performance.

Studies indicate that CTE teachers, which include those in FCS, are one of the areas most likely to leave the profession. In Wisconsin, the CTE area of FCS educators has been identified as a critical shortage area by the US Department of Education.

The areas and levels of teacher satisfaction can be assessed using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Research that helps to identify and understand factors of job satisfaction for family and consumer sciences teachers may assist schools in recruiting and retaining qualified educators in that content area. With the current shortages, retention is vital for the continued sustainability and growth of the FCS profession.
Chapter 2

Review of the literature

The purpose of this study is to investigate the nature of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers who are currently teaching FCS. The primary goal of this chapter is to review and summarize selected theories and literature relevant to the understanding of job satisfaction among FCS teachers and to examine demographic variables that influence their job satisfaction.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

The scientific study of job satisfaction began in the early 1900's with most of the studies focused in the field of industry or business (Hoppock, 1935). Through these studies various theories on job satisfaction have emerged. Traditionalists in the field contended that certain factors, both intrinsic and extrinsic, have the capacity to create satisfaction or dissatisfaction and are found on a single bipolar continuum; satisfaction was placed at one end of the continuum and dissatisfaction at the opposite end (Newby, 1999). This was further interpreted by Gruneburg (1979) and Jorde (1984) that if the presence of a variable in the work environment leads to satisfaction, then its absence will lead to dissatisfaction. Two prominent traditionalists frequently mentioned in the literature, Robert Hoppock and Abraham Maslow, are recognized for their early work in job satisfaction research.

Hoppock (1935) raised the notion that it may not be possible to disassociate job satisfaction with other satisfactions in life. In studies dealing specifically with teachers he included questions about non-work factors such as satisfaction level in their marriage. In *Job Satisfaction*, Hoppock stated that “family relationships, health, relative social status in the
community, and a multitude of other factors may be just as important as the job itself in
determining what we tentatively choose to call satisfaction” (1935, p. 5).

In 1954, Maslow introduced his hierarchy of needs theory (Figure 1), which depicts
how people satisfy various personal needs in the context of their work. According to his
needs-based theory, there is a general pattern of needs recognition that people follow
consisting of five levels in ascending order; the basic lower level needs must be met before
those at higher levels.

![Figure 1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (Source: Adapted from Maslow, 1943)](image)

Maslow stated that that not all people reach the self-actualization level. To become
self-actualizing, a person must be motivated by developing and using his or her own
capabilities. A self-actualizing person does not work merely for extrinsic rewards but for an
intrinsic need. As a person moves through an organization, the more an employer allows an
employee growth and acquisition of higher level needs, the more likely the employee is to
report satisfaction with his or her job. According to Maslow, motivation based on growth
needs does not decrease once the need is met; instead, once people experience self-
actualization they want to experience it more often. He further claimed that the concept of self-actualization could explain motivation in the workplace, where people may be motivated by a desire to improve and continue to learn. Maslow surmised that the success of motivating people depends on recognizing the needs that are unsatisfied and helping the individual to meet those needs (Maslow, 1970).

While Maslow focused on needs and their relationship to motivation, Herzberg performed a number of studies in his research on motivation and its relationship to job satisfaction. Work evolving out of Maslow’s theory by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), refuted the concept set out by Hoppock of a single continuum between the satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Herzberg et al. stated that the factors that motivate the worker are likely to satisfy their needs and lead to positive job attitudes. They contended that job satisfiers were those aspects of work which were intrinsic to the employee and tended to promote feelings of happiness in the worker; they are related to Maslow’s (1970) human psychological needs and are effective in motivating an employee to high performance and effort. “The factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual’s need for self-actualization in his work” (Herzberg, 1959, p. 114). Work is one of the main areas of life where self actualization occurs. Factors surrounding the doing of the job do not on their own lead to satisfaction, but the performance of the tasks leads to rewards, which reinforce individuals’ goals.

Herzberg et al. (1959) stated that factors that lead directly to dissatisfaction are also related to the job itself. Job dissatisfiers were those aspects of work which were extrinsic and focused on the environment of the work; when they deteriorate to a level that an employee considers unacceptable, job dissatisfaction ensues. They further concluded that there
probably were two continua present, one including those factors that caused satisfaction or lack of satisfaction, and a second which included factors that caused dissatisfaction or a condition of no dissatisfaction.

In his dual factor Motivation-Hygiene theory (Fig. 2), Herzberg (1966) further argued that the causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are quite separate. He used the terms motivation and hygiene to separate the factors into two groups. Motivation factors (satisfiers) involve the intrinsic nature of the job, such as achievement, recognition, responsibilities and advancement. Hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) are found in the environment of the job (extrinsic) and include pay, security, supervision and physical working conditions. Herzberg concluded that the absence of hygiene factors can create job dissatisfaction, but their presence does not necessarily motivate or create satisfaction (Gawel, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-Polar Theory (traditional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Factor Motivator-Hygiene Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Traditional and Two-Factor Motivator-Hygiene Models (Source: Adapted from Griffin, 2008, p. 295)

Herzberg’s research is far from being universally accepted; there have been numerous studies supporting, only partially supporting or showing no support of his Motivator-Hygiene theory. Supporters of Herzberg’s theory have postulated that studies refuting the Motivator-Hygiene theory misinterpreted the theory, contained methodological weakness and misinterpreted the results (Whitsett & Winslow, 1967). Critics of the theory claim that it was
method bound, based on faulty research, inconsistent with past evidence (House & Wigdor, 1967), is influenced by income level of respondents (Davis & Newstrom, 1989), underestimated the motivational forces of interpersonal relations and salary (Bellott & Tutor, 1990; Davis & Newstrom, 1989; Evans, 1970; Evans, 2001) and provided no real identification of what job satisfaction is (Evans, 2001).

Despite the possible limitations of the motivation–hygiene theory, many researchers and practitioners still find it attractive because its contribution has influenced current studies on organizational behavior, which has greatly improved educational administrators’ understanding of employee behavior (Ololube, 2007). According to Latham (2007, p.39), Herzberg’s “lasting contribution to practitioners has been shifting their primary focus to the importance of the work itself rather than on what he called the hygiene factors (e.g. employee benefits).”

*Measurement of Job Satisfaction*

Measuring job satisfaction is difficult due to individuals’ perceptions. Measuring job satisfaction is a complex process because teachers are not consistent in their perspectives about what makes them satisfied with their careers. In reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that different methods of collecting and analyzing data are used. The basic data collection techniques most often used in studies of job satisfaction include questionnaires, interviews, rank order studies, sentence completion tests, (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969, DeMato, 2001) or workplace observations (Spector, 1997, Worrell, 2004). Many organizations and researchers favor questionnaires because personal observations and interviews are very time consuming. Research reviewed (see: Bartley & Sneed 2004;
Kluckman & Brands, 1991; Martin & Light, 1984; Tucker, 2009, among others) most commonly used the questionnaire technique to measure job satisfaction. Spector (1997) stated that using existing questionnaires is an easy way to assess job satisfaction; concluding that since they have been used in previous studies, reliability, validity, and norms generally have been established. Advantages of using questionnaires include ease of administering and distribution, require less time and money, have an increased likelihood of insured confidentiality, and are less susceptible to bias (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991; Walonick, 2004).

Since the 1960s, one of the most widely cited standardized job satisfaction questionnaires used is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss, Davis, England and Loftquist (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Sebera, 2005, Spector, 1997, Worrell, 2004). Written at a fifth grade level the MSQ is a gender-neutral, self-administered inventory measuring job satisfaction based on analysis of the relationships of twenty dimensions (see Table 2).

Two forms of the MSQ have been developed, a 100-item long form and a 20-item short form. The shortened form consists of satisfaction items that correlated highest with the scale score on the long form (see Table 2). The 1977 revision of the MSQ (originally copyrighted in 1963) uses a standard five-point response scale. Response choices are “Very Satisfied”, “Satisfied”, "Neither” (Satisfied nor Dissatisfied), “Dissatisfied” and “Very Dissatisfied.” This response format was found to have a ceiling effect resulting in scale score distributions for most groups to be negatively skewed; most responses alternate between “Satisfied and “Very Satisfied.”” The 1967 version adjusted for this by changing the response
options to “Not Satisfied,” “Somewhat Satisfied,” “Satisfied,” “Very Satisfied,” and “Extremely Satisfied.”

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>being able to keep busy all of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>chance to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>the chance to do different things from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>the chance to “be somebody” in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervision/human relations</td>
<td>the way the supervisor handles supervisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision/technical</td>
<td>competence of supervisor in making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moral values</td>
<td>ability to do job without going against conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>providing for steady employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>chance to do things for other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>chance to tell others what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ability utilization</td>
<td>doing something that makes use of abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Company policies and practices</td>
<td>the way company policies are put into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>pay for the amount of work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>chances of advancement on the current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>freedom to use own judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>chance to try own methods of doing the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>overall working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>the way coworkers get along with one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>praise for doing a good job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>feeling of accomplishment from the job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967)

The MSQ is suitable for a wide variety of research applications. Its many advantages include subscale scores corresponding to various dimensions of overall job satisfaction (e.g., extrinsic satisfaction, satisfaction with coworkers) and an overall job satisfaction score (Rentsch & Steel, 1992). The MSQ Short-Form contains twelve questions that measured intrinsic satisfaction and six questions that measured extrinsic satisfaction. All of the questions added together measure general satisfaction with a maximum total score of 100. Table 3 indicates which of these questions measured intrinsic, extrinsic and general
satisfaction. The same scale scores and weights are determined identically for the importance
dimension for each item. In general, the short-form has high reliability and validity
coefficients when measuring intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction (Weiss, et al., 1967).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 19,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>All items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiss et al., 1967)

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

There are a number of studies on teacher job satisfaction available, determining the
causes of existing satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and reporting on possible methods to
promote job satisfaction. While surveyed populations, methodologies and instruments differ,
findings include some familiar threads.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors

Teacher job satisfaction may be approached by looking at the intrinsic and extrinsic
rewards within their professional and personal lives. A survey of 400 state and national
Teachers of the Year indicated that they remain in teaching because of the intrinsic rewards;
motivated by the desire to teach more than salary or career potential (Goldberg & Proctor,
2000). According to Johnson et al. (2005), combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards
influence teachers’ decisions to remain in the profession. Intrinsic rewards include feeling
that they are making a difference in the lives of their students, developing new skills, and
expanded influence on the job (Johnson et al., 2005). Central to teachers’ decisions to remain
in the profession are feelings of competence or self-efficacy and control. Increasing these
feelings along with a sense of connectedness and belonging will increase intrinsic motivation to stay in the profession. Professional variables likely to affect intrinsic satisfaction include years of experience, ratio of teacher to students, and teaching load (Holley & Kirkpaterick, 1987). Extrinsic rewards revolve around salary, benefits, job advancement, and leadership opportunities (Johnson et al., 2005). In addition to these rewards, work conditions including type of school setting, satisfaction with principal leadership and support, access to resources, student population, facility upkeep, school climate, collegial collaboration, and safety may impact a teacher’s decision to leave or stay (Johnson et al., 2005; Ruhland, 2001).

*Education Studies*

The *MetLife Survey of the American Teacher: An Examination of School Leadership* (2006) explored the relationship between teacher satisfaction and numerous factors. When teachers were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their own schools, nearly one-quarter (23%) rated it as excellent, while 15% rated their satisfaction as only fair or poor. Responses indicated secondary schoolteachers were less likely than elementary schoolteachers to rate their satisfaction as excellent (18% vs. 25%). Responses indicate dissatisfaction were in areas of salary, opportunities for training, interaction with the school principal, and involvement in and the ability to influence decisions concerning their jobs and schools.

The following educational studies across disciplines, including FCS, reflect factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Ralph Savage and Thomas Sergiovanni conducted teacher satisfaction/dissatisfaction surveys within the context of their environment. Both Savage and Sergiovanni’s results supported Herzberg’s findings that intrinsic factors such as achievement, creativity and
responsibility all contribute to high job satisfaction levels (Savage, 1967; Sergiovanni, 1967). Chapman (1984) and Newby (1999) identified the importance of positive recognition, an extrinsic factor, from administrators in job satisfaction and retention.

Similarly, Simmons (1970) found that recognition from the principal along with achievement in teaching were significant contributors to teacher satisfaction. Litt & Turk (1985) conducted a study of high school teachers to identify factors of stress and job dissatisfaction. Findings included “the role teachers perceived for themselves and the school climate, particularly the relationship with administrators may be extremely important in predicting job stress” (p. 178).

Studies by Kirk (1988), Murray (1995) and DeMato (2001) found that the majority of elementary school counselors surveyed in Virginia were satisfied to very satisfied with their jobs. The only areas of dissatisfaction were salary (DeMato, 2001; Kirk 1990; Murray, 1995), and school system policies and practices, and advancement (Kirk, 1990). Both Kirk and Murray found that the area providing the most job satisfaction was “opportunity to provide service to others.”

Billingsley and Cross (1992) found that lower satisfaction related to job conditions, making work related variables better predictors of job satisfaction than demographic variables. Factors associated with high job satisfaction include greater leadership support and work involvement (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Baughman, 1996) along with positive student improvement (Brunetti, 2001; Baughman, 1996).

Ruhland (2001), in his study on the factors of turnover and retention of Minnesota's secondary career and technical education teachers, found that “Teachers who rate themselves
higher in skills and abilities, values, and professional accomplishments exhibit more career satisfaction” (p.12).

*Family and Consumer Sciences*

A study by Bartley and Sneed (2004) of FCS teachers in a southern state sought to discover the level of satisfaction with their profession and to develop a demographic profile of FCS teachers. Their findings indicated that FCS teachers (in that state) had high levels of satisfaction with their FCS teaching careers. Although further study is needed to determine specific factors contributing to their satisfaction, Bartley and Sneed state that this information could be helpful in the recruitment of future FCS teachers.

Dainty & Belcher (2008), studying retention of FCS teachers in Kansas, found a connection between career satisfaction and teachers’ skills and abilities. Results indicated that improving teacher confidence in their personal skills and abilities could possibly improve retention. Additional institutional factors important to their willingness to continue teaching included an inner sense of knowing they were doing a good job and adequate time to complete job responsibilities.

Tucker (2009) designed a study to determine the job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers in Texas. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al., (1967) was used as the measure of general job satisfaction, as well as intrinsic and extrinsic levels of job satisfaction. Results indicated that the general job satisfaction of those participating in the study fell between very satisfied and satisfied. The levels of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction of participants were very satisfied and satisfied, respectively.
**Job Satisfaction and Demographic Variables**

Demographic variables have been examined in a number of studies to determine their effects on the overall level of job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with various aspects of the job experienced by workers in various positions. In this section the demographic variables which were studied, including age, gender, ethnicity, degree, and years teaching, will be explored.

**Age**

Recent studies by Bartley & Sneed (2004), Tucker (2009), and Mimbs (2000) provide demographic information about FCS teachers, which indicate that many are in their mid-forties to mid-fifties with findings of 72%, 67%, and 35% respectively. According to Newby (1999), research in understanding the impact of aging workers on organizations is important for several reasons; aging baby-boomers moving toward retirement, longer life spans, fear of a lack of social security benefits, and uncertain economic conditions.

In *Understanding Job Satisfaction* Gruneburg (1979) concurs that the general finding reported by Herzberg et al. (1959) on the relationship between job satisfaction and age, shows that job satisfaction starts high, declines, and then starts to improve again with increasing age in a U-shaped curve. Herzberg suggested that job satisfaction increased with age because as individuals age they usually adjust to their work and life situations. Another explanation for satisfaction of older individuals is “A Life Cycle Explanation: The ‘Job Change’ Hypothesis” provided by Wright & Hamilton (1978). Their explanation suggests that in normal career movement one starts at the bottom of the career ladder and moves up; meaning older workers would have better jobs. In support of that theory, Birmingham (1984) found that teachers under 25 years of age and over 55 were the most satisfied, while Farber
(1984) found teachers 34-44 years of age were at greatest risk of job dissatisfaction. Regarding age, research on Extension faculty’s level of job satisfaction conducted by Nestor & Leary found intrinsic job satisfaction was higher for those in the age groups of 23 to 33 and 46 to 50 (2000). An earlier study of Extension home economists had similar findings of age being related to job satisfaction (Griffin, 1984).

Struble (1993) used Herzberg and Sergiovanni’s studies to evaluate teachers’ perceptions of satisfaction/dissatisfaction finding that less experienced younger teachers were more satisfied with their jobs. Holley & Kirkpaterick (1987) stated “a teacher in her first year of teaching may realize satisfaction from putting her education into practice” (p. 119).

Contrary to findings of other researchers, Saleh & Otis (1964) and Dinham & Scott (1996) concluded that older teachers were more likely to report larger drops in satisfaction than younger teachers. Berns (1989) found no significant differences between groups of teachers by age for secondary vocational educators in Ohio. Studies of secondary agriculture teachers resulted in similar findings (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1990; Cano, 1990; Castillo, Conklin, and Cano 1999).

**Gender**

Concerning gender, there are no simple conclusions about the differences between males and females and their job satisfaction levels. The literature is divergent, with some studies indicating that females were more likely to experience higher levels of job satisfaction than males, (Bowen, Radhakrishna, & Keyser, 1994; Riggs & Beus, 1993; Scott, Swortzel & Taylor, 2005) while other studies indicated the opposite (Herzberg et al., 1959; Worrell, 2004). Still other studies (Castillo et al., 1999; Nestor & Leary, 2000, Padilla-Velez, 1993) indicated that there is no relationship between gender and job satisfaction levels.
Gruneburg (1979) stated there is some evidence that males and females differ in what they expect from a job. He further proposed that the differences between job satisfaction for men and women can be explained in their differences toward the orientation of the job, whereby female workers were less concerned with career aspects and more concerned with social aspects while men are more oriented toward competitiveness. Similarly, Jorde (1984) stated that evidence indicates female teachers are “less concerned with the career aspects of their jobs than their male counterparts” while “males want more from their jobs in terms of achievement and recognition” (p. 23).

**Race**

Few studies of job satisfaction reviewed included the factor of race. Research on the relationship between these two yields mixed results as indicated by the following studies.

For Extension agents, race had a low relationship with general job satisfaction, with Caucasians rating this construct lower than other races that indicated a lower level of satisfaction with their jobs in general (Scott et al., 2005). Billingsley and Cross (1992) found job satisfaction to be lower among non-whites when comparing general and special educators. Findings from a study of fifty-seven Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in Texas indicated a slight variance in job satisfaction levels of the different race categories with African American teachers indicating a slightly higher level of satisfaction than other categories (Tucker, 2009). Weaver’s findings indicated that Caucasians are consistently more satisfied than other races (1980). According to Worrell (2004), some researchers agree that a slight (2-5 percent) difference does exist primarily due to unequal treatment in the workplace.

Some studies have shown that race and job satisfaction are not related (Brush, Moch & Pooyan, 1987; Herzberg et al., 1957). Studies of Home Economics (now “Family and

*Educational Level*

Reviews of job satisfaction studies that include educational level as a variable indicate mixed outcomes. Some studies showed that workers with more education have a higher job satisfaction level, while other studies indicate that workers with more education have a lower job satisfaction level. Additionally, there were also studies that indicated no relationship between the two (Scott et al., 2005).

Berns (1989) discovered teachers with a master’s degree were more satisfied with their teaching position than a teacher with only a bachelor’s degree. Smith’s study (1995) of home economics teachers in Ohio indicates similar findings. However an earlier study of home economic teachers from North Carolina indicated those with a bachelor’s degree were more satisfied than those with a master’s degree (Weiner & Clawson, 1984).

According to Holley and Kirkpaterick (1987), in their study of home economics teachers in Alabama, education level was not related to any of the job satisfaction constructs. Other researchers have found this same conclusion (Bowen et al., 1994; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Castillo et al., 1999; Herzberg et al., 1957).

*Years Teaching*

A variety of results occurred in the studies investigating a relationship between the number of years of experience and job satisfaction. Nestor and Leary (2000) found that as one’s years of experience increased as an Extension faculty member, their intrinsic and overall job satisfaction increased as well. This was also true for 4-H agents (Bowen et al.,
1994), FCS teachers (Holley & Kirkpatereick, 1987; Tucker, 2009) and also Extension agents (Fetsch & Kennington, 1997). In contrast, St. John and Pestle (1992), Smith (1995) and Cano & Miller (1992) found no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience. According to the MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, “Interestingly, satisfied teachers cannot be distinguished from dissatisfied teachers by years of teaching experience. About one-third of both satisfied (36%) and dissatisfied (32%) teachers have 10 or fewer years of experience, and teachers with 21 years or more experience are also just as likely to be dissatisfied (40%) as satisfied (33%)” (MetLife, 2006, p. 75).

Summary

The primary goal of this chapter was to review and summarize selected theories and literature relevant to the understanding of job satisfaction among FCS teachers and to discuss demographic variables that influence their job satisfaction. Based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory, Herzberg and colleagues developed the dual factor Motivator-Hygiene theory which refuted Hoppock’s single continuum concept. The theory separated job factors into motivation factors (satisfiers) involving the intrinsic nature of the job and hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) which are found in the environment of the job (extrinsic). The Motivator-Hygiene theory has drawn considerable debate even though cited in numerous job satisfaction studies. Despite the possible limitations of the motivation–hygiene theory, many researchers and practitioners still find it attractive because its contribution has influenced current studies on organizational behavior, which has greatly improved educational administrators’ understanding of employee behavior (Ololube, 2007).

This review of the literature indicated that questionnaires are the most common instrument used to measurement job satisfaction. One of the most widely cited
questionnaires, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), was examined. The MSQ is a gender-neutral, self-administered inventory measuring job satisfaction based on analysis of the relationships of twenty facets (see Table 2).

Different studies conducted to investigate job satisfaction were reviewed. While surveyed populations, methodologies and instruments differ, findings include some familiar threads. Combinations of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards influence teachers’ decisions to remain in the profession. Intrinsic rewards include feeling that they are making a difference in the lives of their students, developing new skills, and expanded influence on the job. Extrinsic rewards revolve around salary, benefits, job advancement, and leadership opportunities (Johnson et al., 2005).

The number of job satisfaction studies conducted in the area of family and consumer sciences teachers when compared to job satisfaction studies in general are relatively sparse. However, to gain an understanding of the factors related to job satisfaction of teachers, specifically FCS teachers, studies investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and demographic variables were examined. Demographic variables, including age, gender, race, degree, and years teaching, were investigated. Findings yielded mixed results indicating that the extent to which demographic variables may be related to the job satisfaction of teachers cannot be conclusively determined based on the research examined.
Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers who are currently teaching FCS. Previous research findings indicate a connection between job satisfaction and teacher turnover rates (Johnson et al., 2005; Weiss, 1999). Research indicating why teachers stay or leave the teaching profession may be useful in developing teacher inservice programming and policies geared toward attracting and retaining educators.

Research Design

A descriptive research design was followed in this study. Due to researcher limitations, a web-based survey was utilized to collect the data. Limitations for the researcher included time and cost. The school e-mail addresses for the respondent sample were used limiting survey distribution time to the school calendar. Research on web-based surveys has found that they are inexpensive, have a short response time (Granello & Wheaton, 2004, Jansen, et al., 2007; Lazar & Preece, 1999), and can achieve similar response rates compared to those delivered by mail (Ganassali, 2008).

Population

The target population for this study was Wisconsin Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) public school teachers who were currently teaching FCS. Names and contact details of potential participants were obtained from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, which provided a list of family and consumer sciences teachers who were currently employed in the state of Wisconsin. Undergraduate students were hired to conduct a search of school district websites to obtain each instructor’s current email address. The result of that
search yielded 735 Wisconsin FCS educators with current email addresses, which provided the population sampling frame for this study.

**Instruments**

The survey for this study consisted of two sections, combined for delivery/data collection, which was self administered by participants via the internet. The sections consisted of (a) a Teacher Profile section developed by the researcher with input from public school educators gathered demographic data, including age, gender, race, degree type and years in teaching; and (b) a web-based version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form (see Appendix A).

The Teacher Profile section was used to gather information about selected characteristics of the respondents. The review of literature on job satisfaction assisted in selection of the items on the Teacher Profile section. The selected variables and their definitions, adapted from other studies (Ghazi, 2004; Newby, 1999; and Tucker, 2009), follow:

**Age:** referred to the length of life for each respondent. Age was measured by asking the respondents to select the appropriate given age range. Ranges included under 23 years, 23-34 years, 35-44 years, 45-54 years, 55-64 years, and 65 years or over.

**Gender:** referred to the sex of the respondent. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select “male or “female”.

**Race/Ethnicity:** referred to the self-identified ethnicity of the respondent. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select the ethnic group that applied to them.

**Degree:** referred to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of studies. Degree was measured by asking respondents to select their highest
degree from given options including bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, masters plus 30 semester hours, and doctorate degree.

**Years as a family and consumer sciences teacher:** referred to the respondent’s number of years of experience as a family and consumer sciences teacher. The variable was measured by asking respondents to fill in the number of years the respondent had been a family and consumer sciences teacher.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is intended to evaluate the degree to which needs and values are satisfied by a job. It is copyrighted by the University of Minnesota, Vocational Psychology Research Department, and required permission for its use (see Appendix B). The MSQ was selected primarily because it is one of the most widely utilized measures of job satisfaction in research (Spector, 1997) and can be administered to either groups or to individuals. The questionnaire is designed to assess satisfaction with 20 separate aspects of the work environment that pertain to psychological needs (see Table 2). The MSQ short form is composed of one question from each of the twenty aspects. It takes about five minutes to complete, is at a fifth grade reading level, meets accepted standards for reliability and shows evidence of validity (Weiss, et al., 1967).

The MSQ short form consists of twenty questions which make up three scales: Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction. The intrinsic satisfaction was measured by twelve of the twenty questions with six of the remaining questions measuring extrinsic satisfaction. All twenty of the questions added together measured general satisfaction (see Table 3). The respondent rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from being Very Satisfied (1) to Very Dissatisfied (5). It was self-
administered, with directions for the respondent stated on the beginning page. Further instructions were located at the top of each page (see Appendix A).

The *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (Weiss et al., 1967) provides documentation about the instrument’s construct, concurrent, and content validities. Construct validity of the MSQ “is derived mainly from its performing according to theoretical expectations” (p. 16). According to Spector (1997), researchers have used the short form of the MSQ with “acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for extrinsic and intrinsic scales and total scores” (p. 15). Weiss et al. reported that Hoyt reliability coefficients for each short form scale were high. The intrinsic scale coefficients ranged from 0.84 to 0.91. For the extrinsic scale, the coefficients varied from 0.77 to 0.82. The reported median reliability coefficients were 0.86 for intrinsic satisfaction, 0.80 for extrinsic satisfaction, and 0.90 for general satisfaction. For this study Cronbach’s alpha analysis revealed a high reliability coefficient for general job satisfaction (.91), the intrinsic scale (.87), and the extrinsic scale (.84) indicating that the MSQ had internal consistent reliability for this particular group.

Weiss et al. (1967) stated that the validity of the short form can be implied from validity for the long-form. Additional evidence for the concurrent validity of the MSQ is derived from the study of 25 occupational groups’ differences in satisfaction. Data for these groups were analyzed by one-way analyses of variance to test differences; results indicated that both the mean and variances for all 20 MSQ dimensions were statistically significant at the 0.001 level. The findings showed that the MSQ can distinguish among groups from different occupations indicating professional groups were the most satisfied and unskilled groups the least satisfied. These findings support research literature on job satisfaction.
Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was accomplished through a self-administered, anonymous web based survey delivered through Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey is a web survey company located in the USA that provides software and instructions to create, gather, publish and view the results of custom surveys. Adaptations of procedures recommended in the research (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003; Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Solomon, 2001) were employed to strengthen the rate of return. This included sending a pre-notification e-mail, followed a few days later by an e-mail with a brief cover letter and link used to access the survey instrument. Two reminder e-mails that include a request to respond and a link to the survey were sent out at one week intervals. A final reminder e-mail was sent which included a personal message to please respond (see Appendix C). According to Dillman (2000) the overall response rate could be improved if final contact included a personalized message for response.

The responses were tracked in the Survey Monkey program maintaining confidentiality. To handle non-response error, data from those who responded to the initial email message was compared with data from those who responded to either the first, second or third follow-up email messages. According to Linder, Murphy, and Briers (2001), comparing early respondents to late respondents is an acceptable method for addressing nonresponse error as a threat to external validity. No differences were found between the responses of early and late respondents in this survey, indicating that the results are generalizable to the target population (Miller & Smith, 1983).
Web-based surveys

With the rapid advancement of Web technology and computer network access seeming to be everywhere in the world, alternative means of data collection are being made available to researchers. According to Pocknee and Robbie (2002) and Solomon (2001), web-based surveying is becoming widely used in educational research. The Web has been found to be a useful means of conducting research, especially for special populations such as educators, who regularly use the Internet (Couper, 2000; Sills & Song, 2002). Web-based surveys are “generally defined as survey instruments that physically reside on a network server (connected to either an organization’s intranet or the Internet), and that can be accessed only through a web browser” (Jansen et al., 2007, p. 2).

Common reasons for choosing this survey method over a traditional mailed paper-pencil approach include (a) faster response times, (b) increased response rates, and (c) decreased cost (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Jansen et al., 2007; Lazar & Preece, 1999). Cost savings for the researcher are associated with the elimination of printing, mailing, possible travel and interviewer expenses; and by having returned data already in an electronic format additional time and cost savings are realized (Dillman, 2000). Taking advantage of technological advances, web-based surveys can provide quick delivery, guaranteed confidentiality and the ability to transfer responses directly into a database, all of which may improve response rates and reliability of the data (Andrews, et al., 2003). According to Solomon (2001), several researchers have found that web-based surveys have a lower response rate than traditional mailed surveys. However, Ganassali (2008) states that it has been established that web-based surveys can achieve similar response rates compared to those delivered by mail.
Web-based surveys by their design are self administered and must be completed on a computer. They are not easily put aside to be completed at a different time or in a different setting as with traditional mail surveys. When designing a web-based survey, researchers are to consider that not all respondents will be computer literate or have access to up-to-date technology. Granello and Wheaton (2004) discussed the need for researchers using web-based surveys to maintain their formatting in all types of software and hardware environments and ensure that their pages are easily downloaded.

Web-based survey design is afforded a wide range of textual options, graphics and format control. There are also options for adding images, animation and color to enhance survey presentation, making them more challenging to design and more technically difficult to implement (Andrews et al., 2003). Dillman, Totora, Conradt, and Bowker (1998) found that surveys with advanced features that may add visual appeal and interest but that do not make clear what the respondent is to do result in lower response rates than surveys having simple black letters on a white screen.

Additionally, when looking at web-based survey design, it was found that placing the request for personal-demographic data at the beginning increased response rates (Frick, Bachtinger, & Reips, 1999). Andrews et al. (2003) state that by placing the personal data request at the beginning the researcher eliminates any surprise for the respondent, which may create greater trust leading to higher completion rates.

Response rates can also be affected by how survey subjects are invited to participate in the survey, and how survey completion is encouraged. Several researchers (Andrews et al., 2003; Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Solomon, 2001), recommend a multi-step process beginning with separating the invitation and survey; the original solicitation for participating
in the survey is done via email cover-letter with follow-up email reminders. Web-based surveys proceeded by an email cover-letter inviting individuals to the URL to participate had higher response rates than email surveys (Smith, 1997). Two meta-analyses cited by Ganassali (2008, p. 25) concluded that “the number, the persistence, and the personalization of the contacts are the dominant factors affecting rates of response in web surveys.”

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2007). Using SPSS software for analysis provided descriptive statistics of the participants and addressed the study’s objectives. The study attempted to determine which, if any, of the independent variables had a significant effect on the dependent variables. Intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction related variables were utilized as dependent variables; demographic variables were set as independent variables. Demographics included teachers’ age, gender, race/ethnic group, degree held and years of teaching experience, among others.

Responses to questions on the Teacher Profile section were analyzed and summarized using descriptive statistics which then provided a summary of the characteristics for the population surveyed.

For each of the proposed research questions there was a proposed method of analysis. For research question one (What is the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form?), frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics including appropriate measures of central tendency were computed and reported.

For research question two (What level of job satisfaction do FCS teachers report on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?), statistics were calculated for each of the twenty
dimensions of the MSQ. Frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics including appropriate measures of central tendency were computed and reported. Results were presented in descending order of means to observe dimensions reflecting relatively greater and relatively lesser satisfaction levels.

For research question three (Is there a relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables?), tests of statistical significance were carried out through a multiple regression analysis which incorporated a step-wise variable selection process utilizing 13 independent variables. Multiple regression procedures were used to determine if combinations of the independent variables showed a significant relationship to the dependent variable, general job satisfaction level.

The procedures for this research were approved by the Institutional Review Board, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa (see Appendix E).

Summary

This chapter provided a description of the quantitative research methods and the rationale for their use in this study. This study was an investigation of the job satisfaction of family and consumer sciences teachers in Wisconsin. Methodological strategies relating to participants, instrumentation, and data collection procedures were discussed. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1: What was the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form?

Research Question 2: What level of job satisfaction did FCS teachers report on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?

Research Question 3: Was there a relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables?

This chapter will present the analysis of data which were collected in the study of job satisfaction of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) teachers in Wisconsin. Using a descriptive research design this study followed survey protocol and was administered via the Internet. The survey consisted of two sections, (a) a Teacher Profile section developed by the researcher with input from public school educators to ascertain demographic data, including age, gender, race, degree type and years in teaching and (b) a web-based version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form (see Appendix A).

Survey Response

Of the 625 FCS teachers invited to participate in the study, five e-mailed to inform that they are no longer teaching FCS and 18 e-mail addresses were returned as undeliverable-no longer in the system. Removal of those 23 addresses yielded 602 valid e-mail addresses; these individuals were contacted with the e-mail invitation to participate in the study. Of that total, 389 individuals responded to the survey. This represented an overall response rate of 65% and included four which were deemed to be non-useable--- two were incomplete and two participants chose not to participate further. The final total number of usable responses
was 385—a 64% response rate. The percentages of returns during each step of data collection are presented in Table 4. Those not responding to the first initial e-mail message were declared non-respondents. To handle non-response error, data from those who responded to the initial e-mail message (321) were compared with data from those who responded to the second, third or fourth follow-up e-mail messages (64). It is possible to address non-response error as a threat to external validity by comparing early respondents to late respondents (Linder, et al., 2001). After analyzing the data of early respondents and late respondents, no significant differences were noted ($p < .05$); therefore the results were interpreted to be generalizable to the target population (Miller & Smith, 1983).

Table 4
Survey Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>% total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial (first) e-mail invitation</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with survey link</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second (follow-up) e-mailing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (follow-up) e-mailing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth (final follow-up) e-mailing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There were 602 possible participants.

Demographic Data

Participants’ responses to items on the Teacher Profile section of the instrument were used to describe the population and to identify relationships between demographic variables
and job satisfaction. The variables are reported in the order they appear on the Teacher Profile section.

**Age**

Table 5 represents the number and percentage of responses for each of the six age categories. Over half (59%, \( n = 227 \)) of the total respondents were between the ages 45-64.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 23 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- 34 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- 44 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45- 54 years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55- 64 years</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

The majority of respondents were female (374, 97.9%).

**Race**

The largest percentage of respondents in the sample was White (\( n = 381, 99.2\% \)). No participants reported their race/ethnic group as Asian, Hispanic and Latino, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Responses to the remaining categories made up less than 1% (\( n = 3 \)) of the total sample. One respondent in this study failed to complete this item.
Marital Status

A majority of respondents (80.9%, n = 310) reported being married at the time of this survey. There is the possibility of overlapping data due to remarried not being included as a selection; some respondents who reported being married may have been divorced and remarried.

Education Level

Table 6 reflects the number and percentage of responses for each degree level held by the participants of this study. Over 57% held a Master’s degree or higher (57.2%, n = 218) however no respondents reported having obtained a Doctorate degree. Four respondents in this study failed to complete this item.

Table 6

Highest Degree Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s plus 30 sem. hrs</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Four respondents failed to complete this item.

Yearly Income

As shown in Table 7, the largest number of respondents earned between $40,000 and $59,999 (52.1%, n = 198). Five respondents failed to complete this item.
Household Income

Of the 369 responses to this item, 27.9% \((n = 103)\) indicated that household income was between $100,000 and $149,000, followed by 24.4 percent \((n = 90)\) indicating a household income of between $80,000 and $99,999. Sixteen respondents failed to respond to this question.

Table 7
Yearly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 to $89,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Five respondents failed to complete this item.

Part Time or Full Time

Nearly eighty three percent of respondents \((82.5\%, n = 315)\) worked full time as family and consumer sciences teachers while 17.5% \((n = 67)\) worked part time as a family and consumer sciences teachers. Three respondents failed to respond to this question.
Years of Teaching

The least number of years teaching being reported by the respondents was one and the greatest 43 years with the mean number of years being 17. The median number of years teaching was 15.

Number of Placements in Career

The number of respondents and corresponding percent as shown in Table 8 indicate that 31.4% (n = 118) have not changed placements up to this point in their career. The greatest number of placement changes reported was 8 times, with the average number of placement changes being between 2 and 3 times. For this study “placement changes” was not defined and may have been interpreted differently by respondents (e.g. within the same district, in a different district, etc.).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of placement changes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 375 100.0

Note. Ten respondents failed to complete this item.
**Mentoring Program Participation**

Of the 385 responses, 273 (70.9%) respondents have participated in a mentoring program. Of those that have participated, 111 (40.7%) have been in a mentor role, 92 (33.7%) have been in a mentee role, with 70 (25.6%) having participated in both roles.

**Community in Which School is Located**

School setting categories were defined as follows: (a) rural- low population density; (b) suburban- residential community within commuting distance of an inner city and (c) urban- high population density, inner city. Over 47% of the respondents (47.7%, $n = 183$) reported that their school was in a rural community, 38.8% of the respondents ($n = 149$) reported that their school was in a suburban community, and 13.5% of the respondents ($n = 52$) reported that their school was in an urban community. One respondent failed to respond to this question.

**Class Size**

As shown in Table 9, the majority of respondents (72%, $n = 277$) indicated that their average class size is 20- 29 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10- 14 students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- 19 students</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- 24 students</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- 29 students</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family Income Level of Student Population

Based on their best estimate, the majority of respondents, 61.5% ($n = 236$) reported that their school’s student population came from middle income households while 35.2% ($n = 135$) reported their school’s student population came from low income households, and 3.4% ($n = 13$) reported the school’s student population came from high income households.

Research Questions

This section restates the research questions and discusses the data analysis and results. Data were summarized using frequencies, percentages, central tendency, and standard deviations. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if any relationship existed between independent variables and general job satisfaction (dependent variable).

Research Question 1

What was the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form?

Three hundred-eighty five family and consumer sciences teachers in Wisconsin completed the Teacher Profile section (see Appendix A) and the MSQ. For the MSQ, participants responded to 20 questions related to different dimensions of job satisfaction using a five point Likert scale. The Likert scale consisted of “Not Satisfied”=1.00; “Somewhat Satisfied”=2.00; “Satisfied”=3.00; “Very Satisfied”=4.00; and “Extremely Satisfied”=5.00.

All 20 of the questions added together measured a general level of job satisfaction. The frequency distribution on the general level of satisfaction ranged from a low score of 2.77 to a high of 4.38 (see Table 10). The mean score for general satisfaction was 3.94 with a standard deviation of 1.01. These results demonstrated that scores tended toward the high end
of the “satisfied” range, indicating that on the general level of job satisfaction, Wisconsin FCS teachers surveyed were “satisfied” with their jobs.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social service-chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety- chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability (utilization)- doing something that makes use of abilities</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity- chance to try own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity- being able to keep busy all of the time</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral values- ability to do job without going against conscience</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility- freedom to use own judgment</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement- feeling of accomplishment from the job</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security- providing for steady employment</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence- chance to work alone</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status- chance to “be somebody” in the community</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work conditions- overall working condition</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers- the way coworkers get along with one another</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (T)*- competence of supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (HR)**- the way the supervisor handles supervisees</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority- chance to tell others what to do</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition- praise for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; practices- the way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement- chances of advancement on the current job</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation- pay for the amount of work done</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General level of job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T= Technical; **HR= Human Relations
Research Question 2

What level of job satisfaction do FCS teachers report on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?

A mean score for each of the 20 dimensions was calculated and then ranked from the highest to the lowest mean (see Table 10). The responses were scored using a five point Likert scale which consisted of “Not Satisfied”=1.00-1.99; “Somewhat Satisfied”=2.00-2.99; “Satisfied”=3.00-3.99; “Very Satisfied”=4.00-4.99; and “Extremely Satisfied”=5.00.

Intrinsic job satisfaction

The MSQ Short-Form contained twelve questions that measured intrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction (see Table 3). The responses to those specific items were evaluated to determine the intrinsic job satisfaction level. In analyzing the frequency tables (see Appendix D) findings indicated ten of the twelve intrinsic questions (83%) received the highest percentage of responses by participants in the “very satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” range. Those dimensions receiving “extremely satisfied” as their largest response rate included Activity (42.6%), Variety (54.3%), Moral Values (41%), Security (37.4%), Social Services (49.6%), Ability (51.4%), and Creativity (44.4%). Three intrinsic dimensions received “very satisfied” as their largest response rate; these dimensions were Independence (34%), Responsibility (40.5%), and Achievement (35.8%). The remaining two, Social Status (30.6%) and Authority (47%) were both at the “satisfied” level for their highest percentage of responses. The job satisfaction scores based on intrinsic dimensions as a whole showed a mean level of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 0.92. Scores are based on a 5 point Likert scale (1.00= Not Satisfied to 5.00= Extremely Satisfied). Results indicated that the intrinsic
job satisfaction level of Wisconsin FCS teachers who participated in the study was “very satisfied.”

**Extrinsic Job satisfaction**

Six of the 20 questions on the MSQ were evaluated to determine the extrinsic satisfaction level of the survey participants. In analyzing the frequency tables (see Appendix D) findings indicated all of the six questions (100%) received the highest percentage of responses by participants in either the “satisfied” or “very satisfied” range. Two of the six extrinsic dimensions (33%) received “very satisfied” ratings and included Supervision HR (27%) and Supervision Tech (26.5%). The remaining four extrinsic dimensions were rated at the “satisfied” level and included Policies and Practices (30.6%), Compensation (33.2%), Advancement (40.3%), and Recognition (30.9%). These four extrinsic dimensions also received the highest percentages of “not satisfied” responses and had the lowest mean scores of all the dimensions; indicating that these dimensions continue to negatively influence job satisfaction for FCS teachers. The job satisfaction scores based on extrinsic dimensions as a whole showed a mean level of 3.03 with a standard deviation of 1.18. Scores are based on a 5 point Likert scale (1.00= Not Satisfied to 5.00= Extremely Satisfied). Results indicated that the extrinsic job satisfaction level of Wisconsin FCS teachers who participated in the study was “satisfied.”

The frequency of responses for each rating on the Likert scale is presented for each of the 20 dimensions. The responses were tabulated and are presented in tables found in Appendix D. Wisconsin FCS teachers were “very satisfied” with 6 dimensions: Social service, Variety, Ability, Creativity, Activity, and Moral values. They were only “somewhat satisfied” with Policies and practices, Advancement, and Compensation. For the remaining
dimensions, the FCS teachers were “satisfied.” A discussion of the summaries and a
description of each dimension are included in this section.

Activity

Activity, in the context of this study, refers to being able to keep busy all the time.
Data in Table D1 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (164 out of 377 or 43.5%) selected “extremely satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (129 out of 377 or 34.2%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (70 out of 377 or 18.6%) selecting “satisfied.” Only 3.7% of the respondents (n= 14) chose “somewhat satisfied” or “not satisfied.” The data show that the majority of the selections were between “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for being able to keep busy on the job.

Independence

Independence, in the context of this study, is defined as the chance to work alone on
the job. The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ
scale are found in Table D2. The highest number of FCS teachers (131 out of 378 or 34.7%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (108 out of 378 or 28.6%) selected “extremely satisfied” with the third highest number (104 out of 378 or 27.5%) selecting “satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (30 out of 378 or 7.9%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (5 out of 378 or 1.3%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the chance to work alone on the job.
**Variety**

Variety, in the context of this study, refers to the chance to do different things from time to time. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table D3. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (209 out of 382 or 54.7%) selected “extremely satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (122 out of 382 or 31.9%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (42 out of 382 or 13.4%) selecting “satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (6 out of 382 or 2.4%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (3 out of 382 or 0.8%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the chance to do different tasks on the job.

**Social status**

Social status, in the context of this study, refers to the chance to be “somebody” in the community. The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table D4. The highest number of FCS teachers (118 out of 381 or 31%) selected “satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (115 out of 381 or 30.2%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (99 out of 381 or 26%) selecting “extremely satisfied.” At the lower end the second lowest number of FCS teachers (36 out of 381 or 12.9%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (13 out of 381 or 3.4%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. Thus the majority of the respondents selected “very satisfied” and “satisfied” for social status.
**Supervision-Human Relations (HR)**

Supervision-human relations, in the context of this study, refers to the way the teachers’ supervisors supervise other school employees. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table D5. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (104 out of 384 or 27.1%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (84 out of 384 or 21.9%) selected “extremely satisfied” with the third highest number (81 out of 384 or 21.1%) selecting “satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (78 out of 384 or 20.3%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (37 out of 384 or 9.6%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the way their supervisor handles his/her workers.

**Supervision-Technical**

Supervision-technical, in the context of this study, refers to the competence of the teachers’ supervisors in making decisions. The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table D6. The highest number of FCS teachers (102 out of 382 or 26.7%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (90 out of 382 or 23.4%) selected “extremely satisfied” with the third highest number (85 out of 382 or 22.3%) selecting “satisfied.” At the lower end the second lowest number of FCS teachers (72 out of 382 or 18.8%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (33 out of 382 or 8.6%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. It was noted that the majority of the responses selected were between “extremely satisfied” and “satisfied” for supervision-technical.
Moral values

Moral values, in the context of this study, are defined as being able to do things that do not go against one’s conscience. The ratings for the MSQ scale found in Table D7 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (158 out of 382 or 41.4%) selected “extremely satisfied,” the second highest number (137 out of 382 or 35.9%) selected “very satisfied,” and the third highest number (63 out of 382 or 16.5%) chose “satisfied” for this aspect of the job. The second lowest number (21 out of 382 or 5.5%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the lowest number of teachers (3 out of 382 or 0.8%) selecting “not satisfied.” The majority of FCS teacher responses were between “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for this dimension of the job.

Security

Security, in the context of this study, is the way the job provides for steady employment. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table D8. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (144 out of 384 or 37.5%) selected “extremely satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (127 out of 384 or 33.1%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (71 out of 384 or 18.5%) selecting “satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (25 out of 384 or 6.5%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (17 out of 384 or 4.4%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” concerning job security.

Social Service

Social service, in the context of this study, refers to the chance to do things for other people. The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ
scale are found in Table D9. The highest number of FCS teachers (191 out of 383 or 49.9%) selected “extremely satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (142 out of 383 or 37.1%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (40 out of 383 or 10.4%) selecting “satisfied.” Less than 3% of the respondents ($n = 10$) chose “somewhat satisfied” or “not satisfied.” Therefore the majority of the selections were between “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the chance to do things for other people.

**Authority**

Authority, in the context of this study, is the opportunity to tell other people what to do. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table D10. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (181 out of 372 or 48.7%) selected “satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (89 out of 372 or 23.9%) selected “very satisfied” with the third highest number (46 out of 372 or 12.4%) selecting “extremely satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (41 out of 372 or 11%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (15 out of 372 or 4%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the chance to tell others what to do.

**Ability (utilization)**

Ability (utilization), in the context of this study, is the opportunity to do things on the job that makes use of one’s abilities. Data found in Table D11 show that the highest numbers of responses (198 out of 383 or 51.7%) were “extremely satisfied” with aspect of the job. The second highest number of FCS teachers’ responses (131 out of 383 or 34.2%) were “very satisfied,” and third highest (37 out of 383 or 9.7%) were “satisfied.” On the low end the
second lowest number of FCS teachers (13 out of 383 or 3.4%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (4 out of 383 or 1%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. It was noted that the majority of the responses selected were between “extremely satisfied” and “satisfied” for the opportunity to make use of their abilities.

**Policies and Practice**

Policies and practices, in the context of this study, refer to the way school policies are put into practice. Data presented in Table D12 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (118 out of 384 or 30.7%) selected “satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (104 out of 384 or 27.1%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the third highest number (81 out of 384 or 21%) selecting “very satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (47 out of 384 or 12.2%) selected “not satisfied,” and the lowest number (34 out of 384 or 8.9%) selected “extremely satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” for school policies and practices.

**Compensation**

Compensation, in the context of this study, is the pay for the amount of work that is done. The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table D13. The highest number of FCS teachers (128 out of 384 or 33.3%) selected “satisfied” with this dimension of the job, the second highest number (93 out of 384 or 24.2%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the third highest number (85 out of 384 or 22.1%) selecting “very satisfied.” The second to the lowest number of FCS teachers (52 out of 384 or 13.5%) selected “not satisfied,” and the lowest number (26 out of 384 or 6.8%) selected “extremely satisfied” for the pay they receive. For this dimension of the job the data
indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” for the compensation received for the amount of work that they do.

**Advancement**

Advancement, in the context of this study, represents the chance to get ahead on the job. Data pertaining to the frequencies of response for this dimension are located in Table D14. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (155 out of 380 or 40.8%) selected “satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (81 out of 380 or 21.3%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the third highest number (64 out of 380 or 16.8%) selecting “very satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (58 out of 380 or 15.3%) selected “not satisfied,” and the lowest number (22 out of 380 or 5.8%) selected “extremely satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” for the advancement opportunities in their positions.

**Responsibility**

Responsibility, in the context of this study, is defined as the freedom to use one’s own judgment. Data pertaining to the frequency of response for Responsibility are found in Table D15. The highest number of FCS teachers (156 out of 385 or 40.5%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (127 out of 385 or 33%) selected “extremely satisfied” with the third highest number (78 out of 385 or 20.3%) selecting “satisfied.” At the low end, the second lowest number of FCS teachers (21 out of 385 or 5.5%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (3 out of 385 or 0.8%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. From this data it can be noted that the
majority of the responses selected were between “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” concerning the freedom of teachers to use their own judgment.

**Creativity**

Creativity, in the context of this study, is defined as the chance to try one’s own methods of doing the job. The data in Table D16 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (171 out of 384 or 44.5%) selected “extremely satisfied,” the second highest number (136 out of 384 or 35.4%) selected “very satisfied,” and the third highest number (54 out of 384 or 14.1%) chose “satisfied” for this aspect of the job. The second lowest number (18 out of 384 or 4.7%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the lowest number of teachers (5 out of 384 or 1.3%) selecting “not satisfied.” The majority of FCS teacher responses were between “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for this dimension of the job.

**Work conditions**

Work conditions, in the context of this study, refer to the physical surroundings (heating, lighting, etc.). The frequencies of responses for this dimension of the job measured on the MSQ scale are found in Table D17. The data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (127 out of 384 or 33.1%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job, the second highest number (98 out of 384 or 25.5%) selected “extremely satisfied,” with the third highest number (92 out of 384 or 23.9%) selecting “satisfied.” The second to the lowest number of FCS teachers (51 out of 384 or 13.2%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (16 out of 384 or 4.2%) selected “not satisfied” for work conditions. For this dimension of the job the data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “Extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the conditions of the work environment.
Coworkers

Coworkers, in the context of this study, refer to the way coworkers get along with one another on the job. The data presented in Table D18 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (111 out of 385 or 28.8%) selected “very satisfied,” the second highest number (107 out of 385 or 27.8%) selected “satisfied,” and the third highest number (94 out of 385 or 24.4%) chose “extremely satisfied” for this aspect of the job. The second lowest number (51 out of 385 or 13.2% selected “somewhat satisfied,” with the lowest number of teachers (22 out of 385 or 5.7%) selecting “not satisfied.” The majority of FCS teacher responses were between “very satisfied” and “satisfied” for the way coworkers get along on the job.

Recognition

Recognition, in the context of this study, is defined as the praise one gets for doing a good job. The ratings for the MSQ scale found in Table D19 show that the highest number of FCS teachers (119 out of 382 or 31.2%) selected “satisfied,” the second highest number (88 out of 382 or 23%) selected “very satisfied,” and the third highest number (69 out of 382 or 18.1%) chose “somewhat satisfied” for this aspect of the job. The second lowest number (58 out of 382 or 15.2% selected “not satisfied,” with the lowest number of teachers (48 out of 382 or 12.6%) selecting “extremely satisfied.” The majority of FCS teacher responses were between “satisfied” and “very satisfied” for this dimension of the job.

Achievement

Achievement, in the context of this study, is the feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job. Data pertaining to the frequency of responses to Recognition are found in Table D20. Data show that the highest number of FCS teachers (138 out of 384 or 35.9%) selected “very satisfied” with this dimension of the job. The second highest number (133 out of 384
or 34.6%) selected “extremely satisfied” with the third highest number (76 out of 384 or 19.8%) selecting “satisfied.” Next to the lowest number of FCS teachers (28 out of 384 or 7.3%) selected “somewhat satisfied,” and the lowest number (9 out of 384 or 2.3%) selected “not satisfied” for this dimension of the job. The data indicated that the majority of the respondents selected “extremely satisfied” and “very satisfied” for the feeling of accomplishment the teachers perceive from their jobs.

**Research Question 3**

Is there a relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables?

To answer this research question, satisfaction scores for 13 of the 14 independent variables were analyzed through descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis using SPSS software. In looking at the groups within each independent variable as they relate to general job satisfaction, no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between groups (see Table 11).

**Age**

No statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) was found between means on the general satisfaction scale for different categories of the variable “Age.” The data indicated the mean on the general job satisfaction scale was 3.94 (SD= 1.01). As indicated by median comparisons there was no difference in job satisfaction levels between age categories (see Table 12). These findings are similar to studies where no significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between groups of teachers by age for secondary agriculture teachers (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1990; Cano, 1990; Castillo et al., 1999), studies of secondary vocational educators in Ohio (Berns, 1989) and Texas urban FCS teachers (Tucker, 2009). However,
several studies have shown a relationship between age and job satisfaction. Following a U-shaped curve satisfaction starts high with younger employees, declines during middle age years, and then starts to improve again as employees near retirement age (Gruneburg, 1979; Herzberg et al., 1957).

Table 11
Relationships Among Independent Variables and General Level of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ family income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing positions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income (Teacher)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistical significance is set at alpha < .05

Gender

Studies reviewed indicate a divergent mix of conclusions about the differences between males and females and their job satisfaction levels. In this study, no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between the mean scores on the general job satisfaction scale between the categories of gender. The mean score on the general
satisfaction scale for females was 3.94 (SD=1.01) and 3.75 (SD=0.87) for males. The differences between the standard deviations indicated that male respondents were more similar in responses to job satisfaction than female respondents.

Table 12

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- 34 yrs</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- 44 yrs</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45- 54 yrs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55- 64 yrs</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 yrs or older</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

This variable was not analyzed as a predictor of job satisfaction for this study since the respondents were overwhelmingly white (n = 381, 99.2%).

Marital Status

This current study along with a majority of the studies that considered marital status found no significant difference (p < .05) in the level of satisfaction and marital status (Weiner & Clawson, 1984; Grady, 1985, St. John & Pestle, 1992; Smith, 1995). Two studies reported that married teachers were more satisfied with their jobs than single, divorced, or widowed (Martin & Light, 1984; Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). In this study, no statistically significant differences (p < .05) were found between job satisfaction and marital status. However median scores do indicate that those respondents in the widowed category were slightly more satisfied. The differences between the standard deviations indicated that divorced respondents were more dissimilar as a group in responses to job satisfaction (see Table 13).
Table 13
Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highest Academic Degree*

Reviews of job satisfaction studies that include educational level as a variable indicated mixed outcomes. Two studies (Berns, 1989; Smith, 1995) showed that workers with more education have higher job satisfaction, while another study (Weiner & Clawson, 1984) indicated that workers with more education have lower job satisfaction. Additionally, the majority of studies reviewed indicated no relationship between the two (Bowen et al., 1994; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Castillo et al., 1999; Herzberg et al., 1957; Holley & Kirkpaterick, 1987).

A similar level of satisfaction was reported for FCS teachers with a Bachelor’s, Master’s, or Master’s +30 (see Table 14).

Table 14
Highest Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s +30</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of Teaching

Studies investigating a relationship between the number of years of experience and job satisfaction relayed a variety of results. Two studies with FCS teachers indicated that as one’s years of experience increased overall job satisfaction increased as well (Holley & Kirkpaterick, 1987; Tucker, 2009). This was also true for 4-H agents (Bowen et al., 1994), and also Extension agents (Fetsch & Kennington, 1997). In contrast, St. John and Pestle (1992), Smith (1995) and Cano & Miller (1992) found no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience. In this study, no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were found on the general satisfaction scale for years of teaching (see Table 15).

Table 15
Years of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0- 5 yrs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- 10 yrs</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- 15 yrs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- 20 yrs</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- 25 yrs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- 30 yrs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ yrs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following factors (personal income, household income, teaching load, changes in placement, mentor program participation, community, class size, and student’s family income level) were either not addressed in the studies reviewed or were addressed by very few of the studies reviewed.

No statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) was found on the general satisfaction scale for personal income, household income, teaching load, changes in placement, mentor
program participation, community, class size, and student’s family income level. The
different income categories showed a slight variance in job satisfaction levels; with those at
the low end and high end reporting the highest levels of satisfaction.

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the level of relationship between
selected demographic variables and general job satisfaction. The regression model was
generated with SPSS version 16. The regression analysis incorporated a step-wise variable
selection process that utilized the 13 independent variables. Based on previous research and
the research questions in the current study, the following variables were selected: age,
gender, marital status, degree level, income, household income, teaching load, years
teaching, number of placements, mentor program participation, school community, class size,
and students’ family income level. All independent variables were dropped out of the step-
wise regression indicating that none of the independent variables were statistically significant
\((p < .05)\) sources of general job satisfaction. The independent variables as a set accounted for
only 4.5% of the variance in general job satisfaction (see Table 16).

**Summary**

This chapter presented the findings of the three research questions posed pertaining to
Wisconsin FCS teacher satisfaction. A total of 385 FCS teachers responded to the survey for
a response rate of 64%. Analyses of the responses indicated that their overall level of job
satisfaction fell at the high end of the “satisfied” range, with FCS teachers being “satisfied”
or “very satisfied” with 17 of the 20 job dimensions measured by the MSQ. Analyses of the
responses also indicated that none of the demographic variables showed a statistically
significant relationship on the dependent variable- general level of job satisfaction, for FCS
teachers in Wisconsin.
Table 16

Multiple Regression Analysis of General Job Satisfaction on Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .212
R Squared = .045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Program</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Income Level</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Positions</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Income</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p < .05
CHAPTER 5

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Chapter 5 contains a brief review of the study which consisted of responses provided by 385 Wisconsin Family and Consumer Sciences public school teachers who were teaching FCS at the time of this study. This chapter provides a discussion of major research findings including conclusions and implications from those findings and concludes with recommendations based on those findings for further research.

Job satisfaction is an extensively researched area. During the last decade, job satisfaction has become a subject of increased interest in the education arena. According to Werhan and Way (2006), a shortage of FCS teachers due to turnover and an aging workforce continues to be a concern for many school districts. Previous research has indicated that turnover of teaching staff may in part be due to job dissatisfaction. Research previously conducted suggested that identifying and understanding factors of job satisfaction that influences retention of teachers is important to the sustainability and growth of education (Woods & Weasmer, 2002). The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the levels of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers.

The issue of job satisfaction in this study was focused around the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What is the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form?

Research Question 2: What level of job satisfaction do FCS teachers report on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ?
Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables?

Data related to the research questions were summarized using descriptive statistics (frequency distributions, percentages, central tendencies and standard deviations) with a multiple regression analysis additionally being carried out on 13 demographic factors. Findings were used to develop a profile of the teachers and determine levels of job satisfaction.

Discussion of Findings

Results for research question 1, which dealt with how satisfied family and consumer sciences teachers were overall with their jobs, indicated these teachers were at the high end (3.94) of the “satisfied” level. A Likert scale was used which consisted of “Not Satisfied”=1.00; “Somewhat Satisfied”=2.00; “Satisfied”=3.00; “Very Satisfied”=4.00; and “Extremely Satisfied”=5.00.

In this study few respondents (n=9 or 2.3%) reported that they were dissatisfied overall with their job as a FCS teacher. The findings in this study were similar to both earlier and more recent research findings on FCS teacher job satisfaction (Arnett & Polkinghorne, 2010, Bartley & Sneed, 2004; Kluckman & Brands, 1991; Mimbs, 2002; Tripp, 2006; Tucker, 2009).

Research question 2 addressed the level of job satisfaction FCS teachers reported on each of the 20 dimensions of the MSQ. According to the MSQ data, the majority of FCS teachers (70.3%, n = 281) rated their general job satisfaction level at the “very satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” level. In addition to general job satisfaction levels, specific dimensions of job satisfaction and their importance to FCS teachers were also measured in this study.
Results found that 87.3% of teachers who responded were “satisfied” to “extremely satisfied” with 17 of the 20 job dimensions measured by the MSQ.

The findings indicated that intrinsic dimensions yielded higher levels of satisfaction than extrinsic factors, although the measure was not statistically significant ($p < .05$). Of the 20 dimensions of job satisfaction the 11 highest ranked were all intrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction. The top six ranked dimensions were social service, variety, ability-utilization, creativity, moral values and activity, all of which had mean scores of 4.12 or higher, falling in the “very satisfied” range. This mirrors results from other job satisfaction studies (Brunetti, 2001; DeMato, 2001; Dinham & Scott, 1996; Herzberg et al., 1959; Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987; Huysman, 2007; Sergiovanni, 1967; Tucker, 2009).

In this study, the dimension that participants were most satisfied with was in social service. This indicates that FCS teachers were more content with their ability to help others than any other aspects of their jobs. In a study of FCS teachers in Texas, teachers claimed their relationship with students was the most satisfying aspect of their profession (Tucker, 2009). According to Herzberg et al. (1959), social service is an intrinsic dimension of the job, and therefore, represents a variable leading directly to job satisfaction when present in the occupation.

The Motivation-Hygiene theory indicated that extrinsic dimensions influence the perceived level of job dissatisfaction among employees (Herzberg et al., 1957). The three extrinsic dimensions that received the highest frequency of “somewhat satisfied” and “not satisfied” responses among participants in this study were compensation, advancement, and policies and practice. These findings were similar to findings in other studies of teacher job satisfaction (DeMato, 2001; Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987; Huysman, 2007; Tucker, 2009).
The dimension producing the most dissatisfaction in this study was compensation (feelings about pay in contrast to the amount of work completed). A number of things can be attributed to the FCS teacher’s low ranking of the compensation factor. As teachers try to carry out their ever-increasing duties, in today’s economic and political climate they often are met with such barriers as authority figures, politics, and lack of funds (Bane, 2006). Today, with more single-parent households and a rising cost-of-living, a teacher may be confronted with significant financial challenges. A teacher who must assume sole financial responsibility or whose salary is a necessary contribution to the family’s finances is more likely to experience extrinsic dissatisfaction (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). As school systems experience budget reductions, teachers’ salaries in general are increasing at smaller rates if at all; many experience furloughs, or in some cases layoffs. In order to limit school spending the Wisconsin legislators enacted the Qualified Economic Offer (QEO) in 1993. The QEO limited school boards from offering more that a 3.8% combined compensation offer for pay and benefits. As rising health insurance costs have taken most of the 3.8% total compensation allowed, teacher salaries in some districts have declined in Wisconsin. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Flickinger, 2010), while Wisconsin teachers have made small gains in salary in the past three years, it is clear that they remain steadily behind other states around them and those of most other states in the nation (see Table 17).

The findings show that the lack of career advancement is second to compensation when evaluating dimensions contributing to dissatisfaction. Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) concluded that the lack of career advancement due to the teaching profession having no well defined career hierarchy was a primary source of dissatisfaction among FCS teachers in their
Table 17
State Rank Based on Teachers’ Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54,683</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53,410</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47,070</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47,365</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48,263</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49,725</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53,463</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56,505</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat’l Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52,250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53,700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Flickinger, 2010)

study. According to Worrell (2004) dissatisfaction with career advancement is partially due to the fact that the teaching profession is both an entry level and terminal position. In larger school systems where a team or department of FCS teachers may be employed, an individual may have the opportunity to advance into a department chair role. In the 2009 Met Life Survey of the American Teacher nearly 37% responded that a hybrid role would be appealing. A hybrid role was described as teachers teaching in the classroom part-time as well as having other responsibilities or roles in their school setting. Another form of advancement may be to an administrator position such as a Local Vocational Education Coordinator or Career and Technical Education Coordinator, which may require additional education. Although this study did not investigate the rationale behind the dissatisfied ratings for the advancement dimension, the finding was not statistically significant ($p < .05$) to job satisfaction.

The policies and practices of a school affect a teacher’s satisfaction and may be to a large extent beyond a teacher’s control. The climate within a building and the workforce conditions it encompasses can cause dissatisfaction leading to teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 2001; Johnson, et al., 2001). Climates and working conditions that include teacher’s in
decisions regarding both instruction and school governance issues, have supportive administration, incorporate collaborative professional development opportunities (North Central Regional Education Laboratory [NCREL], 2001) and enforce student discipline policies are more successful in retaining teachers (Boyer & Gillespie, 2004; Ingersoll, 2001).

Involving teachers in decision making may improve (a) the relationship between administrators and teachers, (b) the decisions that are made, and (c) the likelihood that the decision will be implemented. A survey of Superintendents in a seven state region (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) found that treating teachers as professionals, by providing common planning time and involving them in decision making, helped in teacher retention (NCREL, 2001).

Drawing on his research and secondary-school teaching experiences, Ingersoll stated that schools’ policies should be examined as to whose policies are emphasized and what options or choices are in place for those who individually or collectively disagree with those policies. He hypothesized that “…if a school provides mechanisms for the protection of academic freedom and job security (such as tenure) and for voicing opposition (such as unions) those who disagree with school policies will be less likely to exit” (2001, p. 527-8). In Wisconsin there is currently a push to pass legislation that would severely restrict the collective bargaining rights of some public employee groups including teachers. The legislation would also restrict collection of union dues by school districts and require unions to recertify by vote every year. This would dramatically change the structure of the teachers’ union, which may lead to loss of representation and a lack of feeling protected mentioned by Ingersoll.
Research question 3 investigated the relationship between the general level of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers and specific demographic variables. Multiple regression analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant ($p < .05$) effect on the dependent variable—general job satisfaction, based on any of the independent variables. The lack of significance in these findings suggests that these factors are not serious sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction for family and consumer sciences teachers in Wisconsin. Research reviewed (e.g. Tripp, 2006; Tucker, 2009) indicates that other dimensions of the job, specific to the content area, may provide further insight into the area of job satisfaction.

Analysis of the demographic data portrayed the typical Wisconsin FCS teacher as a white female, older than 45 years of age, with a Master’s degree, teaching full time for an average of 17 years. In taking a closer look at some of the independent variables found in a review of the available research we find some similar results and concerns for the profession.

**Age**

The majority of the respondents to this study were 45-65+ years. This supports other’s findings of an aging teacher population. Bartley and Sneed (2004) found that just over 40% of the FCS respondents were over age 50, while Mimbs (2002) results indicated nearly three-fourths were 41-55 years in her sample. Tripp (2006) reported just over 56% of her respondents were 51-60 and for Tucker’s (2009) sample over 60% were age 45-55+ years.

**Gender and Ethnicity**

The research has reported on issues of diversity of FCS teachers. Werhan and Way (2006) reported that there were 252 males out of an estimated 37,500 FCS teachers in the United States in 2002-2003 school year. In studies of FCS teachers by Mimbs (2002), Tripp
(2006) and St. John & Pestle (1992), respondents were reported as 100% female and predominantly white. Tucker’s study (2009) in Texas reported one male out of 57 respondents with nearly 65% white. In other reports, over 90% of the respondents were white (Bartley & Sneed, 2004; Mimbs, 2000). In an exploration of men in FCS, Werhan discussed gender stereotypes of FCS content and the teaching profession as a whole. She stated that “the stereotype of FCS education being ‘women’s work’ continues. The recruitment of men may…help lessen stereotypes that serve to limit the impact of and respect for the entire FCS profession” (2010, p. 27).

Degree

The demographic data collected showed that 57.5% of the FCS teachers responding to the survey had a master’s degree; 42.5% reported having a bachelor’s degree and no participant reported having a doctorate. All degree levels showed a nearly equal level of satisfaction with findings also indicating no relationship of degree level to job satisfaction. This mirrored the findings of several other studies (Bowen et al., 1994; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Castillo et al., 1999; Herzberg et al., 1957).

Years of Teaching

Results show over 63% of respondents have been teaching for less than 20 years with those teaching 21 years or more (37%) being slightly more satisfied than those with less experience. Similar findings indicating an increase in job satisfaction as years of experience increased were reported in studies by Holley & Kirkpaterick (1987) and Tucker (2009).

Retention rates can also be affected by the number of years a teacher has spent in a particular location. The more years working in a particular district, the more costly it
becomes to leave, simply because pay, responsibilities, and job opportunities are often tied directly to experience within the same school district (Kain, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2004).

Mentoring Program Participation

Findings for this study indicate that those that had participated in a mentoring program were only slightly more satisfied than those who had not participated (but not statistically significant, \( p < .05 \)). Studies indicate that addressing the learning needs of new teachers through induction and mentoring programs raise retention rates for new teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Ingersoll & Kralik, 2004; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Mimbs, 2000). A review of literature conducted by Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley (2006) indicates that “types of induction support that had the strongest positive association with retention were having a mentor in the same field” (p. 198). Theobald and Michael’s findings suggest that on-going mentoring programs should be a shared responsibility that promotes teacher learning across all experience levels (2001). In Wisconsin each school district is required to have a mentor program in place. There is no standard program; each district has the autonomy to design and put their program into practice; leading to varying levels of program effectiveness.

Limitations of the Study

This study as with all survey research was subject to certain limitations. A main limitation was that both sections of the survey, the teacher profile section and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, were self-report instruments. With self-reporting, inadequate answers cannot be probed for more specific or relevant responses, and if the question is unclear to the respondent, there is no interviewer to explain the question. There was also a limitation in that the study was limited to the respondents’ responses on the twenty given
dimensions of the job as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The study was limited to the factors included in the MSQ, therefore other specific areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction may not have been revealed. The findings were also limited by the accuracy of the responses provided by the participating teachers. FCS teachers’ level of interest in the study and their willingness to respond to the questionnaire may also have had an effect on responses.

**Conclusions**

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the levels of job satisfaction of FCS teachers in Wisconsin as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Considering this purpose, the findings revealed that FCS teachers working in a Wisconsin public school reported a general job satisfaction level of “satisfied” in their current positions, as well as levels of “satisfied” to “extremely satisfied” with 17 of the 20 job dimensions as measured by the MSQ short form. The mean satisfaction score of 3.94 on a scale of 1.00 (not satisfied) to 5.00 (extremely satisfied) was the finding that supports this conclusion. According to these results, the majority of family and consumer sciences teachers in Wisconsin are having a positive experience in their present jobs.

The findings also indicate that FCS teachers were most satisfied with intrinsic dimensions (e.g. social service, variety, ability-utilization, creativity, moral values, activity, responsibility, achievement, security, independence, social status, and authority) than with extrinsic dimensions (e.g. compensation, advancement, policies and practices and recognition). These conclusions are not surprising since similar conclusions were reached for FCS teachers in California (Tripp, 2006), Illinois (Arnett & Polkinghorne, 2010), Florida (St.John & Pestle, 1992), Missouri (Mimbs, 2002), North Carolina (Weiner & Clawson,
and a southern state (Bartley & Sneed, 2004).

In light of the small percentage of those surveyed indicating they were “not satisfied” (2.3%), or only “somewhat satisfied” (6.5%) with their job as an FCS teacher the findings of this study are important. The research reaffirmed that the profession is facing a critical time; shortages are increasing with an imbalance of supply and demand caused by teachers changing professions or retiring. With research indicating that job satisfaction is a critical element for attracting and retaining educators, this study provides direction for more content specific research into this crucial area of FCS education.

**Recommendations for the Profession**

1. With the knowledge of job factors that FCS teachers find to be satisfying, administrators and school boards can improve their recruiting, interviewing, evaluating and ultimately retention of FCS teachers, strengthening the continuity of the FCS program in their school.

2. Family and consumer sciences teachers in Wisconsin perceive extrinsic dimensions (e.g. compensation, advancement, policies and practices and recognition) as dissatisfiers. The elimination or reduction of these dissatisfiers should be addressed by stakeholders (e.g. administrators and school board members). Raising salaries and increasing benefits will ultimately keep some teachers in the field. However, in light of the poor economic conditions in Wisconsin, salary increases are not a realistic possibility. This study also indicated that higher levels of satisfaction came from many intrinsic dimensions of the job. Dimensions that do not necessarily add an additional financial burden to a school district include:
• doing for other people
• doing different things
• using one’s abilities and creativity
• being free to use one’s judgment and trying one’s own methods
• providing teachers with a sense of accomplishment through recognition
• These dimensions of the job can, to a large part, be enhanced without a large investment of new resources.

3. Findings indicate that recruitment of minorities and males is needed. With nearly 98% of respondents indicating they were females, and 99% of respondents indicating they were “white”, there are definite imbalances that should be addressed. With data collected nationally indicating that student enrollments at the secondary level in FCS were fairly equal between genders (Werhan & Way, 2006), a more gender balanced teaching force would be desirable. A further consideration for recruiting more males is the elevation of the teaching profession as a whole. A review of literature indicates that teaching lacks status as a profession (Cushman, 2005; Johnson et al., 2004). According to Werhan (2010), an increased number of competent men serving as role models in the teaching profession and specifically in FCS would be beneficial to all students in helping to lessen the stereotypes that limit the respect for the profession.

4. Based on the findings of this study and others, the high satisfaction levels of FCS teachers and the number of available teaching positions could be used in recruiting students to post secondary programs.


Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the conclusions of this research, the following recommendations are presented for consideration to strengthen research in the area of FCS education and specifically FCS teacher job satisfaction:

1. Because the majority of Wisconsin FCS teachers indicated they were at least “satisfied” with their role as a FCS teacher, it is recommended that data be collected from those who ended their employment in an effort to determine their perceived level of job satisfaction and the factor(s) that influenced their decision.

2. Researchers should investigate the job satisfaction of FCS teachers using qualitative methods in order to gather data from a different perspective and provide a more in depth understanding of how FCS teachers view their jobs. Responses to these questions may provide Higher Ed faculty with a better picture of a typical position that could be passed on to their current or potential students.

Open ended survey or personal interview questions may include:

- How has the current political climate affected how you feel about your job?
- How has the current social climate affected how you feel about your job?
- What are the significant impediments to the preferred role and function of your job?
- What are the significant supports that allow you to perform the preferred role and function of your job?
- Are there factors that have not been asked about that would help in understanding your level of job satisfaction?
- Do you plan on remaining in your current position at your present school for the next 5 yrs? If yes, for how long? If no, why not?
- What level do you teach; middle school, high school or combination?
- What are the courses that are taught?

3. Researchers should also investigate the possible trend towards shortages of FCS teachers due to retirement as well as possible recruitment efforts. Several of the studies reviewed indicated findings of an aging FCS teacher population (Bartley &
Sneed, 2004; Mimbs, 2002; Tripp, 2006; Tucker, 2009) and a documented shortage of qualified teachers (Werhan & Way, 2006) leading to a concern that programs may close if the supply does not improve.

4. A longitudinal study tracking FCS teacher’s job satisfaction and retention rates would be beneficial to school districts and institutes providing FCS teacher education programs.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of the research and a summary of the findings. The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the levels of job satisfaction of Wisconsin FCS teachers who are currently teaching FCS. The results indicate that FCS teachers working in a Wisconsin public school reported a general job satisfaction level of “satisfied” in their current positions, as well as levels of “satisfied” to “extremely satisfied” with 17 of the 20 job dimensions as measured by the MSQ short form. These results are similar to past studies around the country. In the current study, a statistical analysis of 13 variables revealed that none were related at a statistically significant level (p<.05) to the general level of job satisfaction of FCS teachers. In conclusion, recommendations were made for the profession and future research.
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APPENDIX A

Survey

1. What is your age? (select one)
   - Under 23 years
   - 23-34 years
   - 35-44 years
   - 45-54 years
   - 55-64 years
   - 65 years or over

2. What is your gender? (select one)
   - female
   - male

3. What is your primary race/ethnic group? (select one)
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Other

4. What is your current marital status? (select one)
   - Single, never married
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Would rather not say

5. What was the last grade or level of school that you completed? (select one)
   - Bachelor's degree
   - Master's degree
   - Masters plus 30 semester hours
   - Doctorate degree
6. **What is your yearly income? (select one)**

- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more

7. **What is your total household income? (select one)**

- $10,000 to $19,999
- $20,000 to $29,999
- $30,000 to $39,999
- $40,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $59,999
- $60,000 to $69,999
- $70,000 to $79,999
- $80,000 to $89,999
- $90,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,999
- $150,000 or more

8. **How much of your teaching assignment is Family and Consumer Sciences? (select one)**

- Part time
- Full time

9. **Including the current school year, how many years of teaching Family and Consumer Sciences do you have?**
10. In your career, how many times have you changed placements as an Family and Consumer Sciences teacher?

11. Have you ever participated in a teacher mentoring program? (select one)
   - Yes
   - No

12. If you answered yes to question 11, which role have you been in? (select one)
   - Mentor
   - Mentee
   - Both

13. How would you describe the community your school district is in? (select one)
   - Rural (low population density)
   - Suburban (residential community within commuting distance of an inner city)
   - Urban (high population density - inner city)

14. What is the average class size that you teach? (select one)
   - 10-14 students
   - 15-19 students
   - 20-24 students
   - 25-29 students
   - 30+ students

15. Based on your best estimate of the student population at your school what family income level would the majority of your students come from? (select one)
   - Low income
   - Middle income
   - High income
On this page you will find statements about your present job. Please read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about the aspects of your job described by the statements provided.

Please be frank and honest with your responses, giving a true picture of your feelings about your present job. (Modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Copyright 1967, Vocational Psychology Research; U of M. Reproduced by permission)

### 16. Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my boss handles his/her workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17. Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Permission

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus
Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts
N218 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Office: 612-625-2818
Fax: 612-626-2079
www.psych.umn.edu
Email: psymain@umn.edu

July 30, 2010

Marhsa Larson
230 Shorewood Ter
WI Rapids, WI 54494

Dear Marsha Larson:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1967 short form on a secure web site is your research project as you requested.

Please note that each copy that you make must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1967, Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota. Reproduced by permission.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) Demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including, scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
APPENDIX C

E-mail Letter and E-mail Scripts to FCS Teachers

E-MAIL LETTER AND E-MAIL SCRIPTS TO FCS TEACHERS

First e-mail letter to be sent to participants in the survey to indicate upcoming e-mail

"Marsha Larson" <malarson@uwsp.edu>  
April 10, 2010

Dear Fellow Family and Consumer Sciences teacher,

I am in the process of designing a study that will aid in the collection of data to explore job satisfaction among Wisconsin Family and Consumer Sciences teachers.

You have been selected to participate in an internet survey to identify what characteristics of the job teaching Family and Consumer Sciences in a Wisconsin school district contribute to job satisfaction. Soon, you will receive an e-mail from (Survey Monkey) entitled FCS Teacher’s Job Satisfaction Survey.

Please take 10 minutes to complete this important survey, as it will yield valuable information for our profession. Your response to this e-mail is vital.

Your individual responses will be kept in strict confidence. Your personal information will not be associated with your response. The principal researcher will use a protected password, to access data from the web-based survey.

There are no foreseeable risks from participating in this study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not feel comfortable completing the questionnaire, you are free to discontinue at any time. There is no penalty or loss to you for not completing the survey or if you begin the survey but wish to withdraw and discontinue. You can skip any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. By participating, you give the researchers your consent to participate.

As a teacher, I realize how valuable your time is, and I appreciate your helping with this short survey. If I can be of any assistance, or if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by phone. Once again thank you for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Marsha Larson, CFCS  
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University  
715-424-1987  
malarson@uwsp.edu
**First E-Mail script**

Date __________ 2010
From: malarson@uwsp.edu
To: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers
Subject: Survey

Recently you received an email letter that spoke of a survey on job satisfaction among FCS teachers in Wisconsin school districts.

The survey is part of my doctoral dissertation for Iowa State University and I hope you will be able to help. The link to this first ever internet survey is:

________________________________________________________________________

Please click this link, OR paste it to your browser and it will take you to the link.

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey. Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Thanks,

Marsha Larson
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
715-424-1987 malarson@uwsp.edu

**Second E-Mail script**

Date
From: malarson@uwsp.edu
To:
Subject: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers second

If you have already replied to the survey, thank you for your help with this very important project.

Recently you received a letter and an e-mail that spoke of a survey on job satisfaction among FCS teachers in Wisconsin school districts and I really need your help. The survey is part of my doctoral dissertation for Iowa State University and I hope you will be able to help. The link to this first ever internet survey is:

________________________________________________________________________

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Marsha Larson
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
715-424-1987 malarson@uwsp.edu
Third E-Mail script
Date:
From: malarson@uwsp.edu
To: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers
Subject: Survey

If you have already replied to the survey, thank you for your help with this very important project.

Recently you received a letter and an e-mail that spoke of a survey on job satisfaction FCS teachers in Wisconsin school districts and I really need your help. The survey is part of my doctoral dissertation for Iowa State University and I hope you will be able to help. The link to this first ever internet survey is:

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Marsha Larson
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
715-424-1987 malarson@uwsp.edu

Fourth and final E-Mail script
Date:
From: malarson@uwsp.edu
To: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers
Subject: Final Chance to Participate in FCS Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey

I wanted to send one final e-mail to invite you to participate in the Wisconsin FCS Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey. The survey will be closing on (date). If you have responded, I am so appreciative of your effort to participate in the first ever internet survey of job satisfaction among Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in Wisconsin.

If you have not responded won’t you please consider doing so now? The survey is part of my doctoral dissertation for Iowa State University and I really need your help. The link to the survey is:

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey. Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Marsha Larson
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
715-424-1987 malarson@uwsp.edu
APPENDIX D

Frequency Distributions for MSQ Dimensions

Table D1
Frequency Distribution for Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D2
Frequency Distribution for Independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D3
Frequency Distribution for Variety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D4
Frequency Distribution for Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D5
Frequency Distribution for Supervision (HR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D6
Frequency Distribution for Supervision (Tech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D7
Frequency Distribution for Moral Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D8
Frequency Distribution for Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D9
Frequency Distribution for Social Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D10
Frequency Distribution for Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D11
Frequency Distribution for Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D12
Frequency Distribution for Policies and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D13
Frequency Distribution for Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D14
Frequency Distribution for Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D15
Frequency Distribution for Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D16
Frequency Distribution for Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D17
**Frequency Distribution for Work Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D18
**Frequency Distribution for Coworkers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D19
**Frequency Distribution for Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D20
**Frequency Distribution for Achievement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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