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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the overall job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers in Texas using a quantitative approach. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) was used via a web-based survey through Iowa State University. The review of literature yielded an alarming deficit in satisfaction studies of family and consumer sciences teachers.

The data analysis indicated urban FCS teachers in Texas were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their overall level of job satisfaction. Their intrinsic job satisfaction (i.e. security, variety, independence, recognition, moral values, social service, authority, abilities and creativity) was higher, yielding a satisfactory level. Extrinsic job satisfaction factors (i.e. supervisor competency, company policy and practices, compensation, and advancement) yielded neither satisfied nor dissatisfied level of job satisfaction. Findings demonstrated that their level of the job satisfaction did not significantly vary in relation to the six demographic variables.

This study concluded there was a large percentage of urban FCS teachers over the age of 46 years and the increasing number of teacher retirements brings to the forefront the FCS teacher shortage in Texas' urban schools. It is crucial that we understand satisfaction levels as they pertain to all age groups of teachers, but especially to the younger teachers. Uncovering the factors that provide the most amount of satisfaction may lead to others choosing FCS as a teaching career, including high school students in FCS classes. Urban FCS teachers have the opportunity to grow the profession from the inner city, and influence students to choose a career that is interesting, expansive, and provides knowledge for the greater good of families and communities.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The typical American worker averages almost nine jobs before he/she is 32 years old, with over half of the changes occurring before the age of 23 (Arthur, 2001). However, when employees are satisfied with their work environment, they are less likely to seek alternative employment (Dribble, 1999). Job satisfaction research, conducted for decades, has yielded useful findings but no single definition of job satisfaction.

Research on teacher job satisfaction is complicated by the fact that the roles of educators and education have evolved over the years. For example, during the twentieth century, the focus of education shifted toward individual students’ psychological development which, in turn, required teachers to increase their knowledge of various learning styles, develop new teaching strategies, and use a range of assessment techniques to accommodate all learners. To improve individual student achievement, teachers altered learning environments, identified and implemented best practices, and improved pedagogy (Camp, 1983; von Glasersfeld, 1995; Vygostsky, 1978).

As the twentieth century drew to a close, federal and state mandates on student testing, teacher performance ratings, and accountability forced teachers to shift focus from well-documented pedagogical practices to performance-based assessments (Nowell, 1992). These emerging factors could impact job satisfaction and retention.

Extant research studies of job satisfaction among teachers vary in scope, and the results are mixed. Several studies uncovered characteristics of teachers who reported job
satisfaction. For example, Hoppock (1935) reported teachers who were satisfied with their profession were more emotionally adjusted than their non-satisfied peers. Other studies indicated that satisfied teachers were more autonomous in their work, interacted more positively with peers, and were more successful in improving student achievement (Ferguson, 2000; Jacobson, 2005; Mertler, 2002; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Singer, 1995). In another study, teachers who inherently believed education is a noble profession expressed higher levels of satisfaction and a greater commitment to the field than their peers who chose teaching for monetary reasons (Goodlad, 1990).

Teacher job satisfaction and job retention appear to be linked. The Metropolitan Life surveys of American teachers found only seven percent of participating teachers were very satisfied with the profession (MetLife, 2004). The results of several studies indicate that approximately 14% of teachers leave the profession after one year and 46% leave after five years (Combs, 2006; Ingersoll, 2001, 2003; National Education Association, 2005; Olsen & Anderson, 2007). A study by Norton (1999) indicated “...as many as 25% of teachers leave the profession after one year and only 50% remain after five years of service” (p. 52). Such findings suggest that teacher job satisfaction should be further studied in order to improve the development and retention of quality personnel (Bogler, 2001). A field related to education, Cooperative Extension agents, could be used to compare retention trends. In numerous studies of Extension agents, researchers found agents were satisfied with their work and had high retention rates (Manton & van Es, 1985, Riggs & Beus, 1993, Lee, 2005),
Secondary teachers' satisfaction and retention have been studied for more than twenty years. Findings suggest that secondary level teachers leave the profession earlier than elementary level teachers (Shen, 1997). Further, results of several studies indicate that certain personal characteristics, concerns about students, workload, lack of recognition, low salary, and policy-administration were common factors related to job dissatisfaction and turnover (Chapman, 1984; Chapman & Green, 1986; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Chapman & Lowther, 1982; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Other studies indicate that while money is not the primary factor in deciding to choose teaching as a career (Han, 1994), it is a major factor in the decision to leave teaching (Han, 1994; Grissmer & Kirby, 1987).

Understanding urban teacher satisfaction is important due to the critical shortage of urban teachers as reported by the Council of Great City Schools (2007); Phi Delta Kappa polls (Langdon, 1999), Perie and Baker (1997), and in the report, *Mentoring May Aid Teacher Retention* (2000). The attrition rate for urban teachers is more prevalent early in their careers and, regardless of their race, urban teachers have shorter teaching careers (Shen, 1997). Weld (1998) confirmed that 50% of urban teachers left the profession early in their careers and concluded that schools in large urban areas cannot staff their buildings with qualified teachers.

While all subjects and grade levels have been affected by teacher attrition, secondary family and consumer sciences (FCS) has been particularly stressed (Mimbs, 2000). The rate at which secondary FCS teachers are leaving the profession is on the rise, in part because of the aging of FCS professionals. As early as 1995, the Ad Hoc Supply and Demand Task
Force predicted a national shortage of FCS teachers, anticipating a 78% shortfall in the supply of FCS teachers to meet anticipated demand. Specifically, the task force reported that by the year 2001 only 2,000 candidates would be available to fill over 9,000 family and consumer sciences teaching and extension vacancies (Research Impact Statement, 1995). Further, local data indicate that in Texas alone more than one-third (37.9%) of family and consumer sciences teachers were eligible to retire in 2003, and by 2010, more than half (55%) of the discipline’s teachers will be eligible to retire (FCS Alliance, 2006; Texas Education Agency, 2007). Several universities indicated lower enrollment numbers in undergraduate FCS education majors. Two historically strong FCS education schools had a combined undergraduate FCS education enrollment of 82 students (Couch, personal e-mail, January 2009, Davis, personal e-mail, January 2009). Schools in Texas will not be able to fill these vacancies.

Theoretical Framework

Job satisfaction has been the focus of extensive research and has given rise to many theories. Green (2000) concluded there were various historical frameworks proposed by both content theorists and process theorists. Content theorists (e.g., Herzberg, 1966, and Maslow, 1954) hypothesized overall need fulfillment resulted in job satisfaction. Process theorists Vroom (1964) and Adams (1965) posited overall job satisfaction was determined by the interaction between expectancies, values, and needs. Herzberg’s two-factor theory serves as the theoretical framework for this study. A more extensive explanation of Herzberg’s theory will be provided in Chapter 2.
Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1 presents the factors that affect job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is multidimensional. The intrinsic motivators include those factors that are more likely to be of an internal nature, such as, status, recognition, appreciation, respect, achievement, and responsibilities (Herzberg, 1966). The extrinsic factors are likely to be externally determined, such as policy and practices, autonomy, authority, decision making, supervision, and salary (Herzberg, 1966). The intrinsic motivators, the extrinsic motivators (hygienes), added with working conditions and interpersonal relationships, determine the general level of job satisfaction (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Finally, the fourth category, which deals with individual demographics, includes factors of a personal nature, such as age, gender, degree, years teaching, certification and race. This conceptual framework represents the multidimensional factors that influence urban FCS teacher job satisfaction.

Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework of study
Instrumentation

Various instruments have been utilized to measure job satisfaction; i.e., single item, general, or facet measures (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). For this study, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by the University of Minnesota, was used to quantify job satisfaction levels (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The MSQ is a “widely used, nationally recognized, reliable and valid instrument that measures facet specific levels of job satisfaction” (Green, 2000, p. 23).

Statement of the Problem

Although family and consumer sciences teachers, in general, report high job satisfaction (Bartley & Sneed, 2004), a review of the literature yielded little information about the job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers. Based on the limited research, further study is needed to understand job satisfaction among urban family and consumer sciences teachers.

Research Questions

Five research questions guided this investigation:

1. What is the general level of job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers?

2. What factors are present that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers?

3. What is the relationship of the overall job satisfaction level of urban FCS secondary teachers with selected demographic characteristics?
4. What are the areas of job satisfaction (motivators) reported by urban FCS teachers?

5. What are the areas of job dissatisfaction (hygienes) reported by urban FCS teachers?

**Definitions of Terms**

Terms used throughout this research study have been operationally defined as follows:

1. Job satisfaction: “a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job” (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

2. Teacher job satisfaction: “a multifaceted construct that is critical to teacher retention, teacher commitment, and school effectiveness. . . . It is a predictor of teacher retention, a determinant of teacher commitment, and, in turn, a contributor to school effectiveness” (Shann, 1998, p. 1).

3. Two-Factor Theory (Hygiene-Motivation Theory): Hygienes are factors; e.g., supervision, salary, work environment, administration/school policies, and relationships with co-workers, which, when not met, contribute to job dissatisfaction. Motivators are factors; e.g., responsibility, recognition, promotion, achievement, the work itself, and professional/personal growth, that contribute to job satisfaction.

4. Climate: The feelings and attitudes elicited by a school’s environment are referred to as school climate. Although it is difficult to provide a concise definition for school climate, researchers agree that it is a multidimensional construct that includes physical, social, and academic dimensions (Loukas, 2007).
5. Urban school district: “Major urban districts are the districts with the greatest membership in counties with populations of 725,000 or more, and more than 35 percent of the students are identified as economically disadvantaged. In some cases, other size threshold criteria may apply” (Texas Education Agency, 2007, p. 2)

Significance of the Study

There were several compelling reasons for conducting this study. Given the current shortage of FCS teachers and the high attrition rate of secondary teachers, particularly secondary FCS teachers, there was a need to examine factors that may contribute to the situation. In previous studies of other teacher populations, job satisfaction and job retention have been linked. However, there is limited research on the job satisfaction of urban secondary FCS teachers. This study contributed to the knowledge base by examining this topic.

Previous research findings uncovered commonly held perceptions on various factors related to job satisfaction and suggest actions to improve retention and increase job satisfaction. Identification of factors related to the job satisfaction of the target population provide significant information to prospective FCS teachers, family and consumer sciences pre-service and in-service educations programs, school district administrators, career and technology directors, FCS national and state organizations, and professionals in the field. The study also provided demographic information on the urban secondary FCS teachers studied.
Delimitation

The proposed study was conducted in urban school districts in Texas.

Limitations and Assumptions

The study sought to understand factors related to job satisfaction of urban secondary FCS teachers. Findings apply only to the population investigated and should not be generalized to other populations. The cross sectional nature of this web based delivery collects data at one point in time (Patten, 2005). The instrument used, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), short form, was self-administered (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). With most self-report survey research, common method bias may be present when the data for dependent variable and the independent variables are collected from the same researcher at the same time (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff, 2003). Sample selection bias may arise for two reasons: self selection by the individuals being investigated, or analysts deciding to operate in the same fashion as self selection (Heckman, 1979). Results of the questionnaire are limited by how respondents interpreted the items.

Non-response error

The study could be limited by non-response error (Dillman, 2000). Some urban FCS teachers chose not to participate for unidentified reasons. Teachers may not have participated due to time constraints, workload, concerns about privacy and confidentiality of web-based surveys, or low level of interest in the research topic. Teachers who may be less than satisfied
with their jobs may have chosen to abstain from the survey for various reasons, possible concern for privacy, status of current environmental state, and current state of mind.

**Instrumentation**

The study addresses only those aspects of job satisfaction that the MSQ is designed to measure; thus, measurement error could occur. The MSQ (short form) used in this study includes only one question per motivator of satisfaction while the 100-question MSQ includes several questions for each motivator. This may prevent respondents from accurately responding.

**Survey administration**

A limitation of web-based surveys is participants’ concerns about anonymity and confidentiality. Study participants may have been concerned that response information could be traced back to them. This concern was addressed by the researcher in the initial letter of invitation to participate in the study. Survey Gizmo’s reputation for encryption and trustworthiness as a survey service may have encouraged teachers to participate in the study.

Questions on the MSQ (short form) may have been worded ambiguously. Since the survey was conducted via the Internet, respondents may not have had opportunities to seek clarification. Dillman (2000) found that feedback regarding poorly structured and worded questions occurred less often in self-administered surveys than in face-to-face interviews.

**Organization of the Study**

The study investigated the degree of job satisfaction of urban secondary family and consumer sciences teachers. Chapter 1 consists of the introduction, the theoretical
framework, instrumentation, the statement of the problem, the research questions, definitions of terms, the significance of the study, and the delimitation and limitations of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature and builds a theoretical framework for the research study. Chapter 3 describes the methodology for this quantitative research study. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study based on analysis of the data, and Chapter 5 provides a summary and discussion of the findings, implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Perspective

Until the Reformation and the emergence of the Protestant work ethic in the 16th century, there was little coordinated effort to educate middle- and lower-class children. With the Reformation came requirements to educate children according to their station in life in order to promote harmony and meet society's standards (Matzat, 2000).

With the coming of the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century, society turned its attention to employment, the growth of unions, and suitable working conditions. In America, as in Europe, industries concentrated on ways to increase employee productivity. Early studies suggested links between performance and working conditions. At the same time, theories surfaced about a possible relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction (Mayo, 1933).

Employee Job Satisfaction

A precursor to the body of literature on job satisfaction was Mayo's (1933) well-known study of workers' level of productivity based on certain conditions. Employees at Hawthorne Works, a large complex owned by Western Electric Company, were observed to determine if a change in lighting would affect worker productivity. Results indicated production temporarily increased with a change in the work environment (Mayo, 1933). Later it was determined that productivity improved because workers knew they were being observed. This phenomenon of short-term improvement caused by observing worker performance is now known as the Hawthorne effect, deriving its name from the factory in
which the study was carried out (Landsberger, 1958). A second finding of the Mayo (1933) study suggested, for the first time in the literature, that pay was not an indicator of worker productivity.

Studies of worker job satisfaction are typically based on motivational theory that can be broadly categorized as either process or content theories (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1997). Process theories emphasize the differences in people’s needs and focus on the cognitive processes that create these differences. According to these theorists, people are motivated to work toward an extrinsic reward; e.g., title, bonus, salary. Process theorists study variables; e.g., equity and fairness and job characteristics, to measure employee job satisfaction (Campbell, Dunette, Lawler, & Weik, 1970). Vroom’s expectancy theory exemplifies process theory. Content theories assume that all individuals have the same set of needs and continually strive to attain these needs. Examples include Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Alderfer’s continuum of needs, McClelland’s learned needs theory, and Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Gibson et al., 1997).

Process theories

Vroom’s (1964) primary research interest was the expectancy theory of motivation that stipulates that workers’ expectations determine their behavior. In other words, the amount of effort workers exert depends on the interaction between what they want from a job and the degree to which they believe the employer will reward their effort. For example, if an employee wants a pay raise and believes he is likely to receive it if he improves his performance, he will exert the extra effort necessary to obtain the reward.
Another process theorist, J. Stacey Adams, developed the equity theory that hypothesized employees compare their efforts and rewards with those of others doing the same or similar work (Scholl, 2002). According to equity theory, workers are motivated by the desire to be treated equally at work. Motivation is a series of inputs and outputs from the employee and inputs and outputs from the person of reference (i.e., the person to whom the employee compares himself). These inputs and outputs are perceived as equitable or inequitable. Equity occurs when the input ratios are equal to the output of other similar employees (Adams, 1965).

A third example of process theory is Locke’s (1968) goal setting theory that assumes an individual’s conscious goals and intentions are the primary determinants of behavior. The theory is based on the belief that specific goals lead to better performance than vague goals. Supervisors and subordinates work together to set the subordinates’ goals for a specified period of time (Locke, 1968). According to the goal setting theory, the goal is a standard for assessing one’s satisfaction (Latham, 2006).

**Content theories**

Among motivational theorists who focused on content theory, Maslow (1954) is perhaps the most renowned. His hierarchy of needs theory describes four levels of needs and hypothesizes that lower-ordered needs must be met before higher order needs can be met. From lowest- to highest-ordered needs, the levels are: (a) hunger and thirst; (b) shelter and clothing; (c) love, affection, and belonging; and (d) self-respect and respect for others.

In contrast to Maslow, Alderfer envisioned a continuum of needs rather than a hierarchy of needs. Further, he revised Maslow’s theory of needs, reducing the number of
levels to three: existence, relatedness, and growth. Existence needs were defined as concrete nutritional and material requirements; e.g., water, food, pay, and working conditions (Gibson et al., 1997). Relatedness needs were those satisfied through relationships with family, friends, and work colleagues (Gibson et al., 1997). Growth needs reflected a desire for personal psychological development; e.g., an employee is able to be creative and productive in work-related tasks (Gibson et al., 1997). Alderfer argued that individuals could move along the continuum of needs in either direction.

McClelland (1975) posited there are three basic human needs that motive people to strive and succeed: need for achievement, need for affiliation, and need for power. He hypothesized that these needs change over time and depend on the individual’s experiences, culture, and education. McClelland’s learned needs theory has significant implications for the workplace. Employee satisfaction and performance are dependent on the proper matching of job requirements and employees’ needs. For example, placing a person with high achievement needs in a position ideal for a person with high affiliation needs will result in a mismatch and possible underperformance (McClelland, 1975).

Herzberg’s (1966) two-factor theory is another example of content theory. Given its importance for measuring workers’ job satisfaction; it is described in detail in the next section of this chapter.

*Job satisfaction and performance studies*

For decades, researchers from various disciplines have attempted to determine if a correlation exists between worker satisfaction and work performance (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, 1966, 2003; Vroom, 1964). Results of research studies are mixed. Results of
studies by Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Herzberg, Mausner, and Snydermann (1959) concluded that no relationship existed between job satisfaction and a higher performance yield.

In the 1950s, Herzberg studied factors related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In face-to-face, one-on-one interviews with engineers and accountants in Pittsburgh, Herzberg and his associates asked subjects about events they had experienced at work that led to either a marked reduction or a marked increase in job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). From analysis of employees’ responses, Herzberg identified “thought units,” which indicated both the degree and direction of employees’ attitudes toward their job. Two categories of factors, called motivators (satisfiers) and hygienes (dissatisfiers), emerged from analysis of the thought units and became the foundation of Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, also known as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory of Job Satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snydermann, 1959).

Based on study findings, Herzberg posited that certain “hygiene” factors needed to be present in the workplace to prevent dissatisfaction among employees. Hygienes included supervision, salary, work environment, company policies, and relationships with colleagues. These factors were necessary for job satisfaction but not for motivation, and their absence could result in dissatisfaction among employees. Herzberg believed the second set of factors; i.e., responsibility, recognition, promotion, and achievement, motivated workers to strive for superior performance. The absence of these factors might not demotivate employees if hygiene factors were strong enough. However, absent these factors, employees would not strive for extraordinary performance levels (Herzberg, 1966).
Herzberg’s theory has been widely used in studies of worker job satisfaction. However, the theory has drawn criticism from other motivational theorists, particularly Vroom (1964) and Porter (1961). Vroom claimed the results of Herzberg’s research were tainted by interviewer bias and inconsistent interviewing methods. Steers and Porter (1991) alleged that Herzberg’s conclusions were overstated and presumptuous.

Concerns about research methodology and conflicting results of initial job satisfaction studies prompted interest in further investigation to try to establish a direct link between job satisfaction and work output. Despite the number of studies carried out, no indication of a correlation between job satisfaction and productivity has been established (Vroom, 1964; Clarke & Keating, 1995).

*Job Satisfaction in Education*

Herzberg’s motivational theory emerged from his study of industrial workers but is widely used by both industry and education to study employee job satisfaction (Adair, 1984; Colgan, 2004; Frase, Hetzel, & Grant 1982; Houchins, Shippen, & Cattret, 2004; Sergiovanni, 1967). Many researchers have applied Herzberg’s motivational theory to educational settings. The motivators and hygiene factors identified by Herzberg have been commonly used in educational job satisfaction research (Bowers, 1986; Frase et al.1982; Friesen, Holdaway, & Rice, 1983; Iannone, 1973).

Schmidt (1976) tested Herzberg’s two-factor theory. The sample consisted of suburban public school principals in the metro Chicago area. ANOVA was used to determine the level of satisfaction. The results indicated the principals’ overall satisfaction level was
reported at .01 (Schmidt, 1976). Participants reported job satisfaction factors related to Herzberg’s motivators (e.g., achievement, advancement, and recognition). Dissatisfiers reported by the sample were salary, interpersonal relations, supervision, and administrative policies. Schmidt’s (1976) study was reflective of the two-factor theory.

Job satisfaction studies of superintendents found intrinsic motivating factors (e.g., achievement, recognition, responsibility, and possibility of growth) were reported as satisfiers; hygienes were reported as district policy and interpersonal relations (Manning, 1976). In other studies of superintendent job satisfaction, researchers identified several factors that contribute to job satisfaction: progress of the school district, relationship with staff, community relations, intrinsic feeling of doing a good job, status, achievement, and methods of evaluation (Chand, 1982; Cochran, 1977). Reported dissatisfiers were collective bargaining, contract negotiation, financial problems, legislative restrictions, school board conflict, community pressure, energy drain, district policy, and interpersonal relations (Chand, 1982; Cochran, 1977).

Teacher Job Satisfaction

A number of studies of teacher job satisfaction have been based on Herzberg’s theory. Across studies, teachers identified professional growth and achievement, interactions with peers, and professional challenges as motivators (Bowers, 1986; Frase et al., 1982). Factors that led to retention were teacher rewards, including opportunities to learn and grow professionally (Rosenholtz, 1989).

Frase et al. (1982) examined teacher rewards and the effect they have on job satisfaction and recognition. High-performing teachers were given a choice of two rewards,
cash (an extrinsic hygiene) or professional travel for training (an intrinsic motivator). In support of Herzberg et al.’s (1959) motivation-hygiene theory, teachers who chose professional travel for training reported significantly more opportunities for job enrichment and recognition than teachers who chose the monetary reward.

Findings of a study of National Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) indicated high school board certified teachers were not more satisfied with their teaching positions than non-board certified teachers (Petty, Dagenhart, & O’Connor, 2002-2003). Teachers participating in the study reported they aspired to roles beyond the classrooms (e.g., opportunities to conduct staff development and pursue leadership responsibilities). They also reported that they wished to gain recognition for achievements (Petty et al., 2002-2003). At the same time, study participants indicated they were satisfied in their current teaching positions when they received recognition for their accomplishments, led professional development, and acquired leadership roles (Petty et al., 2002-2003).

These findings support results of previous studies that found teachers have a professional work ethic and disposition that propel them to seek professional growth and increased responsibility (Bowers, 1986; Collinson, 1996; Oakes, 1990). The findings also support Herzberg’s theory that motivators (satisfiers) “develop an internal ‘generator’ that leads to less reliance on outside recognition and an increased value placed on an individual’s own evaluation” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 178).

Other studies of teachers also indicated that intrinsic motivators were satisfiers and predictors of teacher job satisfaction (Chen, 2000; Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966; Lester, 1985; Lortie, 1986; Pennington & Riley; 1991; Sergiovanni, 1967, 1987; Ulriksen,
1996; Wu & Short, 1996). For example, Ulriksen’s (1966) study of 64 teachers supported the premise that intrinsic variables; e.g., the work itself, achievement, and responsibility, contributed to job satisfaction. Sergiovanni (1987) described intrinsic motivators; e.g., achievement, responsibility, and recognition that resulted from work experiences, as contributors to job satisfaction. These findings further confirm Herzberg’s (1966) theory that intrinsic motivators such as responsibility, recognition, achievement and possibilities for growth contribute to job satisfaction.

Other studies indicated that teachers perceive self-efficacy, defined by Bandura (1977) as the belief the teacher is influential in student learning, as a job satisfier (Ulriksen, 1996; Wu & Short, 1996). This finding supports research results by Sergiovanni (1967) and Herzberg (1966) that indicate motivation is an intrinsic desire for psychological growth. Sergiovanni (1967) reported responsibility, achievement, and recognition as factors that lead to job satisfaction. Study participants reported they remained in their current jobs because they were part of a team, worked with excellent peers, and received recognition for work done well (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 1999). Teachers who believe they are contributing to a student’s well being and commitment to their education have an organizational commitment to the school. Organizational commitment is the belief and acceptance of the values and goals of an organization and exhibits a desire to contribute to the school (Mowdy, Porter and Steers, 1982). Based on these findings, Sergiovanni (1967) concluded that satisfied teachers found congruence with their work, and their satisfaction was beneficial to students, faculty, administration, and parents.
In several studies, teachers claimed their relationship with students was the most satisfying aspect of their profession (Clarke & Keating, 1995; Moore, 1987; Ulriksen, 1996; Wubbels, Levy, & Breckelmans, 1997). This finding applied to teachers across the spectrum, from novice to veteran teachers. A 2004 study of American teachers conducted by MetLife centered on teacher transitions and the role of supportive relationships. Novice teachers, regardless of the location or socioeconomic status of the school, reported their highest motivator was their relationships with students (Transitions and the Role of Supportive Relationships, 2005). A study of teachers enrolled in a graduate education course indicated 82% of the teachers reported interaction with students was the single most satisfying factor in their role as a teacher (Clarke & Keating, 1995). Further, the satisfaction levels of a teacher determined the level of commitment to educating students (Wubbels, Levy, & Breckelmans, 1997).

The studies described above uncovered several factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction. Other teacher motivators/satisfiers cited in the literature include administrative leadership and support, school climate, teacher autonomy in the classroom, student behavior, and parental support (Norton, 1999). “Each of these factors shows stronger relationships with job satisfaction than salary and benefits and are of paramount importance in retention efforts” (Norton, 1999, p. 53).

Herzberg’s research did not identify “climate” as a motivator, yet some of the studies of his work suggest certain motivators present in a work environment may lead to a positive school climate. Buckman, King, and Ryan (1995) concluded qualities such as openness, trust, communication, and support lead to job satisfaction and improved performances by teachers.
Climate was difficult to tease out because of the different perceptions teachers have regarding school climate. Hoy and Miskel (1991) concluded school climate has an effect on teacher behavior.

*Teacher Job Dissatisfaction*

Among studies of teacher dissatisfaction, some findings confirm and others disagree with the theoretical foundation and findings of empirical studies. In general, factors that appear to contribute to dissatisfaction among teachers were aligned with low salaries, inadequate supervision from school administrators, discipline issues, and low incidence of teachers’ involvement in school policy and decisions (Ingersoll, 2001; Shann, 1998).

In several studies, teachers reported salary as a neutral issue. For example, in Clarke and Keating’s (1995) study, teachers reported salary was neither a satisfier nor a dissatisfier. In other studies; e.g., Perie and Baker (1997), compensation appeared to be moderately related to satisfaction levels. Other studies found a direct correlation between salary and teacher retention. Han (1994) and Grissmer and Kirby (1987), for example, reported that salary is the main factor related to teacher retention. Hawthorne (1990) and Beck-Frazier (2005) found teachers were dissatisfied with their salary. Male teachers reported the importance of earning a high enough salary to support a family, and female teachers claimed they worked to supplement a family budget or support individual needs. Beck-Frazier (2005) reported some teachers felt their only option to increase salary was to leave the teaching profession. Based on these findings, salary appears to be a hygiene factor (Herzberg, 1966) for teachers; that is, salary does not appear to motivate or create satisfaction for teachers, but low salaries can lead to dissatisfaction.
Some teachers reported the most dissatisfying job factor was the lack of supportive administrators (Clarke & Keating, 1995; Hawthorne, 1990). For some teachers, dissatisfaction stemmed from a low level of agreement with administration (Vancouver, Milsap, & Peters, 1991). High school teachers surveyed by Litt and Turk (1985) identified stress and dissatisfaction as factors that might contribute to an increased rate of teacher attrition. Results indicated that teachers’ stress levels were correlated to their perceptions of the school climate and their relationship with administrators.

Conversely, when teachers reported low dissatisfaction with administrative support, teacher behavior led to a better school climate and faculty morale (Bradley & Loadman, 2005). Similarly, when teachers reported they had more control of their classroom; i.e., less interference from non-supportive administrators, they were more satisfied (Bein, Anderson & Maes, 1990). These studies confirm Herzberg’s (1966) theory that supervision and company policies are hygiene factors that do not increase satisfaction, but their absence can cause job dissatisfaction.

Working conditions also affected the level of dissatisfaction among teachers. One indication of dissatisfaction was teachers’ perceptions of their work environment. When teachers believed the work environment had declined (indicators were reported as low morale, low achievement, and lack of responsibility), they developed a negative attitude and increased dissatisfaction (Steers & Porter, 1991).

Urban Teacher Job Satisfaction

Research studies on job satisfaction of urban high school teachers produced varying results on a number of factors. In general, teachers in urban schools reported satisfaction
levels were higher when they were working directly with students, but lower when they were faced with the challenges of the urban environment, building issues, and administration and leadership (Haycock, 1998; Ingersoll, 2001, 2003; Olsen & Anderson, 2007). The student population in urban schools is more diverse than the student population in other schools (Renfro, 2003). Even so, urban teachers, like their peers in other school settings, reported job satisfaction was highest in relation to teacher-student relations (Haberman, 1995; Shann, 1998). Further, urban teachers believed their charge was to reach students regardless of the challenges they faced in the classroom (Haberman, 1995; Worthy, 2005; Worthy & Patterson, 2001). For example, a fifth grade teacher in an urban Texas school described the importance of building relationships with students both inside and outside the classroom:

People who aren’t teachers don’t have any idea what a commitment teaching is. I think with the profession comes more than just teaching in the classroom, and…. I do everything I can. If there’s a special event going on, you can probably guarantee I am one of the teachers that’s there…. It goes back to knowing your children as opposed to ‘I have no idea how you feel’, or ‘I have no idea where you come from’ (Worthy, 2005, p. 390).

Urban schools educate almost half of all American students (Jacob, 2007; Renfro, 2003), and teaching children in the inner cities can “present immeasurable rewards and satisfaction” (Casserly, 2007, para. 6). Yet these schools often face serious challenges, including teacher turnover and shortages, due, in part, to dysfunctional administration supervision and policies (Jacob, 2007). Urban teachers, like their non-urban counterparts, are dissatisfied with unsupportive administration (Worthy, 2005) and administrators who do not
recognize or value teachers (Jacob, 2007; Renfro, 2003). In fact, urban teachers who left teaching reported lack of effective administration as one reason for their departure from the profession (Shann, 1998).

Urban teachers’ stories indicate the degree of their dissatisfaction with unsupportive administration and policies. One first-year teacher described distress that he attributed to the micromanagement style of the school principal:

She was real direct. Real negative. Which was not what you need when you are a first year teacher and you really are under a lot of pressure. You don’t need to feel like management is coming down on you too....A couple of times she had me on the cusp of tears. Several times. She would say just hurtful things to me. And some people would have been like ‘Forget it. I quit’ And people jumped ship the first two years like it was on fire (Worthy, 2005, p. 390).

A Chicago teacher expressed unhappiness with lack of administration support when the school’s music program was threatened. “That’s one of the biggies, keeping the program alive...keeping them [administrators and policy makers] from diminishing your program because the emphasis was on reading and math” (Renfro, 2003, p. 36).

The environment and working conditions differ in urban and suburban schools (Renfro, 2003). Working conditions are particularly important to teachers in urban schools. According to Darling-Hammond (2000), “frequently observed flight of teachers from schools serving low income and minority students is at least in part a function of the degree to which
many of those schools also exhibit poor working conditions rather than solely attributable to the characteristics of the students or communities themselves” (p. 64).

Jacob’s (2007) study of urban teachers indicated that teachers who believed they could make a difference in urban schools described their efforts to improve working conditions as a catch 22. To improve working conditions in order to attract effective teachers, it was necessary to reform the whole school, but whole school reform would not work without effective teachers. Another factor related to urban teacher satisfaction is that middle-class teachers have difficulty adjusting to an urban school setting (Renfro, 2003). Jacob (2007) also found that compensation was a factor in urban teacher mobility.

Although mobility was more related to student characteristics than to salary, compensation appeared to be a factor in hiring and retaining urban teachers. In addition, uniform salary increases seemed unfair because (a) they provide additional compensation to many teachers who would have taught in the same position anyway, and (b) they do not adequately compensate teachers working in more challenging urban schools. Finally, in cases where states initiated large signing bonuses to recruit teachers for urban schools, the programs had little success. Within several years, many of the bonus recipients had moved to suburban districts or left the teaching profession (Jacob, 2007).

*Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Satisfaction*

Very little is known about the job satisfaction of FCS teachers although Bartley and Sneed (2004) reported high rates of job satisfaction among FCS teachers and an abundance
of available teaching positions. Currently, Texas reports a shortage of FCS teachers and an increasing rate of retirements.

Data collected and analyzed by the Texas Education Agency and the State Board for Educator Certification indicate that 638 or 19.17% of the state’s family and consumer sciences teachers were eligible to retire after the 2000-2001 school year; an additional 624 or a total of 37.92% were eligible to retire after the 2005-2006 school year; 55.35% of the discipline’s teachers will be eligible to retire by the end of the 2010-2011 school year; 33.3% of those teaching family and consumer sciences courses are teaching without a certificate in the area; and an increasing number of schools in all areas of the state report unfilled teaching positions due to the unavailability of family and consumer sciences teachers. (FCS alliance, author, n.d., para 2)

A university in Texas describes family and consumer sciences as one of the “hottest professions in Texas” and yet, the expected retirement rate for teachers will be beyond 55 percent by 2010, and there is a shortage of new teachers to take their place (Texas State University, 2008).

Hollandsworth (1960) conducted a longitudinal study (1935-1955) of 540 home economic graduates of Montana State University to determine why they entered, left, or remained in the teaching profession. Participating teachers were divided into categories: those teaching, those who taught but were currently homemakers, those who never taught, and those who taught but were no longer working in schools (Hollandsworth, 1960). The
participants completed a survey. Results of the study indicated the highest mean satisfaction levels were among teachers who were teaching (69.8), full time homemakers who had previously taught (69.4), and those who once taught but were no longer working in schools (65.0) (Hollandsworth, 1960). Across all respondents, the mean satisfaction score was 69.6 (Hollandsworth, 1960).

Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) used the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to study the job satisfaction of 100 New York home economics teachers. The study examined the relationship between job satisfaction, stress, and nine demographic variables of secondary home economic teachers. The demographic variables were age, marital status, type of school, number of pupils, years as a teacher, highest degree, ethnic group, school system, and number of positions held (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). Results indicated they were most satisfied with their jobs because of intrinsic factors; e.g., student progress, student teacher ratio, type of school setting, prestige accorded to teachers by the community, and years in teaching (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). Study findings related to the intrinsic variables of tenure, pupil population, and working conditions were consistent with the findings of previous educator studies. FCS teachers reported dissatisfaction related to extrinsic factors; e.g., salary, promotion, supervision, status, and decision involvement (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). Also, findings related to the extrinsic variables of pupil population and marital status of the teacher contributed to overall general job satisfaction (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987). Holley and Kirkpatrick state urban FCS teachers were the most dissatisfied among all teachers surveyed (1987).
The review of literature yielded alarming statistics related to the current status of FCS programs and teachers. In 1999-2000, there were 163 family and consumer sciences university-based teacher education programs in the United States, down 58% from 1984 (Bartley & Sneed, 2004). The rate of retirement of family and consumer sciences teachers and the insufficient numbers of new teachers entering the field have contributed to a serious teacher shortage. At the national level, there are growing numbers of family and consumer sciences teacher vacancies. Based on the demographic indicators across the country, there will be jobs available for graduates of family and consumer sciences programs (Bartley & Sneed, 2004).

In addition to the dwindling number of FCS teacher education university-based programs and the shortage of qualified FCS teachers, the field of family and consumer sciences faces other interrelated threats to the future of the discipline. These include perceptions of the value and benefits of FCS education (Texas Tech, 2004); recruitment and persistence of FCS students at the high school level (Tinto, 2001) and the postsecondary level (McGinnis, 2004; Bartley & Sneed, 2004); alternative routes to certification of FCS teachers (Bartley & Sneed, 2004; Miller & Meszaros, 1996); development of FCS teachers (Bull, Uerz, & Yoakum, 2000); lack of diversity (ethnic and gender) of the teaching population (Bartley & Sneed, 2004); and effects of federal and state legislation on FCS programs (Maldonado, 2008).

It is evident from the literature review there is a need for further study regarding the satisfaction levels of urban FCS teachers. Extant literature in this area is sparse and provides little insight into problems plaguing the field.
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) is one of the most widely researched instruments available for measuring job satisfaction (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Pennington & Riley, 1991; Watson & Hillison 1991; Sutter, 1994; Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, Newby, 1999; Newby, 1999). The MSQ is popular among researchers (Spector, 1997) because it can be used to measure several variables related to job satisfaction and can be used for many different categories of jobs. The MSQ measures job satisfaction on an interval scale.

The MSQ was developed in the early 1960s based on vocational psychologists’ theory that an individual is a responding organism and will respond to his/her environment (Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1964). Further, the theory posits that every employee has observable adjustment outcomes; i.e., satisfaction, satisfactoriness, and tenure. Satisfaction can be defined as the contentedness of the employee with the work environment, and satisfactoriness is the work environment with the individual and tenure is the amount of time an employee remains with the job (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1997). The relationship between the employee and the work environment determines the amount of satisfaction the employee derives from his/her employment.

The MSQ measures satisfaction based on analysis of the relationships of twenty facets (see Table 2.1).

In the MSQ, five statements describe each of the 20 facets (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement, using a five-point Likert scale. It is reported the 1977 version, originally
copyrighted in 1963, obtained a ceiling effect and scale score distributions were negatively skewed alternating between “satisfied” and “very satisfied” (University of Minnesota, 1977). To adjust for this effect, the 1967 version uses the five response categories ranging from “extremely satisfied” to “not satisfied” (University of Minnesota, 1977).

Each facet set score is determined by the sum of the five constituent item scores. Dawis and Lofquist (1984) report, “The coefficient alpha reliabilities are mostly in the .80s, with an occasional high of .70” (p. 480). Coefficient alpha values for the intrinsic satisfaction subscale ranged from .82 to .86, while the coefficient alpha values for the extrinsic satisfaction sub scale ranged from .70 to .82 (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

Currently, there are two forms of the MSQ: the original form and a shortened form that includes fewer questions. The shortened form contains questions that were selected because they received the highest correlation scores based on responses to questions on the long form. Both the long and short version of the MSQ can measure two-second order scales on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (University of Minnesota, 1977).

The MSQ short form consists of a scale measuring 12 intrinsic and 6 extrinsic motivators. General satisfaction scale items include the intrinsic and extrinsic scale items as well as two additional questions; working conditions and interpersonal relationships (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).
Table 2.1 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability utilization</th>
<th>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>The ability to keep busy all of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>The opportunity for job promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>The opportunity to tell others what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company policies and practices</td>
<td>The way in which company policies are put into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>The amount of pay for work done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>The way co-workers get along with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>An opportunity to attempt my own way of completing a task or doing my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>The opportunity to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral values</td>
<td>The ability to do my job with good conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Praise received for doing my job well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Freedom to use my own judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Stability of my employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>The opportunity to do good toward others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>Community recognition and importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of responsibilities</td>
<td>The diversity of job tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>The environment in which I work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, technical</td>
<td>A supervisor's confidence to make decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, human relations</td>
<td>The way a superior leads/manages workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Weiss et al., 1967)
The 20 questions on the short form can be subcategorized into a twelve-item subscale measuring intrinsic motivators; i.e., the work itself, sense of accomplishment, opportunity for professional growth, responsibility, authority, moral values, social status, security, social service, independence, creativity, and activity (See Table 2.2).

Table 2.2 Intrinsic scale items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSQ Short Form Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being able to keep busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The chance to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The chance to do different things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Being able to do things that do not contradict conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Security of steady employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The chance to do things for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The chance to tell others what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The chance to use abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The chance to try original methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Weiss et al., 1967)
The six extrinsic factors of job satisfaction measured by the short form are salary, supervision (human relations), supervision (making decisions), authority, recognition, policies and practices, and opportunity for advancement (See Table 2.3).

Table 2.3 Extrinsic Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSQ Short Form Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisor relations with coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervisor competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Company policies and how they are put into practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pay in relationship to work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chances for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Praise received for a good job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Weiss et al., 1967)

General job satisfaction is determined by the score of all 20 questions (See Table 2.4).

Table 2.4 General Satisfaction Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSQ Short Form Question #</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-16, 19-20</td>
<td>All Intrinsic and Extrinsic questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Weiss et al., 1967)
The MSQ short form measures three job satisfaction scales: intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction. Intrinsic and extrinsic scales emerged from factor analysis of data obtained from the MSQ short form administered to a heterogeneous group of 1,460 employees facets (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984) (See Table 2.5).

Normative data for the MSQ short form reveal that each occupational group scored close to others on the three scales (Weiss et al., 1967). These data provide evidence the MSQ short form is a survey that can be used to measure job satisfaction in diverse occupations (See Table 2.5).

Table 2.5 Normative Data for the MSQ (Short Form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>77.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office clerks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>47.32</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>74.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salesmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>79.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.5 Normative Data for the MSQ (Short Form) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janitors and maintenance men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>49.03</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>78.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Machinists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>75.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assemblers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>69.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical assemblers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>67.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>12.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt reliability coefficient</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The MSQ (short form) has been used in educational research to test Herzberg’s theory. Iacqua, Schumacher, and Li (1995) sought to determine the relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction. Survey questions solicited demographic information and degree of job satisfaction related to various intrinsic and extrinsic factors.
The researchers concluded that three demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, and education) were not associated with job satisfaction. In general, job satisfaction was linked to intrinsic motivators, and job dissatisfaction was linked to extrinsic motivators.

Pennington and Riley (1991) cite criticism of the MSQ. These include respondents not participating because of a lack or time or lack of inclination to respond, especially if they are satisfied with their job. Additionally, the long form may cause annoyance, thus possibly elicit negative responses (Pennington & Riley, 1991).

Newby (1999) conducted a study of middle school principals in Virginia, using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (long form) to measure job satisfaction. The study attempted to answer the question: what was the general level of job satisfaction of middle school principals. Results of the survey indicated Virginia middle school principals were generally satisfied with their jobs with a mean satisfaction score of 3.65 (Newby, 1999).

Sutter (1994) studied the job satisfaction of assistant principals in Ohio, using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (long form). The assistant principals reported they were satisfied with their jobs when they believed they had higher levels of accomplishment and opportunities for advancement (Sutter, 1994). Further, they reported a higher level of job satisfaction when they felt their professional skills were utilized (Sutter, 1994).

Watson and Hillison (1991) used the MSQ short form in a study of 55 agriculture teachers in West Virginia. Results indicated agriculture teachers were more satisfied with intrinsic factors than extrinsic factors of their employment. Teachers were most satisfied with the following intrinsic factors: creativity, social service and independence. Teachers were
least satisfied with extrinsic factors of policies and practices, advancement, compensation, and supervisor competence.

The MSQ is a valid and reliable instrument that has been used to measure job satisfaction as posited by Herzberg in his two-factor theory. Thus, the current study used the MSQ to determine the satisfaction levels of urban FCS teachers in Texas. To accommodate participants’ busy schedules, the MSQ short form was used and delivered via the Internet.

*Web-Based Surveys*

The increased use of web-based surveys is becoming apparent in the field of social science and educational research (Solomon, 2001). A web-based survey is a self-administered questionnaire that is delivered in one of four ways (Donmeyer & Moriarity 1999/2000). One method of delivery to a recipient is embedding a survey in an email. Emailing surveys to targeted respondents is another method. Sending the survey as an attachment that is opened by a recipient is a third option. Finally, a recipient may be sent a web address and asked to visit the web site and complete the survey (Ravichandran & Arendt, 2008).

Web-based surveys offer significant advantages over traditional surveys. They offer visual stimulus, participant control, and convenience of questionnaire completion. Each participant is able to control the sequence and pace of completing the survey questions (Dillman, Phelps, Tortora, Swift, Kohrell, & Bereck, 2001). However, delivery time and response rates are decreased. The researcher spends less money, time addressing, mailing, and coding questionnaires delivered via traditional means (Schonlau, Fricker, & Elliott, 2002).
Web-based surveys may reduce researcher bias (Salant & Dillman, 1994). For example, research results have indicated that participants’ responses to questionnaires have been influenced by social norms, especially when in the presence of the interviewer (Smyth, Dillman, & Christian, 2006). Internet surveys, given the absence of face-to-face interaction between the interviewer and respondent, may decrease participants’ tendency to acquiesce to social norms (Smyth, Dillman, & Christian, 2006).

There are many benefits of web-based surveys. For the researcher, there is little cost burden; i.e., no copying and postage costs and implementation time is reduced (Dillman, 2000). Web-based surveys allow easy follow up reminders and non-respondent communication (Dillman, 2000). Data can be reported in real time and numerical format, and survey information is easily imported to statistical analysis software programs (Dillman, 2000). With traditional surveys, researchers indicated a higher response rate when respondents were enticed with a monetary incentive (Mehat & Sivadas, 1995). However, Bosnjak and Tuten (2003) reported that prepaid incentives for web surveys seem to provide no additional motivation in the respondents’ willingness to participate.

While there are documented advantages to using web-based surveys, there are also methodological challenges. Security is an issue. Since many computer systems are set up to gather information about users, anonymity of respondents may be revealed. Respondents may question the security and anonymity of their responses, especially if they are using shared computers (Smyth, Dillman, & Christian, 2006). The issue of uniformity of survey appearance has been linked to different browsers (Dillman & Bowker, 2001). Seeing
different views of identical survey information may cause respondents to receive different visual stimulus (Zanutto, 2001).

Summary

This chapter discussed literature related to three broad categories: (a) job satisfaction, particularly the job satisfaction of teachers; (b) instruments that measure job satisfaction; and (c) web-based surveys. The review of literature began with the historical progression of job satisfaction theories and research studies. Two categories of motivational theory, process and content theories, were discussed. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory, precursor of Herzberg’s job satisfaction theory, was explained. Herzberg’s two-factor theory of motivators (satisfiers) and hygienes (dissatisfiers) was described and recognized as a widely used and accepted mechanism to explain job satisfaction of teachers.

The review of literature revealed motivators and dissatisfiers for teachers in general and for teachers in urban environments. Based on the results of several studies, the stated motivators for teachers were recognition, responsibility, advancement, and professional growth. Reported hygiene factors were salary, school policy, administration and supervision, interpersonal relationships, and working conditions.

The review uncovered a limited number of studies on job satisfaction of family and consumer sciences teachers. Demographics of the FCS program, including teacher turnover and a shortage of replacements, were described along with other major challenges faced by FCS programs and teachers.

The purpose of this review of literature was to gain an understanding of the factors related to job satisfaction for teachers, particularly for urban FCS teachers. The paucity of
research studies on this population is one indicator of the need for further research in this area.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is a reliable and valid survey instrument that has been widely used in the field of education. The MSQ is one of the most widely researched instruments available for measuring job satisfaction (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). The MSQ is popular among researchers (Spector, 1997) because it can be used to measure several variables related to job satisfaction and can be used for many different categories of jobs.

Web-based surveys provide a cost effective and efficient way to conduct research via the Internet. Economic factors may prohibit a researcher from spending an inordinate amount of funds on postage and copying. The web-based delivery of surveys provides real time, accessible and convenient means to gather data.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The review of literature revealed a theoretical basis and research findings related to job satisfaction, teacher job satisfaction, and urban teacher job satisfaction, but few results on urban family and consumer sciences teacher job satisfaction. The purpose of this non-experimental descriptive study is to determine factors related to urban secondary FCS teachers’ perception of job satisfaction.

A quantitative approach was chosen for the study. The literature clearly showed a paucity of research in the area of urban FCS teachers. A deductive approach to the research provided explanations of factors related to urban FCS teachers’ job satisfaction (Patten 2005). A quantitative approach provided data that were easy to quantify and analyze statistically (Creswell, 2002, Patten, 2005). A web-based survey was utilized to collect data. The timeline for the research was limited by the constraints of the school calendar, and a quantitative approach allowed an expeditious collection of data from the sample. A quantitative approach “…provide[d] quick, inexpensive snapshots of narrow aspects of a research problem” (Patten, 2005, p. 21).

This study used descriptive statistical methodology to organize, simplify, and summarize data to increase knowledge about urban secondary FCS teachers’ reported levels of job satisfaction. A self-report questionnaire was used to elicit responses from urban FCS teachers. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were used to analyze the relationships among variables (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).
Job satisfaction was the dependent variable identified for this study. Teacher demographics (teacher’s age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree held, certification type, and ethnic group) were the independent variables.

This chapter describes the population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis of data. The study was conducted following recommended protocols.

*Population and Sample*

The population of interest for this study was urban FCS teachers in the ten urban school districts in Texas.

Ten urban school districts in Texas were identified for this study according to the following definition. “Major urban districts are the districts with the greatest membership in counties with populations of 725,000 or more, and more than 35 percent of the students are identified as economically disadvantaged” (Texas Education Agency, 2008). Ten urban districts were invited to participate in this study.

Texas public schools comprise 1,200 school districts with over 4.6 million students, of which 47 percent are Hispanic and 35 percent are White (Texas Education Agency, 2008). More than 50 percent of Texas students are economically disadvantaged (i.e., receive free or reduced lunch based on household income) (Texas Education Agency, 2008).

Teachers in Texas are not as reflective of the student population in terms of ethnic representation. The ethnic breakdown of teachers is: White, 67.5 percent, Hispanic 21.4
percent, African American 9.6 percent, and Other 1.5 percent (Texas Education Agency, 2008).

Descriptions of the participating districts in this study are presented in this section. This information was obtained using the Academic Excellence Indicator System reported by the Texas Education Agency (2008).

District A is in a large geographic area. There are 58 campuses with an enrollment of nearly 50,000 students. The ethnic composition of the student population in the district is 5.9 percent White, 2.2 percent African American, and 91.1 percent Hispanic. The majority (80.7 percent) of students are economically disadvantaged, as defined by the Texas Education Agency. The teacher ethnic composition is 34.6 percent White, 2.1 percent African America, and 62.5 percent Hispanic.

District B is in a large urban city. There are 74 campuses with an enrollment of more than 64,000 students. The ethnic composition of the student population in the district is 31.4 percent White, 23.9 percent African American, 31.4 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent Asian. The majority (54 percent) of students are economically disadvantaged, as defined by the Texas Education Agency. The teacher ethnic composition is 80.5 percent White, 9.6 percent African America, and 8.1 percent Hispanic, and 1.3 percent Asian.

District C is comprised of a large urban metropolitan area serving 13 municipalities. There are 225 campuses with an enrollment of more than 160,000 students. The ethnic composition of the student population in the district is 4.8 percent White, 28.7 percent
African American, 65.3 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian. The majority (71 percent) of students are economically disadvantaged, as defined by the Texas Education Agency. The teacher ethnic composition is 34.6 percent White, 2.1 percent African America, and 62.3 percent Hispanic.

District D is one of the largest school districts in the nation, encompassing a large urban area that is organized into five geographical regions (i.e. North, South, East, West, and Central). There are 293 campuses with an enrollment of more than 199,500 students. The ethnic composition of the student population in the district is 8.0 percent White, 28.4 percent African American, 60.3 percent Hispanic, and 3.2 percent Asian. The majority (79 percent) of students are economically disadvantaged, as defined by the Texas Education Agency. The teacher ethnic composition is 33.1 percent White, 39.3 percent African America, and 23.2 percent Hispanic, and 4.4 percent Asian.

Purposive non-probability sampling was used to select participants (Patten, 2005). The sampling method was used to gain information from a targeted group. The intent of purposive sampling is to identify and seek participants from a specific population that has pertinent information related to the topic of the research. (Patten, 2005; Creswell, 2002). This methodology was selected because of the subpopulation of urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers.
**Instrumentation**

The two instruments used for this study, both administered via the Internet and both self-administered, were a demographic questionnaire and a web-based version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short-Form (see Appendix E).

The demographic instrument, developed by the researcher, collected the following data from each study participant: age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree held, type of certification, and ethnic group. It was estimated that the demographic questionnaire, hereafter called the Individual Data Sheet, could be completed in approximately five minutes. Results were used for later comparison.

Selection of the items for the Individual Data Sheet was based primarily on variables described in the educators’ job satisfaction literature. Nominal variables measured by the Individual Data Sheet were gender, ethnicity, and certification. The selected variables and their definitions follow:

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

**Ethnicity/Race:** refers to the self-identified ethnicity of the respondent. Respondents were asked to identify the ethnicity that applies to them.

**Certification:** refers to the type of teacher certification held by each respondent. This variable was measured by asking the respondent to choose the applicable State of Texas certification he/she currently possesses.
Ratio variables measured by the Individual Data Sheet were the respondents’ age and years of teaching.

**Age:** refers to the length of life for each respondent. Age was measured by asking respondents to select the appropriate age range listed on the form.

**Years as a family and consumer sciences teacher:** refers to the respondent’s number of years of experience as a family and consumer sciences teacher. This variable was measured by asking the respondent to select from a pre-determined range of given figures indicating the number of years he/she has been a family and consumer sciences teacher.

The ordinal variable measured by the Individual Data Sheet was the highest degree earned by the respondent.

**Degree:** refers to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of studies. Degree was measured by asking the respondent to circle, on a list of given options, the highest degree obtained.

The second instrument, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short-Form (MSQ), copyrighted by the University of Minnesota, Vocational Psychology Research Department, was used with the university’s permission (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). In the MSQ, five statements describe each of the 20 facets (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement, using a five-point Likert scale. It is reported the 1977 version, originally copyrighted in 1963, obtained a ceiling effect and scale score distributions were negatively skewed alternating between “satisfied” and “very satisfied” (University of Minnesota, 1977). To adjust for this effect, the 1967 version uses the five response categories ranging from “extremely satisfied”
to “not satisfied”, which are the response categories utilized for this web-based job satisfaction survey (University of Minnesota, 1977).

Participants in the study were expected to complete the questionnaire in approximately five minutes (University of Minnesota, 2008). The questionnaire is written at a fifth grade reading level (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

Researchers have used the short form of the MSQ with “…acceptable internal consistency reliabilities for extrinsic and intrinsic scales and total scores (Spector, 1997, p. 15). Reports on the reliability of the instrument stated the coefficient alpha values range from .85 to .91; the coefficient alpha for the intrinsic satisfaction subscale ranges from .82 to .86; and the extrinsic satisfaction subscale coefficient alpha ranges from .70 to .82 (Fields, 2002).

“Overall job satisfaction measured with the 20 item MSQ has test retest reliability across three time periods of r-.58 (Fields, 2002, p. 7).

There is evidence of concurrent validity of the MSQ from results of the study of group differences in satisfaction. One-way analyses of variance tested differences of 25 occupational groups. Results showed that group differences were statistically significant at the 0.001 level for means and variances on each of the 21 MSQ scales (Weiss et al., 1967).

Content validity of the MSQ was supported by factor analysis; approximately half of the score variance can be represented by an extrinsic satisfaction factor. The six extrinsic factors of job satisfaction measured by the short form are salary, supervision (human relations), supervision (making decisions), authority, recognition, policies and practices, and opportunity for advancement. Additionally, there is a twelve-item subscale measuring intrinsic motivators; i.e., the work itself, sense of accomplishment, opportunity for
professional growth, responsibility, authority, moral values, social status, security, social service, independence, creativity, and activity (Weiss et al., 1967). General satisfaction scale items include the intrinsic and extrinsic scale items as well as two additional questions; working conditions and interpersonal relationships (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984).

Studying the relationship between personal characteristics and job related variables to levels of job satisfaction provided useful information about urban secondary FCS teachers and their satisfaction with their jobs.

Pilot Study

The researcher conducted a pilot study that sought FCS teachers’ feedback on two open-ended questions related to the most and least satisfying aspects of their job. A convenience sample of 25 FCS Leadership Academy students from Iowa State University was selected for the pilot study. The students in the convenience sample were contacted via e-mail and provided with a description of the study, a request to participate, and a direct link to the survey. Three respondents participated in the pilot. Because of the brevity from these responses it was insufficient to create closed-ended questions for the study. The survey instrument was finalized without input from pilot study participants.

Data Collection Procedures.

Data for the study were collected via the Internet. Web based surveying is becoming widely used in educational research (Solomon, 2001).
Web-based survey methodology

There are many benefits of administering the questionnaires via the Internet. Zanutto (2001) listed the advantages to web based surveys: faster response rate, ease of sending reminders to participants, ease of analyzing data because responses can be downloaded in statistical software, ability to create complex skip-pattern questions that are easy for respondents to follow, and the use of drop down boxes.

Another benefit for the researcher was the lowered cost burden. The initial request for permission to conduct research in a school district incurred minimal postage costs. The initial e-mail to the sample and the follow up e-mails did not incur any postage cost. Authors of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire only required the researcher to pay royalties based on the response rate. This was a significant savings because the researcher sent out a large number of e-mails to targeted participants. Paying for responses only resulted in a higher savings than the traditional mail method in which the researcher incurs a cost for each MSQ mailed.

To increase the response rate, the subjects were contacted in four stages (Salant & Dillman, 1994). In May 2008 all superintendents of the identified urban school districts in Texas were notified via a personal letter (see Appendix F). The purpose of the letter was to request permission to conduct research in the school district. The letter explained the nature of the study and the identified sample (i.e., urban FCS teachers). A follow-up letter was sent in June 2008 to the superintendents who had not responded to the previous request. In September 2008 an initial e-mail was sent to each FCS teacher in the school districts that
agreed to participate in the research study (see Appendix G). The e-mail informed the teacher that he/she had been selected to participate in an Internet survey on job satisfaction, described the importance of the research study, requested their participation, ensured them that participation was voluntary, and guaranteed their identify would not be revealed. Two weeks later subjects were sent another e-mail inviting them to participate and providing them a direct link to the web based questionnaires that had been uploaded on Survey Gizmo, the licensed survey site at Iowa State University’s College of Human Sciences. A week after the e-mails were sent out, a follow up e-mail reminder was sent. The fourth contact was sent out the first week in October 2008, (i.e. two weeks after the initial e-mail letter). The e-mail included a personal message to the participant, another request to respond, and a direct link to the survey. Dillman (2000) suggested that the overall response rate could be improved if the researcher made a final contact, including a personalized message.

Completed questionnaires were submitted via a direct link to the survey site at Iowa State University’s College of Human Sciences. The survey was designed for each respondent to answer the demographic questions using a drop down box. This allowed each respondent the opportunity to classify themselves for each demographic listed. The MSQ portion of the survey utilized a table/matrix with radio buttons so each respondent could indicate their level of satisfaction ranging from 5, “Extremely Satisfied” to 1, “Not Satisfied”. The respondent needed to answer all of the questions on each screen before the survey would proceed to the next screen. There was not the ability to go back to previous screens. Survey Gizmo’s duplicate response protection prevented respondents from completing the survey more than
once. The researcher obtained the questionnaire responses from research personnel in the College and had no knowledge of the participants’ or school districts’ identity, thereby protecting the anonymity of participants.

The demographic form was presented first; the MSQ questionnaire followed. This allowed respondents the opportunity to answer easy and quick questions first and reduced the likelihood that they would not complete the survey.

Data Coding

Iowa State University’s College of Human Sciences site license provided a fee-free survey site. Respondents submitted completed questionnaires directly to the University’s survey site. Data were coded using Survey Gizmo and then delivered to the researcher.

Data Analysis

Data were prepared for statistical analysis. SPSS was the statistic software used for data analysis. Responses to the demographic questionnaire were analyzed and reported using frequencies and percent distributions. Responses to questions on the MSQ were analyzed and summarized using non-experimental descriptive statistics and univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), a statistical technique that allows a researcher to compare the means and standard deviations of three or more groups in order to determine if there is a statistically significant difference (Patten, 2005). Univariate analysis of variance was suitable for this study because it tested the null hypotheses that group means did not differ. Levene’s Test of Equality of
Error Variance was conducted to test homogeneity of variance assumptions (Wielkiewicz, n.d.).

The study attempted to determine which, if any, of the independent variables (e.g., teacher’s age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree held, certification type, and ethnic group) had a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable (e.g., level of job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers). Levene’s test of equality of error variances is calculated by SPSS to test ANOVA assumption that each group of the independent variables has the same variance. If the Levene statistic is significant at .05, the researcher will fail to reject the null hypotheses. If the significance is less that .05, the researcher rejects the null hypotheses that the groups have equal variances (Garson, 2008).

Institutional Review Board

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Iowa State University are responsible for reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local regulations. For purposes of this research study, an exemption from the requirements of the human subject regulations was granted because the research was conducted in an “established or commonly accepted education setting, involving normal educational practices” (Iowa State University IRB, para. 26).
Summary

Chapter 3 described the design methods for this quantitative research study. The chapter also provided information about the population and sample studied, the instrumentation, and procedures for data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the overall job satisfaction of urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in Texas. Data were collected via an Internet survey version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form). Additionally, an Individual Data Sheet collected responses related to participants’ demographic variables.

This chapter describes the population, sample studied, and analysis of data related to each research question.

Description of the Population

The target population for this study was Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) teachers who currently teach in one of the 10 urban school districts in Texas. There are 464 FCS teachers teaching in the ten urban districts identified by the Texas Education Agency. Of the ten districts contacted, three districts did not respond; three districts denied participation, and four districts granted permission for the study. Two hundred FCS teachers teach in the four participating districts, resulting in a target sample size of \( n = 200 \).

Description of the Target Sample

The initial e-mail to the sample consisted of information about the study, an invitation to participate, and a consent agreement. The second e-mail invited the participants to participate in the web-based survey consisting of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) and an Individual Data Sheet that requested demographic information about
participants. Two additional e-mails were sent in an effort to increase participation in the study.

Of the 200 teachers contacted from the four participating districts, 57 responded for a response rate of 35 percent. This is an acceptable response rate for a web-based survey (Weisberg, Krosnick & Bowen, 1996). The University of Texas’ Instructional Assessment Resources website indicated for an online survey 30 percent was average, email surveys 40 percent was average, 50 percent was good and 60 percent is excellent (“Response Rates”, para. 6, 2009). Other teacher satisfaction studies (Hess, 2007; Bragger, Rodríguez-Sednicki, Kutcher, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005) that used the MSQ yielded response rates between 40 percent and 63 percent.

Data were collected on each participant’s age, gender, degree earned, years in teaching, certification, and race. Frequency and percent distributions are reported on these variables. Means and standard deviations were reported as appropriate.

Age

Participants were asked to select the age group in which they fit. The categories were: younger than 35 years old, 36-45 years old, 46-55 years old, and older than 55 years.

The majority of the population were older than 46 years. Less than one-fourth of participants reported they were 35 or younger, and even fewer respondents reported they were between the ages of 36-45 (See Table 4.1).
Table 4.1 Age, Frequency, and Percent Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

Participants were asked to report their gender by selecting either a = male or b = female. All but one of the 57 respondents was female.

Degree

An almost equal number of respondents indicated they held a bachelor’s degree and a master’s degree. Four individuals held doctorate degrees (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Degree, Frequency, and Percent Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years in teaching

Nearly 60 percent of respondents indicated they had been in teaching for more than 10 years. A smaller percent reported teaching between four and six years. Fewer reported they had been teaching between one and three years, and a considerable smaller percent reported being in teaching for seven to nine years (See Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Years teaching FCS, Frequency, and Percent Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Certification

Most of participants indicated they held standard Texas teacher certification in Family and Consumer Sciences. Fewer reported holding a standard Texas teaching certificate in Family and Consumer Sciences with Certified Family and Consumer Sciences (CFCS) accreditation. A few held an alternative Texas teaching certification, or Texas teaching certification (See Table 4.4).
Table 4.4 Certification, Frequency, and Percent Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Certificate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Certification with CFCS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race

The majority (65%) of the respondents identified their race/ethnic group as white. Fewer (23%) reported their race/ethnic group as African American. A low percent (7%) identified their race/ethnic group as Hispanic. Three identified their race/ethnic group as “other.” No participants reported their race/ethnic group as Native American or Pacific Islander (See Table 4.5).
Table 4.5 Race, Frequency, and Percent Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions

The following questions guided the research for this study:

1. What is the general level of job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers?

2. What factors are present that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers?

3. What is the relationship of the overall job satisfaction level of urban FCS secondary teachers with selected demographic characteristics?
   
   \( H_{01} \): There will be no significant difference in the level of general job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers in Texas with respect to selected demographics.
   
   \( H_{02} \): There will be significant difference in the level of general job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers in Texas with respect to selected demographics.

4. What are the areas of job satisfaction (motivators) reported by urban FCS teachers?
5. What are the areas of job dissatisfaction (hygienes) reported by urban FCS teachers?

Job Satisfaction

Data obtained from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were analyzed to determine respondents’ level of “general” job satisfaction as well as their levels of “intrinsic” and “extrinsic” job satisfaction.

General Job Satisfaction

Participants responded to 20 questions related to job satisfaction using a five point Likert scale. The response format used most frequently in the long and short form are 5 = “Very Satisfied”, 4 = “Satisfied”, 3 = “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied”, 2 = “Dissatisfied”, and 1 = “Very Dissatisfied”. This response format was found to have a ceiling effect which caused the scale score distributions to be negatively skewed (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The 1967 version adjusted for this by using the response options “Not Satisfied,” “Somewhat Satisfied,” “Satisfied,” “Very Satisfied,” and “Extremely Satisfied.” This modification resulted in a symmetrical scale score distribution that centered on the "satisfied" category and evidenced larger item variance (Weiss, Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). This web-based survey used the 1967 response categories.

The frequency distribution on the general level of satisfaction ranged from a low of 2.74 to a high of 4.42 (see Table 4.6). The mean for the general satisfaction was 3.69 with a standard deviation of .679.

Since the scale consisted of 20 questions, the possible range was from 20 – 100. The mean for the general satisfaction was 73.88 with a standard deviation of 13.58 Results
suggest that the general job satisfaction level of the urban FCS teachers participating in the study fell between “Very Satisfied” and “Satisfied.”

The possible range of scores for intrinsic job satisfaction was from 12 to 60. Intrinsic satisfaction scores ranged from a low of 31 to a high score of 60. The mean of intrinsic satisfaction was 48.56 with a standard deviation of 7.93. These data converted to the Likert scale indicated the intrinsic satisfaction level mean was 4.04 with a standard deviation of .660. Results indicated the intrinsic job satisfaction level of the urban FCS teachers participating in the study was “Very Satisfied.”

The extrinsic satisfaction scores ranged from 6-30. The mean extrinsic satisfaction score was 15.54 with a standard deviation of 4.33. These data converted to the Likert scale indicated an extrinsic satisfaction level mean of 3.10 with a standard deviation of .867 (see Table 12). Results indicated the extrinsic job satisfaction level of the urban FCS teachers participating in the study was “Satisfied.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General level of job satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things different from time to time.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to be “somebody” in the community.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my boss handles his/her workers.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for advancement on the job.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment from the job.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Weiss et al., 1967)
Analysis and Findings

This section of Chapter 4 restates the research questions followed by discussion of data analysis and results. Data were summarized using frequencies, percents, means, and standard deviations. Tests of statistical significance were carried out, e.g., ANOVA and Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances. The researcher used these analytical methods because univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA), allows the comparison of the means and standard deviations of three or more groups in order to determine if there is a statistically significant difference (Patton, 2005). Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variance was conducted to test homogeneity of variance assumptions (Wielkiewicz, 2008).

Research Question 1: What is the general level of satisfaction of urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in Texas?

The frequency distribution of general satisfaction scores indicates mean score of 3.69 and standard deviation of .679. The score range is 1-5. Participants’ scores trended toward the high end of the range. Results indicate that urban FCS teachers trend toward being very satisfied with their jobs.
Research Question 1: To what extent are urban FCS teachers satisfied with their jobs?

- A mean score of 3.69 indicated the FCS teachers scores trended toward the higher end of the satisfaction scale, although strong satisfaction was not indicated.

*Figure 4.1* General, Intrinsic and Extrinsic satisfaction mean scores using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Satisfaction (5 indicating “Extremely Satisfied” to 1 indicating “Not Satisfied”).

Research Question 2: What factors are present that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers?

For this study, climate was defined as “the feelings and attitudes that are elicited by a school’s environment” (Loukas, para. 1, 2007). Although it is difficult to provide a concise definition, researchers agree that climate is “a multidimensional construct that includes physical, social, and academic dimensions” (Loukas, para. 1, 2007). For example, Herzberg’s research (1959) did not identify “climate” as a motivator even though some of his work suggests that certain motivators present in a work environment may lead to a positive school
climate. “Although this broad term has been researched for many years, a sole definition has yet to be formulated” (Marshall, para. 2, 2002). The school climate is a subjective experience, and does not have defined dimensions (Cohen, 2006). Buckman, King and Ryan (1995) did not talk about “climate” per se but concluded that qualities such as openness, trust, communication, and support lead to job satisfaction and improved performances by teachers. Hoy and Miskel (1991) concluded that a teacher's collection of perceptions of behaviors in schools affected their satisfaction with their jobs.

Qualitative researchers strive to identify the “interconnected interpretations” of the research topic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.4). Two open-ended questions were written for the pilot study. The first question asked the FCS teachers to identify two of the most satisfying aspects of their FCS positions. In the second open-ended question, the respondent was asked to identify two of the least satisfying aspects of their FCS position. The responses from the three respondents in the pilot study provided insight to the satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of their positions as FCS teachers. Respondents reported curriculum and working with students as satisfying aspects of their FCS teaching positions, and resource constraints as dissatisfying (See Appendix A). Because of the brevity from these responses it was insufficient to create closed-ended questions for the study. The survey instrument was finalized without input from pilot study participants.

It is apparent that climate is difficult to tease out because it is difficult to define the term and difficult to measure teachers’ perceptions of school climate. For this study, climate was difficult to quantify using the MSQ because the instrument does not include a question that addresses climate.
Research Question 3: What is the relationship of the overall job satisfaction level of urban FCS secondary teachers and selected demographic variables?

The general job satisfaction level of urban FCS teachers was analyzed using ANOVA. No statistically significant difference was found between the mean on the general satisfaction scale and the mean on the six dependent variables (See Table 4.7).

Table 4.7 Analysis of Variance for Overall General Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note Statistically significant at alpha=.05.

Age

There are various positions on the relationship between age and job satisfaction. Herzberg et.al., 1959 identified younger employees had higher levels of satisfaction then after a while the satisfaction waned, with it to rise again as the employees aged. Studies have
indicated as the teacher's age increased, so did overall job satisfaction (Berns, 1989; Grady, 1985).

Does age affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers?

The researcher hypothesized:

$H_{01}$: There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers’ general job satisfaction with regard to age.

No statistically significant difference 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 3.69 (SD = .679). There was slight variance in job satisfaction levels of the different age categories. The teachers in the older age categories indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction than younger teachers (See Table 4.8).

Table 4.8 Age, Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 35</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>3.505</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 55</td>
<td>3.773</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.693</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Age

To test the hypothesis, an ANOVA was carried out (See Table 4.9). The value of critical $F$ is 2.78. Critical $F$ is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.).
When the results of an $F$ test with df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger than the associated value, then the $F$ test is significant at the .05 level (i.e. $p < .05$). The decision rule is to reject $H_{01}$ ($p < .05$) if $F$ equals or is greater than 2.78. Since $F$ (1.485) is not equal to or greater than 2.78 (critical $F$), the null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concludes that there is no statistically significant difference in mean scores of Texas urban FCS teacher’s general job satisfaction with regard to age.

Table 4.9 ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Statistically significant at alpha = .05.*

*Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variance and Age*

Levene’s test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of $p = .988$ (See Table 4.10), which is greater than .05. Results thus indicate that error variances in general job satisfaction scores for each age group do not differ significantly.

Table 4.10 Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.043</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

There is no conclusive evidence indicating that gender makes a difference in job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) indicated males were more satisfied. In contrast, Cano and Miller (1992) found male and female agriculture teachers were equally satisfied. Bowen, Radhakrishna, and Keyser (1994) found females were more satisfied. Riggs and Beus (1993) discovered females were more satisfied when levels of responsibility increased, while their male counterparts were less satisfied when faced with additional responsibility. Other studies (Boltes, Lippke, & Gregory, 1995; Nestor & Leary, 2000) have found no relationship between gender and job satisfaction.

Does gender affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers? The researcher hypothesized:

\[ H_{01}: \text{There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers' general job satisfaction with regard to gender.} \]

No statistically significant difference was 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 males was 2.40 (SD=0) and 3.71 (SD=.662) for females.

**ANOVA for Gender**

Results of the ANOVA indicate the value of critical \( F \) is 4.01. Critical \( F \) is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of
freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.). When the results of an F test are
df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger than the associated value, then the F test is
significant at the .05 level (i.e. p < .05). The decision rule is to reject H01 (p < .05) if F equals
or is greater than 4.01. Since F (3.883) is not equal to or greater than 4.01 (critical F), the
null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concluded that there is no significant
difference in mean scores of Texas urban FCS teacher’s general job satisfaction with regard
to gender.

Levene’s test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of
p = .131 which is greater than .05. Results thus indicate that error variances in general job
satisfaction scores for each gender category do not differ significantly

Degree

Recent research of job satisfaction as it related to level of education were mixed. Wan
and Leightly (2006) found no correlation between level of education and job satisfaction.
Vila and Garcia-Mora (2005) revealed various factors of the job and its relationship to the
level of education may affect job satisfaction. Teachers with a master’s degree were more
satisfied than other levels of education (Berns, 1989). Another study found teachers’ degree
level had no effect on their level of satisfaction (Cano & Miller, 1992). In some cases, the
relationship between types of degrees and job satisfaction may be masked by the opportunity
for higher earnings although a higher degree does not mean a significant increase in salary
(Riggs & Beus, 1993).
An almost equal level of satisfaction was reported for teachers with bachelor and master degrees with only a slightly lower level of satisfaction among teachers who held doctorates (See Table 4.11).

Table 4.11 Descriptive Statistics for Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Degree

Does academic degree affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers?

The statistical hypothesis $H_{01}$: There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers’ general job satisfaction with regard to degree.

The value of critical $F$ is 3.168. Critical $F$ is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.). When the results of an $F$ test are df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger than the associated value, then the $F$ test is significant at the .05 level (i.e. $p < .05$). The decision rule is to reject $H_{01}$ ($p < .05$) if $F$ equals or is greater than 3.168. Since $F$ (1.162) is not equal to or greater than 4.01 (critical $F$), the null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concludes that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers’ general job satisfaction with regard to the degree they hold (See Table 4.12).
Table 4.12 Analysis of Variance for Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Statistically significant at alpha=.05.

Levene’s test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of $p = .497$, which is greater than .05. Results indicate that error variances in general job satisfaction scores for each degree category do not differ significantly (See Table 4.13).

Table 4.13 Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances and Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.708</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Years of Teaching*

Studies have uncovered that years of teaching was not a predictor of job satisfaction (Camilli, 2004; Yezzi & Lester, 2000). These studies support the similar findings of job satisfaction with relation to the demographic, age. Some evidence indicated longer tenure resulted in an increase in job dissatisfaction (Lowther, 1985; Klecker & Loadman, 1997).
Does the number of years of teaching affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers?

The statistical hypothesis $H_0$: There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers' general job satisfaction with regard to years of teaching.

No statistically significant difference was found between means on the general satisfaction scale for different categories of the variable “Years of Teaching”. The data indicated the mean on the general job satisfaction scale was 3.69 (SD = .679). There was slight variance in job satisfaction levels of the different tenure categories. The teachers with the most years of teaching indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction than the younger teachers (See Table 4.14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Years of Teaching

To assess the relationship of demographic data with the overall general job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers in Texas, one-way ANOVA models were estimated (See Table 4.15).
Table 4.15 ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and Years of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*
Statistically significant at alpha=.05.

The value of critical $F$ is 2.779. Critical $F$ is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.). When the results of an $F$ test are df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger than the associated value, then the $F$ test is significant at the .05 level (i.e. $p < .05$). The decision rule is to reject $H_{01}$ ($p < .05$) if $F$ equals or is greater than 2.779. Since $F$ (2.413) is not equal to or greater than 2.779 (critical $F$), the null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference in mean scores of Texas urban FCS teacher’s general job satisfaction with regard to years of teaching (See Table 4.15).

Levene’s test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of $p = .878$, which is greater than .05. Results thus indicate that error variances in general job satisfaction for each category of years of teaching do not differ significantly (See Table 4.16).
Table 4.16 Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances and Years of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.226</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification

There is little research on level of job satisfaction and types of teacher certification. Bernhauen and Cunningham 2001, reported teachers in the induction phase of their careers needed support to build confidence and resiliency. A study found teachers who have contact with other teachers in their academic field contributed to resiliency (Collins, 1999). As previously stated, as a teacher builds tenure and ages, satisfaction tends to rise.

Does type of certification held affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers?

The statistical hypothesis $H_0$: There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers’ general job satisfaction with regard to certification.

No statistically significant difference was found between means on the general satisfaction scale for different categories of the variable “Certification”. The data indicated the mean on the general job satisfaction scale was 3.69 (SD = .679). There was slight variance in job satisfaction levels of the different certification categories. The teachers with alternative certification indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction than other types of certification (See Table 4.17).
Table 4.17 Descriptive Statistics for Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Certification</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Certification</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Certification with CFCS</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Certification</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Certification

The value of critical $F$ is 2.779. Critical $F$ is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.). When the results of an $F$ test are df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger than the associated value, then the $F$ test is significant at the .05 level (i.e. $p < .05$). The decision rule is to reject $H_{01}$ ($p < .05$) if $F$ equals or is greater than 2.779. Since $F$ (.706) is not equal to or greater than 2.779 (critical $F$), the null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference in mean scores of Texas urban FCS teacher's general job satisfaction with regard to certification (See Table 4.18).
Table 4.18 ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Statistically significant at alpha=.05.*

Levene’s test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of $p = .808$, which is greater than .05. Results thus indicate that error variances in general job satisfaction scores for each certification category do not differ significantly (See Table 4.19).

Table 4.19 Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances and Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.323</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Race*

Research on the relationship between race and job satisfaction yielded various results. Many studies found white employees were more satisfied than minority employees (Brush, Moch, and Pooyan, 1987). Spector (1977) stated minor differences exist, but are minimal. In contrast, others discovered minority employees were more satisfied with extrinsic motivators (i.e. monetary gains) than Caucasians who tended to be more satisfied with intrinsic motivators (i.e. recognition, achievement, and personal growth) (Barber & Daly, 1986).
Does race affect the levels of general job satisfaction of Texas urban FCS teachers?

The statistical hypothesis $H_0$: There is no difference in the means of the Texas urban FCS teachers’ general job satisfaction with regard to race.

No statistically significant difference was found between means on the general satisfaction scale for different categories of the variable “Race”. The data indicated the mean on the general job satisfaction scale was 3.69 (SD = .679). There was slight variance in job satisfaction levels of the different race categories. African American teachers indicated a slightly higher level of satisfaction than other race categories (See Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 Descriptive Statistics for Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{3.69} & \text{.679} & \text{57}
\end{array}$$

*ANOVA for Race*

The value of critical $F$ is 2.779. Critical $F$ is determined by the numerator degrees of freedom (df1) divided by the denominator degrees of freedom (df2) when the alpha level is at .05 (Lowry, n.d.). When the results of an $F$ test are df1 and df2 degrees of freedom are larger
than the associated value, then the $F$ test is significant at the .05 level (i.e. $p < .05$). The decision rule is to reject $H_0$ ($p < .05$) if $F$ equals or is greater than 2.779. Since $F$ (2.00) is not equal to or greater than 2.779 (critical $F$), the null hypotheses is not rejected, and the researcher concluded that there is no significant difference in mean scores of Texas urban FCS teacher's general job satisfaction with regard to race (See Table 4.21).

Table 4.21 ANOVA General Job Satisfaction and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistically significant at alpha=.05.

Levene's test of equality of error variances yielded a significance value of $p = .660$, which is greater than .05. Results indicate that error variances in general job satisfaction scores for each category of race do not differ significantly (See Table 4.22).

Table 4.22 Levene's Test of Error of Variances and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.536</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: What are the areas of job satisfaction (motivators) reported by urban FCS teachers?

In his theory, Herzberg (1966) identified 12 areas of motivation for employees. Results of this study, using the MSQ, indicate participants ranked Herzberg’s intrinsic motivators, from highest to lowest, in this order: variety, activity, social service, moral values, ability, security, creativity, independence, responsibility, achievement, vanity, authority.

Intrinsic Motivators

![Graph showing motivators]

Figure 4.2 Intrinsic motivators of urban FCS teachers in Texas, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire using a 5 point Likert scale; 5 indicated “Extremely Satisfied” to 1 indicated “Not Satisfied”.
Variety

Variety, as a motivator, was measured based on the MSQ question, “The chance to do things different from time to time”. The overall mean for the motivator variety was 4.42 with a standard deviation of .801. The majority of respondents indicated being between “Extremely Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” with the chance to do things differently from time to time. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Social Service

“The chance to do things for other people” was the item on the MSQ that measured the motivator for social service. The overall mean for the motivator social service was 4.32 with a standard deviation of .852. In general, respondents indicated being “Very Satisfied” with their chances to do things for other people. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Activity

Activity, as a motivator, was measured from the MSQ question, “Being able to keep busy all the time”. The overall mean for the motivator activity was 4.32 with a standard deviation of .848. In general, respondents indicated being "Very Satisfied" with the ability to keep busy all the time on their jobs. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Moral Values

Moral values, as a motivator, were measured by the MSQ question, “Being able to do things that do not go against my conscience”. The overall mean for the motivator moral value was 4.30 with a standard deviation of .906. In general, respondents reported being “Very
Satisfied” with being able to do things that do not go against their consciences on their jobs. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

*Ability*

Another intrinsic motivator aligned with Herzberg’s (1966) theory is ability. The MSQ question that measured ability was “The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities”. The mean for ability was 4.28 with a standard deviation of .840. In general, respondents indicated they were “Very Satisfied” with their jobs as urban FCS teachers. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

*Security*

Security, as a motivator, was measured from the MSQ question, “The way my job provides for steady employment”. The overall mean for the motivator advancement was 4.02 with a standard deviation of 1.20. In general, respondents reported being “Very Satisfied” with the stability of employment on their jobs. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

*Creativity*

Another intrinsic motivator aligned with Herzberg’s theory is creativity. The MSQ question that measured creativity was “The chance to try my own methods of doing the job”. The overall mean for the motivator creativity was 4.11 with a standard deviation of .976. In general, respondents reported being “Very Satisfied” with the chances to try their own methods of doing their jobs. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.
Independence

Independence, as a motivator, was measured by the MSQ question, “The chance to work alone on the job”. The overall mean for the motivator independence was 3.93 with a standard deviation of 1.06. In general, respondents reported a trend toward “Very Satisfied”. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Responsibility

The question from the MSQ, “The freedom to use my own judgment” reported the data collected on this motivator. The responsibility question yielded a mean of 3.88. The standard deviation was .983. In general, respondents reported a trend toward being “Very Satisfied” with their work. A majority of the respondents reported being "Extremely Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied”. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Achievement

The achievement indicator in the MSQ short form was the question: “The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job”. The overall mean for the achievement score was 3.84 and a standard deviation of 1.03. In general, respondents reported a trend toward being “Very Satisfied” in their job. The majority of respondents were “Extremely Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied”. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Vanity

“The chance to be “somebody” in my community” was the MSQ question that measured the motivator vanity. The overall mean for the motivator vanity was 3.74 with a standard deviation of .955. In general, respondents indicated a trend toward being “Very
Satisfied” with the chances to try their own methods of doing their jobs. The majority of respondents reported being “Extremely Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” while slightly less reported being “Satisfied.” Few respondents reported being “Somewhat Satisfied” with their jobs. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Authority

Authority, as a motivator was measured from the MSQ question, “The chance to tell people what to do”. The overall mean for the motivator authority was 3.40 with a standard deviation of 1.06. In general, respondents indicated they were “Satisfied” with the chances to tell people what to do at their jobs. Respondents reported being “Extremely Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” at a lower rate than previous factors. “Not Satisfied” respondents increased from previous factors, but remained low. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Research Question 5: What are the areas of job dissatisfaction (extrinsic factors, hygienes) related to general job satisfaction?

In his theory, Herzberg identified areas of motivation for employees (1966). The extrinsic motivators were supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), recognition, policy and practices, advancement, and pay. Using the MSQ, the data will be presented in rank order from highest mean to lowest mean for extrinsic motivators (See Figure 4.3).
Extrinsic Motivators

Research Question 5: What are the areas of job dissatisfaction (extrinsic motivators/hygienes) reported by urban FCS teachers

Figure 4.3 Extrinsic motivators of urban FCS teachers in Texas, as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (5 indicated “Extremely Satisfied” to 1 indicated “Not Satisfied”).

Supervision (Human Relations)

Supervision relating to human relations is an extrinsic motivator. The question in the MSQ that measured these was “The way my boss handles his/her workers”. This question yielded a 3.53 mean and a standard deviation of 1.21. In general, respondents indicated they were “Satisfied” with their jobs as urban FCS teachers. An almost equal frequency distribution was reported for “Extremely Satisfied”, “Very Satisfied” and “Satisfied.” Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.
**Supervision (technical)**

The way a supervisor makes decisions is an extrinsic factor measured from the MSQ question, “The competence in my supervisor making decisions”. The overall mean for the motivator supervision was 3.49 with a standard deviation of 1.26. In general, respondents reported they were “Satisfied” with the supervision they received. Again, an almost equal frequency distribution was reported for “Extremely Satisfied”, “Very Satisfied” and “Satisfied.” An increased number of respondents reported being “Not Satisfied” over “Somewhat Satisfied.” Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

**Recognition**

Another extrinsic motivator of Herzberg’s theory is recognition. The question in the MSQ that measured recognition was “The praise I get for doing a good job”. The mean for recognition was 3.04 with a standard deviation of 1.29. In general respondents indicated they were “Satisfied” with their jobs as urban FCS teachers. “Extremely Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” percents showed a decline as “Somewhat Satisfied” and “Not Satisfied” began increase in frequency reported from respondents. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

**Policies and Practices**

Policy and practices were extrinsic motivators. The question in the MSQ that measured these was “The way company policies are put into practices.” This question yielded a 2.89 mean and a standard deviation of 1.03. In general, respondents indicated they were trending toward “Satisfied” with the policy and practices in their jobs as urban FCS teachers. More than a 33 percent reported being “Satisfied.” Respondents reported being
"Somewhat Satisfied" and "Not Satisfied" more than previous factors. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Advancement

Advancement, as a motivator, was measured from the MSQ question, "The chances for advancement". The overall mean for the motivator advancement was 2.75 with a standard deviation of 1.00. In general, respondents reported being between "Somewhat Satisfied" with a trend toward "Satisfied" with the chances for advancement on their jobs. The majority reported being "Satisfied" or "Somewhat Satisfied" while few reported being "Not Satisfied". Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Salary

The final extrinsic motivator measured was salary. The MSQ question, "The pay and the amount of work I do" measured salary. The overall mean for the motivator salary was 2.74 with a standard deviation of 1.15. In general, respondents indicated they were "Somewhat Satisfied" with a trend toward "Satisfied" with the pay and the amount of work they do on their jobs. More than 33 percent of respondents reported being "Satisfied" while "Somewhat Satisfied" and "Not Satisfied" respondents increased from previous factors. Frequency distributions are depicted in Appendix B.

Summary

The respondents to this study reported satisfactory levels of overall job satisfaction. Intrinsic factors (i.e. variety, social service, activity, ability, independence, creativity) were reported as most satisfying. Extrinsic factors (i.e. supervisor competence, company policies,
compensation, advancement, praise) resulted in lower levels of reported job satisfaction. There was no significant difference found between the mean of general job satisfaction and the demographic variables.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter contains a brief summary of the study, discussion of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research studies.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers in Texas. The web based study used an Individual Data Sheet developed by the researcher to gather demographic information about participants and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (short form) developed by the University of Minnesota to measure participants’ level of job satisfaction.

The research questions that guided this study were:

1. What is the general level of job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers?
2. What factors are present that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers?
3. What is the relationship of the overall job satisfaction level of urban FCS secondary teachers with selected demographic characteristics?
4. What are the areas of job satisfaction (motivators) reported by urban FCS teachers?
5. What are the areas of job dissatisfaction (hygienes) reported by urban FCS teachers?

Data related to all five research questions were summarized using descriptive statistics. In addition, for the six demographic factors (age, gender, degree, years teaching, certification, and race), analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were carried out to compare the amount of between-groups variance in individuals’ scores with the amount of within-groups variance (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variance was conducted to test homogeneity of variance assumptions (Wielkiewicz, 2008).

Discussion of Findings

*General Level of Job Satisfaction*

Research question 1 dealt with the extent to which urban family and consumer sciences teachers are satisfied with their jobs. Results indicated that urban FCS teachers were satisfied with their jobs. This result was lower than anticipated. In previous studies, both Bartley and Sneed (2004) and Hollandsworth (1960) reported high FCS teacher satisfaction.

*Factors That Provide a Climate of Job Satisfaction*

Research question 2 investigated the factors that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers.

Although the review of literature uncovered research studies related to climate and teachers’ job satisfaction, the current study was unable to answer this question because the MSQ does not include a question that directly addresses climate. In a previous study, Hoy
and Miskel (1991) found that school climate had an effect on teacher behavior. Teachers’ collection of perceptions of behaviors in schools affected satisfaction (Hoy and Miskel, 1991).

While the current study was unable to answer the climate question, future research studies may wish to address this question by investigating dimensions of climate identified in the literature by coupling the MSQ with an instrument that quantifies climate. Research could also attempt to determine teacher’s personality, such as the Myers-Briggs Type indicator (“MBTI basics”, 2009). Together these results could provide insight to job satisfaction and school climate.

For example, researchers have broadly defined climate as “a multidimensional construct that includes physical, social, and academic dimensions” (Loukas, 2007, p.1). Herzberg’s (1966) research suggests certain motivators present in a work environment may lead to a positive school climate. Buckman, King and Ryan (1995) concluded qualities related to climate; e.g., openness, trust, communication, and support, may lead to job satisfaction and improved performances by teachers.

**Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Selected Demographic Characteristics**

Research question 3 addressed the relationship of overall job satisfaction level of urban FCS secondary teachers with six selected demographic characteristics: age, gender, degree, certification, years teaching and race/ethnic group. The study asked the question: Do the independent variables (demographic variables) affect the dependent variable (general job
satisfaction)? Analysis of variance indicates there was no statistically significant effect on the dependent variable (job satisfaction) based on any of the independent variables.

Analysis of the demographic data portrayed the typical urban FCS teacher as a white female, older than 46 years of age, with a bachelor’s degree and a standard Texas teacher certification in family and consumer sciences and more than 10 years of FCS teaching experience. This finding is of interest for several reasons related to the six independent variables of age, gender, degree, length of teaching, certification, and race.

Age

The majority of participants in this study were 46 years or older. This finding supports the literature that identified the issue of the aging FCS teacher population in Texas. Data from the Texas Education Agency indicated that by 2010-2011, 55.3% of FCS teachers in Texas would be eligible for retirement (Texas Education Agency, 2007). The literature supports the findings of this study. Employees who are older tend to be more satisfied with their chosen profession.

Herzberg’s (1966) U-shaped job satisfaction relationship was identified. Herzberg reported younger workers had higher job satisfaction levels, but satisfaction declined mid career then as employees approached the end of their career, satisfaction increased. Other studies (Bernal, Snyder & McDaniel, 1998; Lee and Wilber, 1985) concluded as an employee’s age increased so does the level of job satisfaction they experience.

There is a relationship between generation differences and work environments (Hankin, 2004). The most consistent indicator of workers and their characteristics can be
found through the study of generations (Hankin, 2004). Baby Boomers comprise 40 percent of working adults today, while Generation X comprises 44 percent (U.S. Bureau of Labor, 2008). Older employees reported higher levels of job satisfaction, whereas employees younger than 35 year were less satisfied, according to Hankin (2004). McKee (2003) found teachers older than 41 years were content to remain in their jobs.

Gender

The demographic data collected in this study showed that all but one of the participants was female. The literature indicated there was still a majority of women working as FCS teachers (Bartley and Sneed, 2004; McKee, 2003; Williams, 2000). According to Werhan and Way (2006), FCS is considered a “stereotypically” woman’s teaching assignment. Currently there is no information that accurately accounts for the number of male FCS teachers in the United States. This study reflected the current information in the literature.

Degree

Demographic data revealed that almost equal numbers of FCS teachers had a bachelor’s degree (47%) or a master’s degree (46%). Only seven percent had a doctoral degree. The literature revealed teachers with a bachelor degree were content to remain as classroom teachers (McKee, 2003). This supported the findings of this research, in that bachelor degreed FCS teachers indicated the highest level of satisfaction.
Years teaching

Results of demographic data also suggested that a large percentage of FCS teachers have been teaching for more than a decade. Respondents in this study with more than ten years FCS teaching experiences reported they were more satisfied than teachers were with less experience. Bartley and Sneed (2004) described the extremely satisfied FCS teachers as having more than six years teaching experience. McKee (2003) found teachers with more than 10 years experience were more content.

Certification

Analysis of demographic data indicated that only 5.3% of the sample is currently not certified to teach in Texas. This finding differs from the Texas Education Agency’s data that reported 33.3% of FCS teachers in Texas were teaching without a FCS teaching certificate (FCS Alliance, n.d.).

This study revealed the majority of FCS teachers chose the traditional path to teacher certification (i.e. through a teacher education program at a college or university). Darling-Hammond (1998) ascertained teachers with traditional certifications were less likely to leave their positions. Bartley and Sneed (2004) reported extremely satisfied FCS teachers were professionally licensed, thus supporting the findings of this study; teachers with a traditional certification are satisfied with their level of job satisfaction. Teachers with university-based preparation to teach FCS have had many hours of classroom theory, FCS practicum teaching, and the opportunity to be mentored by FCS professionals.
The pedagogical development is established for the teacher and anxiety levels maybe reduced because of the ability to put their knowledge into practice as a FCS teacher.

Darling-Hammond (1998) posited teachers with alternative certifications were not satisfied with their teaching role. Refuting these findings, this study revealed teachers with alternative certifications were satisfied.

It may be that teachers with alternative certificates chose to go into the FCS teaching profession after having a different career. It is in the choosing to teach that more satisfaction may arise. Teachers may seek urban settings because of greater need for FCS teachers, higher pay, or job security.

*Race*

Analysis of demographic data also indicated that a large number of Caucasian women teach FCS courses in urban schools, yet the majority of students in urban schools are members of minority groups (Jacob, 2007). African American FCS teachers reported the highest level of satisfaction in this study. This result is different from what some of the literature revealed. European American (i.e. White) FCS teachers were found to be extremely satisfied with their role as a FCS teacher (Bartley and Sneed, 2004). The Texas Education Agency statistics (2007) report Hispanic and White teachers had the lowest attrition rates, while African American teachers had the highest rates. The findings of this study identify the ethnic deficiency of FCS teachers in urban settings. The FCS teachers are not at all representational of their student population. This could be a factor in their job satisfaction. An important component of classroom teaching is establishing relationships with students.
Teachers who are not reflective ethnically of the student population may find it a hindrance to establish these relationships, therefore making teaching even more challenging. This deficiency in the field indicates the profession has lapsed in the area of recruitment of minority FCS teachers.

*Job Satisfaction (Motivators)*

Research question 4 addressed the question: What are the areas of job satisfaction (motivators) reported by urban FCS teachers?

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) examined twenty job satisfiers. Of these 20, 12 were intrinsic motivators (listed here in hierarchical order according to the study's findings), including: variety of responsibilities, social service, activity, moral values, ability utilization, security, creativity, independence, responsibility, achievement, vanity/social status, and authority. Six motivators, described as extrinsic motivators, surveyed by the MSQ, were supervision/human relations, supervision/technical, recognition, company policies/practices, advancement, and compensation. Again, these motivators are listed in hierarchical order according to the study's findings.

In general, findings indicated that intrinsic motivators, with the exception of *authority*, yielded higher levels of satisfaction than extrinsic motivators did. Authority may be a challenge for urban FCS teachers. Urban school environments are faced with societal and cultural influences that may perceive women have little authority. For teachers, this
perception could cause display of authority being met with defiance or omission, therefore, a possible explanation why *authority* did not result in a higher satisfaction level.

Teachers reported being very satisfied with their jobs based on intrinsic motivators. This finding supports the literature. For example, Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) found that FCS teachers in New York were more satisfied with intrinsic (than extrinsic) motivators of their jobs. Other studies indicated intrinsic motivators were satisfiers and predictors of teacher job satisfaction (Chen 2000; Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1966; Lester, 1985; Lortie, 1986; Pennington & Riley, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1967, 1987; Wu & Short, 1996). For example, Ulriksen’s (1996) study of 64 teachers supported the hypothesis that intrinsic variables; e.g., the work itself, achievement, and responsibility, contributed to job satisfaction.

In the current study, one of the highest ranked satisfiers was *social service*; i.e., the chance to do things for others. Teachers across the spectrum, from novice to veteran teachers, ranked this variable high. This finding supports the literature. In several studies, teachers claimed their relationship with students was the most satisfying aspect of their profession (Clarke & Keating, 1995; Moore, 1987; Ulriksen, 1996; Wubbels, Levy, & Breckelmann, 1997). FCS teachers in urban settings may have a deep-rooted commitment to teaching in an environment that is inherently challenging. Urban schools serve the largest and poorest populations of students. FCS is a field that naturally lends itself to teaching others how to care for themselves and their families. The focus of addressing perennial issues in urban settings might improve a student's life. FCS teachers are often sought after to address a
multitude of issues with students, from clothing issues to teenage pregnancy. The lens they see the student through is very different from teachers in other disciplines.

Intrinsic factors clearly provided more satisfaction than extrinsic factors. The economic downturn may have raised the importance of security; i.e., steady employment, for teachers in the study. For example, while this study was being conducted, Hurricane Ike ravaged the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. This affected teachers in one school district in this study who, concerned with keeping their jobs, may have ranked security high on the list of variables contributing to their job satisfaction levels. Another school district participating in this study was experiencing a superintendent vacancy. Leadership mistrust and loss of various income sources rocked the district. Teachers in this district may have felt vulnerable and concerned about the future leadership of the district. A third district reported an $84 million budget deficit that resulted in hundreds of teachers being terminated from their positions. This shortfall was a direct result of supervisor decision and policymaking. The literature supports the findings of this research study as it pertained to supervision and policymaking (Jacob, 2007; Renfro, 2003; Shann, 1998; Worthy, 2005).

*Job Dissatisfaction (Hygienes)*

Research question 5 studied the areas of job dissatisfaction (hygienes) of urban FCS teachers.

Results of this study indicated that salary, advancement, and policies and practices, all hygienes according to Herzberg’s (1957, 1966) two-factor theory, provided participants
with the lowest levels of job satisfaction. Of the six extrinsic factors, salary provided the least job satisfaction among the teachers. This result was consistent with the findings of other studies cited in the literature. Previous research studies reported compensation to be a factor in teacher hiring and retention (Beck-Frazier, 2005; Grissmer & Kirby, 1998; Han, 1994; Hawthorne, 1990). Jacobs (2007) stated that compensation was a negative factor in urban districts. Another study reported salary as a neutral issue (Clarke and Keating, 1995). The average Texas teacher salary is $46,000 and is less than the national average of $50,000 (Texas Education Agency, 2007). Although there is a FCS teacher shortage, in Texas this field is not considered a “critical shortage” area (e.g. math, science, special education, and foreign language) therefore no additional stipends are added to their base salary. Some teachers with graduate degrees may earn a small percentage more, but the slight increase in pay hardly makes up for the expense of a graduate degree. There is no apparent incentive in Texas as an FCS teacher to pursue post baccalaureate credits or degrees.

In this study, advancement was another low ranking hygiene. Participants were not satisfied with their opportunities for job advancement. This finding supports the literature. Dissatisfaction resulted when there was a lack of possibility of advancement (Herzberg, 1966; Sutter, 1994). FCS teachers’ upward mobility may be challenging in an urban school setting. With the number of retirements increasing, schools not replacing vacant FCS teaching positions, and sometimes distributing the FCS courses to other school departments, it is apparent there is little support for advancement within schools and districts. There is the possibility of a FCS teacher with a graduate degree in Educational Leadership and the
required state certifications to move into an administration position as a director of Career and Technology Education (CATE), assistant principal or principal position or district level administration, but these opportunities are limited.

Supervision and administration were evident hygienes in this study. This finding echoes previous research on urban teachers’ job satisfaction. Previous studies reported that urban teachers were dissatisfied with unsupportive administration (Worthy, 2005) and with administrators who did not recognize or value teachers (Jacob, 2007; Renfro, 2003). Furthermore, urban teachers who left teaching reported lack of effective administration as one reason for their departure from the profession (Shann, 1998). FCS teachers do not have much control over the policies and practices of a large urban school district. This lack of involvement in policy may lead to teachers’ apathy and realization they do not have a voice in decision-making. Career and Technology Education (CATE) directors are usually directed to supervise many areas of CATE and the diminishing numbers of FCS programs may not be at the forefront of their agenda, in comparison to other thriving CATE courses (i.e. technology labs, computer aided design, and agriculture courses).

Limitations

Purposive studies pose difficulty in being representative of entire populations, unlike random sample studies. The study was conducted to provide a broad and generalized scope to determine the satisfaction levels of urban FCS teachers in Texas. Although the study was
conducted in Texas, it is possible other FCS teachers in other states will have similar levels of satisfaction.

With most self-report survey research, common method bias may be present when the data for dependent variable and independent variables are collected from the same researcher at the same time (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff, 2003). Sample selection bias may arise for two reasons: self-selection by the individuals being investigated, or analysts deciding to operate in the same fashion as self-selection (Heckman, 1979). Although the sample size was limited to four urban school districts in Texas, it may be possible that other FCS teachers in urban, suburban, and rural districts have the same perception of job satisfaction. Had there been more participating districts, the results would be more representative of a larger sample. These findings may or may not be generalizable and further qualitative study should be explored.

The pilot study conducted for this research was limited to a group of students in a graduate leadership academy. The pilot study could be improved with clarification to the respondents that they did not have to be FCS teachers teaching in an urban school district. This clarification may have increased the responses to the open-ended questions, thus possibly making it possible to create closed-ended questions for the survey instrument.

The MSQ long form requires respondents to answer several questions related to the same factors, thus possibly providing a better statistical measurement of job satisfaction. The more questions related to each factor increases the statistical measurement for factor analysis (Kim and Mueller, 1978).
The MSQ quantifies working conditions as part of the overall general job satisfaction score; however, urban schools may be faced with issues that affect working conditions thus effecting safety, school security, resources, and classroom amenities. Additional questions could be added to the study to address specifics about working conditions and the impact it has on job satisfaction.

Even though the encryption and security of Survey Gizmo is trustworthy, the web-based survey method may have discouraged teachers from participating. They might fear reporting true feelings of job satisfaction. Teachers might question the security of their computer systems in their schools and/or that others could view the responses indicated on the survey.

The lowest age category was “under 35”. Having this as a category limited the ability to differentiate between the youngest of teachers. The categories could have been “under 26”, “27-32”, “33-45”, “46-55”, and “56 and older”. This data could capture the number of younger teachers and their satisfaction levels, resulting in a better picture of this population. Having that data, colleges and universities offering FCS education degrees, school administrators, and campus administrator could address factors related to their job satisfaction. Knowing how younger teachers responded to the factors related to job satisfaction, action could be taken to increase retention rates and reduce turnover.

There was no question on the MSQ that addressed compensation as a whole. The instrument limited the ability to determine if respondents considered “pay” as only salary, or
salary with benefits. Therefore, no data clearly identified if benefits had any effect related to job satisfaction.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the results of this study, the following are suggestions for future research. Research question 1 dealt with the extent to which urban family and consumer sciences teachers are satisfied with their jobs.

1. Replicate study in other large urban school districts. This will shed light on the importance of a broader perspective and comparison of geographical variances. Different areas of the United States may have teachers with higher or lower general levels of job satisfaction. Various urban districts in the United States may have variances in the general job satisfaction outcomes and the relationships between the demographic variables.

2. Replicate study in rural and suburban school districts. Results would provide comparative data. Results could be used as a guide for career and technology education directors, school principals, and other school administration with responsibility for recruitment and retention of Family and Consumer Sciences teachers. Career counselors could also use findings and aspiring FCS teachers as they consider career options. Findings could also be used by FCS education programs for updating their pre-service curriculum.
Research question 2 investigated the factors that provide a climate of job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers.

Although the review of literature uncovered research studies related to climate and teachers’ job satisfaction, the current study was unable to answer this question because the MSQ does not include a question that directly addresses climate. The school climate is a subjective experience, and does not have defined dimensions (Cohen, 2006). Buckman, King and Ryan (1995) did not talk about “climate” per se but concluded that qualities such as openness, trust, communication, and support lead to job satisfaction and improved performances by teachers. In a previous study, Hoy and Miskel (1991) found that school climate had an effect on teacher behavior. Teachers’ collection of perceptions of behaviors in schools affected satisfaction (Hoy and Miskel, 1991). Research could also attempt to determine teacher’s personality, such as the Myers-Briggs Type indicator (“MBTI basics”, 2009).

3. While the current study was unable to answer the climate question, future research studies may wish to address this question by investigating dimensions of climate identified in the literature by coupling the MSQ with an instrument, such as the “Comprehensive School Climate Inventory” (CSCI) (“The school climate challenge”, 2007) that quantifies climate. Together these results could provide insight to job satisfaction and school climate.

4. Conduct a qualitative study that focuses on job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers.

Qualitative methods are especially useful in discovering the meaning that people give
to events they experience (Polkinghorne, 1991). In addition, qualitative data, consisting of words (rather than numbers) and emphasizing people’s “lived experience”, are well suited for the purpose of the study (van Manen, 1991). Findings could provide useful information to FCS teachers as well as to aspiring FCS teachers. Career and technology directors, building principals, and other school administration for purposes of recruitment and retention could use results. University based FCS teacher education programs could utilize results to inform their curriculum for pre-service programs.

5. In future studies, response rates could be improved by offering an incentive (e.g. school supplies, gift cards, and raffle for prizes.

6. Further studies could change the age categories in the survey instrument. In order to break out satisfaction among groups that has closer age ranges.

7. A specific closed-ended question could be created to address the time at which teachers leave the profession. This question would be able to measure tenure as well as trends in attrition rates, thus contributing to the literature in identifying if urban FCS teachers follow the national trend of about 50 percent leave the profession at the five year mark. This question would allow administrators in districts information to determine at what point are most teachers leaving, and then determine from the satisfaction survey possible reasons why they are leaving.

8. A longitudinal study could be conducted to track teachers’ satisfaction and retention rates. Information of this nature could benefit universities providing FCS education degrees
and school districts because it would identify changes in retention rates and keep track of when teachers leave urban FCS teaching assignments.

9. Schools and districts could examine this research to determine how to improve the extrinsic factors of job satisfaction, possibly affecting future recruitment and retention.

10. Encourage recruitment of more males to the profession via positive high school experiences, colleges of FCS recruiting males, and second career options for males who are interested in entering the teaching profession from another related career.

11. FCS education could be marketed toward more Hispanic students to reflect the current demographic of Texas high school students. Encouraging Hispanic students to pursue FCS education could address the shortage in the field. Additionally it could promote FCS teachers to mentor students that show an interest in the field. Providing positive experiences and encouragement may help bridge the current ethnically deficient FCS teacher situation. Along with Hispanic recruitment, males could be encouraged to enter the field as the research indicated there is a low representation of male urban FCS teachers.

Conclusions

There is a paucity of research reports related to the job satisfaction of urban FCS teachers. This descriptive study queried urban FCS teachers in the area of job satisfaction to determine current status and provide insight for future research. Since job satisfaction is a
critical element for working successfully and remaining in the field, this study provides
direction for more research in this crucial area of Family and Consumer Sciences education.

An examination of participants’ perceptions as well as the literature of the field resulted in the following conclusions.

1. Urban FCS teachers in Texas are satisfied with their jobs.

2. Urban FCS teachers in Texas are more satisfied with intrinsic variables (e.g., variety of responsibilities, social service, activity, moral values, ability utilization, creativity) than with extrinsic variables.

3. Urban FCS teachers in Texas perceive extrinsic variables (e.g., compensation, advancement, company policies and practices) as dissatisfiers (hygienes).

This study unfolded information related to the job satisfaction levels of urban family and consumer sciences teachers in Texas. These findings indicated the teachers were generally satisfied with their jobs. The research reaffirmed the profession is facing a critical time, shortages are increasing, university enrollment is low, and retirements are inevitable. If the projected number of teachers retire in the next few years, it could possibly accelerate the decline of FCS programs in high schools. More qualitative research should be conducted to uncover the FCS teachers’ “story” and what their thoughts and beliefs are regarding satisfaction in the workplace. Current FCS university and high school faculties have the opportunity to promote the profession by creating an awareness of the satisfaction FCS teachers reported.
APPENDIX A QUALITATIVE RESPONSES FROM THE PILOT STUDY

Please describe two satisfying aspects of your family and consumer sciences teaching position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Teacher responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>I like the subjects I teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like the fact that I can teach the curriculum I want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with students</td>
<td>When you see that a student really gets the concepts you are teaching. When a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student returns after the weekend and describes how he/she made what we made in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>class and then changed the recipe to work with what they had available at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe two least satisfying aspects of your family and consumer sciences teaching position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Teacher responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Constraints</td>
<td>I have to share a room with others. It makes it tough to set up and take down and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepare for class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of extra time needed – i.e. shopping on own time because there is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enough time to do it during prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>The isolation of the position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The undervaluing of the subject from admin, students and guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B  FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR MSQ SCALES

Frequency Distribution for Variety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Social Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Activity

Being able to keep busy all the time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Ability

The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Frequency Distribution for Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Distribution for Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Frequency Distribution for Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Distribution for Vanity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency Distributions for Extrinsic Motivators

Frequency Distribution for Supervision (Human Relations)

The way my boss handles his/her workers.

<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>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Distribution for Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TITLE: Are they satisfied? A study of job satisfaction of urban Family and Consumer Science teachers in two urban districts in North Texas.

IRB ID: 08-164 Study Review Date: May 23, 2008

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair has reviewed this project and has declared the study exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b).

However, the following conditions apply to your study:

- You must receive formal approval on school letterhead from the appropriate school district official prior to beginning any research activity in any school.

- Additionally, a copy of the school approval letter must be provided to the IRB prior to any research activity taking place. You can simply send a copy to us; you do not need to complete a modification form for this purpose.

The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.

- You must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or if required by the IRB.

- Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuing Review and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please be sure to use the documents with the IRB approval stamp in your research.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future.
DATE: February 18, 2009

TO: Maureen Tucker
2120 Riverforest Drive, Arlington, TX 76017

CC: Robert Bosselman
31 MacKay Hall

FROM: Jan Canny, IRB Administrator
Office of Research Assurances

TITLE: Are they satisfied? A study of job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers in two urban districts in North Texas

IRB ID: 08-164
Study Review Date: 17 February 2009

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair has reviewed the modification of this project and has declared the study remains exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b). The IRB determination of exemption means that:

- You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.

- You must carry out the research as proposed in the IRB application, including obtaining and documenting (signed) informed consent if you have stated in your application that you will do so or if required by the IRB.

- Any modification of this research should be submitted to the IRB on a Continuing Review and/or Modification form, prior to making any changes, to determine if the project still meets the Federal criteria for exemption. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an IRB proposal will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please be sure to use the documents with the IRB approval stamp in your research.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review by the IRB. Only the IRB may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.
APPENDIX D  CORRESPONDENCE

Letter to request use of the MSQ on Internet

April 4, 2008

Dr. David Weiss
Vocational Psychological Research
University of Minnesota
N657 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN  55455-0344

Dear Dr. Weiss

I am a graduate student at Iowa State University currently working on my doctoral degree in Family and Consumer Sciences Education. For my dissertation, I am planning a study involving job satisfaction among urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in two urban school districts in Texas. This study will attempt to survey all urban FCS teachers in the districts. I am requesting permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) for the purpose of data collection, via an internet survey website.

Enclosed is the description of the study that I have proposed as well as the application to use the MSQ instrument. I have completed the application. Dr. Robert Bosselman, my dissertation chair at Iowa State University has completed the application.

If there is anything else, that is required or if there is something I have neglected to consider please write or call me. My home phone is 817-419-8439.

Respectfully,

Maureen L. Tucker
April 16, 2008

Maureen Tucker
Iowa State University
2120 Riverforest Drive
Arlington, TX 76017

Dear Maureen Tucker:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use 150 copies of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short form as you requested to use on a secured web site for your research.

Please note that you must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1977, 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. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

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
April 26, 2008

Maureen Tucker
Iowa State University
2120 Riverforest Drive
Arlington, TX 76017

Dear Maureen Tucker:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use an additional 50 copies of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short form as you requested to use via email using a secure network for your research. Also, you have approval to use the response categories from the 1967 version.

Please note that you must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1977, 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. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

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,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
APPENDIX E. MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (WEB-BASED)

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Page One
Individual Data Sheet

1. What is your age?*
   - Please Select -

2. What is your sex?*
   - Please Select -

3. What is your current degree status?*
   - Please Select -

4. How many years have you been a Family and Consumer Sciences teacher?*
   - Please Select -

5. What is your current teacher certification status?*
   - Please Select -

6. What is your race/ethnic group?*
   - Please Select -
   Click to Next Page

Online Surveys powered by SurveyGizmo
## Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

7. Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</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>

8. Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</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></td>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F  LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

Dear Superintendent:

As a doctoral student at Iowa State University, I am conducting a research study regarding the job satisfaction of urban family and consumer sciences teachers. There has not been a study of this nature in Texas. This study offers many potential uses. The data collected from this study will add to the body of knowledge on what satisfies urban family and consumer sciences teachers about their jobs, and will benefit superintendents in the retention and sustainability of development of family and consumer sciences courses.

I am requesting your permission to survey middle and high school family and consumer sciences teachers in your school district. While your district has been chosen to participate, your permission and teacher participation is voluntary. This web-based survey will take the family and consumer sciences teacher approximately ten minutes to complete. There are no risks associated with this survey and individual participant responses are confidential. Responses will not be shared with other teachers or administrators.

Family and consumer sciences teachers will be contacted via mailing for consent and be provided with information to access the online survey from any computer with internet access. If teachers have questions before or after participating, they may contact me at the address, number, or email address below. Teachers may choose to stop or not participate at anytime and for any reason without penalty.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Please check the appropriate box on the enclosed self addressed, stamped, reply postcard, indicating whether you grant permission for me to survey middle and high school family and consumer sciences teachers in your district. If you have questions regarding this survey, please feel free to contact me at the address, number, or email address below.

Sincerely,

Maureen L. Tucker, Doctoral Student
Iowa State University

Maureen L. Tucker
2120 Riverforest Drive
Arlington, TX 76017
817-419-8439
Mlt1670@iastate.edu
POST CARD RETURNED BY SUPERINTENDENTS

Please check one box and return by June 30, 2008

☐ I GRANT PERMISSION for Maureen L. Tucker to invite middle and high school family and consumer sciences teachers in my district to participate in a web-based survey to gather information regarding the job satisfaction of urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers.

☐ I DO NOT GRANT PERMISSION for Maureen L. Tucker to invite middle and high school Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in my district to participate in a web-based survey to gather information regarding the job satisfaction of urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers.

☐ I would like to receive an executive summary or the results of this study.

Printed Name

Signature

Date
APPENDIX G  E-MAIL LETTER AND E-MAIL SCRIPTS TO FCS TEACHERS

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

"Maureen Tucker" <mlt1670@iastate.edu> 09/12/08 7:22 AM >>>
September 12, 2008

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 urban 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 an urban school district contribute to job satisfaction. Soon, you will receive an e-mail from mlt1670@iastate.edu entitled Urban 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.

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,

Maureen L. Tucker, CFCS
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
817-505-8714
mlt1670@iastate.edu
First E-Mail script
Date 9-16-2008
From: mlt1670@iastate.edu
To:
Subject: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers
Recently you received an email letter that spoke of a survey on job satisfaction among urban FCS teachers in Texas 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:

http://s-f6ex2-45969.sgizmo.com

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,

Maureen Tucker
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
817-419-8439
817-505-8714
mlt1670@iastate.edu
maureenltucker@gmail.com

Second E-Mail script
Date
From: mlt1670@iastate.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 urban FCS teachers in Texas 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:
http://s-f6ex2-45969.sgizmo.com

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Maureen Tucker
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
817-419-8439
817-505-8714
mlt1670@iastate.edu
maureenltucker@gmail.com

---

Third E-Mail script
Date 9-21-2008
From: mlt1670@iastate.edu
To:
Subject: Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers

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 urban FCS teachers in Texas 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:

http://s-f6ex2-45969.sgizmo.com

You only need 10 minutes to complete the survey.

Thank you for your help with this very important project.

Maureen Tucker
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
817-419-8439
817-505-8714
mlt1670@iastate.edu
maureenltucker@gmail.com
Fourth and final E-Mail script

Date
From: mlt1670@iastate.edu
To: 10-08-2008
Subject: Final Chance to Participate in Urban FCS Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey

I wanted to send one final e-mail to invite you to participate in the Urban FCS Teacher Job Satisfaction Survey. The survey will be closing this Friday, October 10, 2008. If you have responded, I am so appreciative of your effort to participate in the first ever internet survey of job satisfaction among Urban Family and Consumer Sciences teachers in Texas.

The survey is part of my doctoral dissertation for Iowa State University and I really need your help. The link to the survey is:

http://s-f6ex2-45969.sgizmo.com

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

Maureen Tucker
Ph.D. candidate Iowa State University
817-419-8439
817-505-8714
mlt1670@iastate.edu
maureenltucker@gmail.com
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