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The major purpose in this study was to determine if the level of job satisfaction of Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers differed significantly. A second purpose was to describe and compare Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers on selected variables. The data used in this correlational study were collected through a mailed questionnaire from 336 home economics teachers in Ohio.

T-tests revealed that Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers are similar on level of Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics and Satisfaction with Principal. Nevertheless, they are significantly different on Satisfaction with Teaching and Satisfaction with School and Co-workers. Job Training teachers had higher means than Work and Family Life teachers.

Based on chi-squares and t-tests, Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers are akin on likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics and three demographic factors; age, marital status, and number of children living at home. They are different in terms of the following demographic factors: educational level, income status, teaching experience, and ethnic group. Higher values were obtained for Work and Family Life teachers rather than Job Training teachers.
One-way analysis of variance on overall job satisfaction revealed that Job Training teachers were more satisfied than Work and Family teachers. According to ANOVAs on overall job satisfaction and independent variables, likelihood of remaining in teaching was related to job satisfaction for both Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The following were related to job satisfaction for Work and Family teachers: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles; distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college; the main effect for the six family background factors, and the main effect for the seven demographic factors. Ethnic group was the only variable related to job satisfaction for Job Training teachers.

According to multiple regression analyses, distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles was the only predictor of job satisfaction for Work and Family Life teachers. On the other hand, marital status was a predictor of job satisfaction for Job Training teachers.

In written comments, teachers further explained their job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction. Both Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers expressed the following concerns: love for teaching, endearment to the subject matter, quantity of paperwork, and amount of time required for the youth organization (FHA/HERO).

The concerns expressed by Work and Family Life teachers only were: unfavorable attitude toward initiation of the new curriculum, inadequate time for the number of class preparations, funding allocated for home economics, and lack of concern by administrators for home economics. The one additional concern expressed by Job Training teachers was lack of job security.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is an extensively researched topic. A plethora of studies on the topic exists. Job satisfaction’s relevance to life accounts for its popularity as an area of study (Jorde-Bloom, 1986). Job satisfaction is an important topic of inquiry for many reasons.

According to Lawler (1973), what happens to people during the work day has profound effects on the individual’s life and on society as a whole. Therefore, if the quality of life in a society is to be high, job satisfaction cannot be ignored. St. John and Pestle (1992) concluded from their study on satisfaction with work and home and family factors that as satisfaction increased or decreased in one area of the teachers’ lives, similar increases or decreases occurred in the other area.

Although a direct causal link between teachers’ feelings of satisfaction on the job and their productivity has yet to be firmly established (Jorde-Bloom, 1986), there remains a basic belief that a satisfied worker gets along better with colleagues, is more accepting of management’s directives, is committed to the job and is more productive (Cooper, 1977). The literature shows that increasing attention is being paid in many countries to improving the quality of the working experience of employees.

Problem Description

The bulk of studies conducted on job satisfaction has been in business and industry. However, the study of job satisfaction in the field of education is becoming a growing phenomenon. During the last decade, the amount of research on job satisfaction in education has
increased (Chapman, 1983; Jorde-Bloom, 1986). According to Lester (1987), it is important to explore the nature of the educational work setting and the characteristics of teachers to understand what contributes to their satisfaction.

Most of the studies on job satisfaction in education have been conducted among elementary and/or secondary teachers without focusing on any particular subject area. However, the most recent search shows that studies of job satisfaction in vocational education are on the rise. These studies have utilized agriculture, business and office, distributive, home economics, trade and industrial, and sometimes all areas of vocational education teachers. Few studies focused exclusively on home economics teachers. The studies found using home economics teachers included both consumer and homemaking and occupational teachers. There have been relatively few studies of differences between groups of teachers in job satisfaction. It seems worth investigating the possibility that teachers differ in the degree of satisfaction. Therefore, this study will determine and compare the contributors of job satisfaction of Work and Family Life (consumer and homemaking) and Job Training (occupational) home economics teachers.

Purpose

The major purpose in this study was to determine if the level of job satisfaction of Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers differed significantly. A secondary purpose was to describe and compare Work and Family Life and Job Training home economics teachers on selected variables. Other purposes included determining which independent variables best explained the variance in teachers’ job satisfaction and determining additional sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

The results of this study can benefit administrators, state staff, and teacher education departments. With a better understanding of the
factors that provide satisfaction to teachers, those involved (administrators, state staff, and teacher education departments) can begin to more effectively meet the satisfaction needs of teachers.

Justification of the Problem

In Ohio, the state's Department of Education has reported that most program areas in secondary vocational education are experiencing a shortage of qualified teachers (Bern, 1990). According to Redick (1992), home economics is no exception. Furthermore, Bowers (1991) projects a considerable shortage of home economics teachers in 1996 with only an average prospect for beginning teachers. A comparison study on the experience distribution of secondary vocational teachers (Ohio State Department of Education, 1993) revealed that fewer home economics teachers are entering the profession during the first three to five years of teaching. Since secondary vocational education in Ohio is not experiencing overall growth, a problem or concern seems evident (Bern, 1990).

According to Berns (1990), one variable that may be related to vocational education teacher turnover is job satisfaction. Tinto (1975) further states that for those who remain in the teaching profession, satisfaction is a big factor. The shortage of home economics teachers, coupled with fewer teachers entering the profession points to the need to study the satisfaction of home economics teachers in Ohio.

Objectives of the Study

The major objective in this study was to determine and compare the job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers on selected variables. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To determine if Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:
a. Vocational characteristics: Satisfaction with teaching, satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with organizational climate, school and co-workers, principal.
b. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
c. Family background characteristics: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.
d. Demographic characteristics: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

2. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differs significantly.

3. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differs significantly on the following variables:
   a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
   b. Family background: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.
   c. Demographic: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

4. To determine which variables predict job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers:
   a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
   b. Family background: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to
where teacher went to college in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.

c. Demographic: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

5. To determine sources of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction among Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for clarity of meaning as they were used in this study.

1) Work and Family Life teacher—a certified professional teacher employed full time in the public high schools of Ohio who teaches some or all of the following core courses: Personal Development, Resource Management, Nutrition and Wellness, Family Relations, Parenting, and Life Planning.

2) Job Training home economics teacher—a certified professional teacher employed full time in a joint vocational school in Ohio who teaches in one area: Early Childhood Education and Care, Clothing and Interiors, Production and Services, Food Management and Production, Hospitality and Facility Care Services, and Multi-Area Services.

3) Job satisfaction—the consensus of the literature defined job satisfaction as the extent to which the job fulfills the needs of the worker (Given, 1987). In this study it is defined by mean scores from four combined rating scales; Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO)-Satisfaction with Teaching, the researcher developed Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics, two of Deer’s organizational climate subscales—Satisfaction with School and Co-workers, and Satisfaction with Principal.

4) Organizational climate—the perceptions individuals have of their daily work environments (Deer, 1980); it is also defined by scores from the Deer Organization instrument that includes two rating scales.
5) Occupationally specific factors—items that are unique to teaching home economics such as shopping/preparation for foods laboratory class and conducting a skill event for Future Homemakers of America (FHA).

Assumptions

This research was based on the following assumptions accepted at the beginning of the study:

1. The list of home economics teachers from the State Department of Education was valid for producing the population frame of home economics teachers in Ohio.

2. The model selected for use, Holland's Vocational Choice Theory (1973), was appropriate for an inquiry on teachers.

3. Teachers' responses to the questions are accurate and reflect their feelings of satisfaction.

Limitations

A comprehensive list of Ohio Work and Family and Job Training home economics teachers in grades 9-12 was not available. However, the State Department of Education did have a list of all home economics teachers in Ohio. This list included teachers from the following programs: Work and Family Life; both middle school and high school, Job Training, GRADS (Graduation, Reality, and Dual-Role Skills), Impact, Goals, Transitions, and Displaced Homemaker. The latter six groups — Impact, GRADS (Graduation, Reality, and Dual-Role Skills), Goals, Displaced Homemaker, Family Life, and Transitions — were not included in the population for this study. Therefore, the population frame included only Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The frame was constructed from the list of names provided by the State Department of Education.

This study is limited to a sample of home economics teachers who teach in public and joint vocational schools in Ohio. An attempt was not made to generalize the findings of this study to any other teacher classification within or outside the state of Ohio.
The demographic characteristics examined in this study include: age, educational level, ethnic group, marital status, income status, and years of teaching. These characteristics do not comprise all measurable demographic characteristics.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose in this chapter is to present literature on the theoretical frameworks undergirding this study, the level of job satisfaction experienced by teachers, and factors affecting the job satisfaction of teachers. A thorough examination of the literature showed a plethora of studies existed on job satisfaction in business and industry. On the other hand, there was a paucity of studies that focused on job satisfaction in education. Fewer studies were found pertaining to the job satisfaction of vocational educators and specifically home economics teachers.

The literature was extensively searched for a model of teacher satisfaction to guide this study. The search resulted in two such models; however both were rejected. The rationale for rejecting the models is given in the following paragraphs.

The first model was developed by Chapman (1983). He built on Holland’s Vocational Choice Theory (1973) and developed a conceptual scheme of factors affecting teacher job satisfaction. Chapman proposed that teacher job satisfaction is influenced by demographic variables, self perceptions of skills and abilities, teachers’ criteria for judging success and their professional achievement in terms of job challenges and rewards and recognition. He further hypothesized that job satisfaction affects professional achievement. This shared causation between professional achievement and satisfaction prevents empirical testing of the model.

The second model was a result of Culver’s (1987) dissertation work. He examined the literature, found variables significant to job
satisfaction and categorized them into a model of teacher satisfaction. However, he did not explicitly state that the factors in his model were drawn from any source or theory. He did indeed mention that previous work with teachers including their satisfaction has relied on the efforts of vocational theorists. Therefore, it is the contention of this writer that factors in Culver’s model were derived from vocational theorists such as Holland.

Based on the information in the preceding paragraphs, Chapman’s model was rejected because it was not empirically tested. On the other hand, Culver’s model lacked a linking ideal or theoretical framework therefore, it was also rejected for use in this study.

The fact that Chapman’s (1983) model was derived from Holland’s (1973) Vocational Choice Theory, it forced the researcher to examine Holland’s theory. Examination of Holland’s theory, it had many factors of the two previous models of teacher satisfaction and was thereby, deemed appropriate for this study. Holland’s Vocational Choice Theory (1973) has been used repeatedly in studies with teachers.

Holland’s (1973) theory was primarily concerned with personality types, environments, and outcomes of pairing the two to achieve vocational stability. The personality types and model environments used in his theory are realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, or conventional. According to Holland, one of several methods can be used to estimate a person’s personality type: a person’s scores on selected scales from interest and personality inventories (Vocational Preference Inventory, etc.), choice of vocation or field of training, work history or history of preemployment aspirations, or combinations of these data.

Holland (1973) also states that people who fit a particular personality type are more likely to seek out occupations representative of that type. In his classification of personality types and occupations, he classified teaching as a social occupation. Therefore,
for purposes in this study and based on Holland’s principles, it is assumed that teachers in this study are social types.

Beyond the two main ideas, personality type and model environment, Holland (1973) proposed several background principles that were important to the theory, but to a lesser degree. Two of those principles important to this study are: members of a vocation have similar personalities and histories of personal development; and because people in a vocational group have similar personalities, they will respond to many situations and problems in similar ways, and they will create characteristic interpersonal environments. These two principles can also be incorporated into this study of job satisfaction.

In this study the first principle, similar personalities and histories of personal development, refers to family and demographic characteristics. The second principle, respond to many situations and problems in similar ways and create characteristics interpersonal environment, is likened to likelihood of remaining in teaching.

Therefore, the factors extracted from Holland’s (1973) model and used in Chapman’s and Culver’s model will also be included in this study. Those factors deal with personality type (teaching), the environment (organizational climate), likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics, and demographic characteristics. Factors relating to teaching home economics were also included. Thus, the dependent variable in this study is job satisfaction (personality and environment combined to achieve job satisfaction), and the independent variables are likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics, and demographic characteristics.

In the review of related literature, the home economics job related factors will be addressed first. The remainder of the review will address levels of job satisfaction, organizational climate, likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics, and demographic characteristics.
Job Related Factors

To date, two studies have documented difficulties encountered by teachers in teaching home economics (Ellis & Ellis, 1982; Block & Griggs, 1988). One problem area identified by both studies was management, both classroom and laboratory setting. A review of the literature on home economics and a focus group interview identified other problem areas unique to teaching home economics. Those areas were student/class liability, service orientation, and image/public perception. Thus, this section was divided accordingly. The studies, summarized below, did not report satisfaction levels. However, they were areas of concern for home economics teachers that may affect their level of satisfaction.

Management

A review of the literature found two studies on management of first year home economics teachers. The first study conducted by Ellis and Ellis (1982) surveyed 73 first year home economics teachers in Illinois Public Schools. The problem stated was: what professional roles and activities do first year home economics teachers report that they had difficulty performing? Results revealed four areas in which more than 50% of home economics teachers had difficulty performing. Only one pertained to management. More than 50% of the teachers reported they had difficulty managing learning laboratory settings.

The second study sought to gain greater understanding of the nature of beginning home economics teacher experiences. Block and Griggs (1988) observed and interviewed eight teachers. These teachers were employed full time in junior/middle and high schools and had no teaching experience. A naturalistic method, case study, was used. Data were collected by three techniques; self report, questionnaire, and on site interview. Data were analyzed using content analysis. Three main factors emerged from this study. They were the work loads of the teachers; their relationships with the school’s administrator, teachers, and their students; and their teaching preparation and performance in
the act of teaching. The factor with relevance to this study is relationship with students. The beginning teachers reported classroom management and control of student behavior was a problem. They also reported having too little time to get things done. The identified problem areas included two aspects of management: time and classroom.

Student/class liability

Reneau and Poor (1983) studied the level of knowledge possessed by secondary vocational agriculture teachers concerning classroom liability as related to the education setting. Through a review of literature, they discovered many concerns on legal aspects relating to vocational educators and divided them into four areas. They are: teachers' supervisory responsibilities, teachers' duties when using materials and equipment, corporal punishment, and teachers' sources of legal protection. For purposes in this study, two of the four problem areas were appropriate: teachers' supervisory responsibilities and teachers' duties when using materials and equipment.

The researchers developed a 20 item liability questionnaire from the literature review. This questionnaire was mailed to all vocational agriculture teachers who participated in the 1981 Illinois Association of Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Conference. Five of the 20 statements on the questionnaire pertained to teachers' supervisory responsibility. Those statements were:

1. In an emergency, the teacher has the legal duty to administer first aid (p. 57).

2. A teacher may be found liable for failure to act to avoid an injury to a student (p. 57).

3. The most frequent basis for litigation against teachers is insufficient or improper use of equipment/materials, supervision of students, administration of corporal punishment (p. 57).

4. A teacher is not legally required to inform substitute teachers of students with special physical problems or special discipline problems (p. 58).

5. If a student leaves the school grounds and is subsequently injured, the school district and the supervising teacher may be held liable. (p. 58)
Participants were instructed to answer True/False to the statements. Responses to the above statements had a mean of 79% correct. The range of correct responses was 57% to 96%. The findings showed that vocational teachers possessed above average knowledge of their supervisory responsibility.

The second area pertinent to vocational education was teachers' duties using materials and equipment. The following four statements dealt with the problem area of teachers' duties when using materials and equipment:

1. It is the duty of the teacher to provide proper machine guards for shop machinery (p. 57).

2. Use of personal equipment in the school shop presents little legal hazard (p. 57).

3. It is the duty of the shop teacher to either maintain the machinery and tools in safe condition, or to report unsafe conditions to the proper personnel (p. 58).

4. The majority of school shop accidents involve power machinery (p. 58).

Analysis of these data yielded a mean of 62% correct responses. The percentage correct for each item within this problem area ranged from 15% to 99%.

According to the data, the problem area that pertained to teachers' duties when using special materials and equipment was the most misunderstood. This conclusion was drawn because of the wide range in scores; 15% to 99%, a range of 84. On the other hand, teachers' supervisory responsibilities were the least misunderstood. This area had a range of 39 in the scores.

**Service Orientation**

Home economics is known for its service orientation. This service aspect attracts many students to the profession. Three studies focusing on home economics service orientation were found. Aadland, Dunkelberger, Molnar, and Purcell (1983) and Norris (1991) queried undergraduate students in their studies. Preservice and inservice teachers were the participants in Vaines and Arcus (1987) study.
Aadland et al. (1983) surveyed home economics majors at Southern Land-Grant Universities to determine similarities and dissimilarities among students. A sample consisting of home economics students enrolled at 27 land-grant colleges in the southern United States was obtained. The south means the 13 states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. A sampling frame for each school was developed from Spring 1977 enrollment lists. Questionnaires were mailed to almost 3,400 students. A response rate of 71% was obtained. Among the sample was 492 home economics education majors. Result revealed, to help others, was a strong motivation for home economics education major's choice.

In a masters' thesis, Norris (1991) sought to determine factors influencing choice of home economics majors at The Ohio State University. Two hundred eighty four students from the College of Human Ecology participated in the study. Of the students in this study, 16 (6%) were from home economics education. The findings revealed that helping others were an important reason for choice of major for over half, 56%, of the home economics education students.

Vaines and Arcus (1987) studied the influences on the decision to major in home economics of a group of preservice teachers and professionals, mainly inservice teachers. From the membership list of the Canadian Home Economics Association, 43% had majored in general home economics or home economics education. Over one half (54%) were employed as educators.

A factor analysis of the data on influences on the decision to major in Home Economics revealed five factors; the service ideal was one of them. The service ideal portion included the statements:

1. A desire to help the world be a better place (p. 183).
2. A desire to help others (p. 183).
3. A desire to improve the quality of family living (p. 183).
4. A desire to help people learn to do things (p. 183).
Of the five factors, the service ideal accounted for the largest amount of variance, 38%. Service ideal was the most important factor that influenced these subjects to enroll in home economics.

**Image/public perception/Network**

Three researchers explored the image of home economics. The studies in this section were arranged based on unit of analysis. All three studies selected multiple audience as the unit of analysis (Johnson, Holcombe, Kean, Woodward, Tweeten, & Hafer 1987; Schroeder, Behnken, Cibrowski, Courses, Gritzmacher, McManus, Niehm, Ruff, Tedrick, Zeithaml, & Zirkle 1991; Wendland & Torrie, 1991).

The first two studies utilized three separate groups to explore the image idea. Johnson et al. (1987) conducted a study on the image perceptions of home economics. The purpose in the study was to identify the image of home economics as perceived by three populations: the public, home economics alumni, and undergraduates.

Data were collected by means of a telephone interview and written questionnaires. There were 234 individuals randomly selected from telephone directories to represent the public, 200 home economics alumni graduating in 1973-1981. The alumni were randomly selected by zip code. Home economics students in their junior year (N=302) were surveyed through a questionnaire administered in college classes. Although different questions were asked, respondents from all populations were asked to respond to their image of home economics. Respondents used a semantic differential technique. Fifteen sets of paired words were used. A rating scale of 1-5 was used. A total of 75 was possible.

Findings revealed the image held by the public was higher than that of the alumni and undergraduates. The public had a mean score of 63, the students 62 and alumni 55. The analysis of variance test indicated no significant differences among the images held by the three populations. Therefore, based on the data, the image of home economics was held higher by the public than by the alumni and students.
Ohio Home Economics Association charged the Marketing Committee of the Association, Schroeder et al. (1991), to conduct a comprehensive study on the image of home economics. The specific objective in the study was to determine the image of the home economics profession from the viewpoint of the key sub groups within the Education and Administration category relative to their overall perception of the field of home economics. The following groups were participants in the study: rural and urban middle school and high school students, parents of students surveyed, guidance counselors, college admission directors, principals (middle schools) junior high schools, principals (high schools), college placement directors, adult education directors, and early childhood program directors. Of the 1,488 surveys mailed, 839 were returned.

Results showed that students seem to have an image of home economics as being easy, fun, and female oriented, but also as practical and useful. This seems to be true among all student groups: those who took home economics and those who did not, and middle school, high school as well as college level students. High school and middle school principals and guidance counselors, held a rather traditional view of home economics on the surface. However, they did seem to recognize that many of the subjects taught are important for all students, and some are rated as being more important than other general electives such as business, art, music, etc. Overall most professional groups still view home economics from a very traditional perspective. These groups naturally think of sewing and cooking. However, they are aware that life skills are taught.

Wendland and Torrie (1991) assessed the perceptions of the current image of home economics held by junior and senior high school students, their parents, and guidance counselors. A total of 284 was in the sample: 179 juniors and seniors, 87 parents, and 18 counselors. Differences among these three groups were examined. Five conceptual areas were presented in the instrument. They were: image of home
economics content, future use, stereotypes, academic orientation, and classroom setting. The area of interest for this study is image of home economics content. A total of 17 word pairs was selected and measured by a 7-point semantic differential scale. Findings indicated no significant differences in the responses of the three groups to the semantic scale for the image of home economics content.

Summary

Home economics teachers, particularly first year teachers, experienced difficulties in classroom and laboratory management. Although home economics teachers are held liable for students while engaged in a laboratory setting, little is known about the liability factor of vocational educators. The one aspect that attracts students to select home economics education as a major is helping others. The majority of students echoed this aspect. The image of home economics is viewed differently by the various groups questioned.

Level of Satisfaction

A review of the literature revealed numerous studies on teacher job satisfaction. These studies displayed various levels of teacher job satisfaction ranging from very satisfied to dissatisfied. The groupings of the studies in this review will be paralleled to the categorization on the questionnaire in the present study; very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, and dissatisfied.

Very Satisfied

These studies conducted by Holdaway (1978), Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979), Galloway, Boswell, Panckhurst, Boswell, and Green (1985), Grady (1985), Grady and Burnett (1985), Knoop (1987), Metropolitan Life (1989), and Kluckman and Brands (1991) concluded that teachers were very satisfied with teaching.

The purpose in Holdaway's (1978) study was to assess the relationship between teacher overall job satisfaction and facet
satisfaction. The sample for his research was 1,379 of the 20,000 K-12 teachers employed in the Province of Alberta, Canada. These teachers were from 21 of the 133 school systems in Alberta. A total of 801 teachers responded for a response rate of 58%. Teachers were asked to rate their degree of satisfaction with 58 named facets and to rate their degree of overall satisfaction with their job. The supplied response categories were from 0 to 7 in descending order: not relevant/not applicable, highly dissatisfied, moderately dissatisfied, slightly dissatisfied, slightly satisfied, moderately satisfied, highly satisfied, and neutral. For ease of interpretation, 0-not relevant and 7-neutral were discarded. Thereby 3.5 was the mean of the possible range of 1-6. With respect to overall satisfaction with teaching, the results showed 89% of elementary teachers, 78% of the junior high, and 79% of the senior high teachers were very satisfied with teaching. The means for the three groups of teachers ranged from 4.7 to 5.4.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) investigated the association between self reported teacher stress and job satisfaction of K-12 teachers. Sixteen mixed comprehensive schools with 100 to 1,100 students in England were randomly selected. The schools were mixed comprehensive with 100 to 1,100 students. Within each of the 16 schools, 20 teachers were sampled. A total of 320 teachers was in the study. As a measure of job satisfaction, teachers were asked, "Overall, how satisfied are you with teaching as a job?" The response to the question was scored 1 to 5 with 1 representing the lowest level of satisfaction. Results showed the mean score on the question was 3.7. Additionally, a large portion of the respondents, 72%, rated themselves in the top two areas; very satisfied or fairly satisfied.

Galloway et al. (1985) used K-8 grade teachers to determine sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. After some changes, they used the Satisfaction with Teaching questionnaire developed by Holdaway in 1978. The 42 items were preceded by the question "How satisfied are you with the following aspects of teaching?" A 5-point scale from 1 =
very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied was used. On overall satisfaction, a mean score of 3.5 was achieved for 80% of the teachers; 68 fairly satisfied and 13 very satisfied.

In 1985, Grady and Burnett sought to determine the relationship of teacher performance ratings and student achievement to job satisfaction. The sample was composed of vocational agriculture teachers in Louisiana. A random sample of 50 programs was selected and 45 responded. Later in the 1985, Grady used the same data set to assess overall job satisfaction. The population for this study was the vocational agriculture instructors who taught Vocational Agriculture I in secondary institutions. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to collect data. The instrument contains 100 items and 20 scales; 5 items for each scale. A 5-point Likert format was used to record responses. The highest possible score on each scale was 25. The authors of this instrument suggest that a percentile of .75 or higher indicated a high degree of satisfaction, .25 or lower represents a low level of satisfaction, and scores in between reflect a moderate level of satisfaction. Findings from these studies revealed a mean general satisfaction score of 77.

Knoop (1987) studied causes of job dissatisfaction among elementary and secondary teachers. The 894 elementary and 971 secondary teachers were from 17 school boards in Ontario. The teachers were purposively selected by 42 graduate students who distributed questionnaires to all the teachers in their schools. Hoppock’s (1935) four item measurement instrument was used to determine overall job satisfaction. On a 7-point scale, 92% of the teachers marked the top three responses. The top three responses were a good deal of the time, most of the time, and all the time. Thirty percent of the teachers were satisfied a good deal of the time. Over half of the teachers (52%) were satisfied most of the time, and 10% were satisfied all the time.

The 1989 Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher was conducted by Louis Harris and Associates. A total of 2,000 telephone
interviews was conducted with public school teachers in grades K-12 nationwide. The sample was randomly selected according to the population of each state. As a measure of job satisfaction, the question was asked: "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with teaching as a career - very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?" The results showed 86% of the teachers were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with teaching as a career.

Kluckman and Brands (1991) conducted a study with 143 South Dakota home economics teachers. The purpose in the study was to analyze factors that contributed to teacher work satisfaction. The two researchers developed a three-part instrument. Part 2 of the instrument, Work Satisfaction, contained nine factors. One of the nine factors was overall job satisfaction. Analysis of the data related to overall job satisfaction indicated 84% of the respondents were moderately to very satisfied with their job.

**Somewhat Satisfied**

Some studies reported that teachers were somewhat satisfied with their jobs. Somewhat satisfied was reported by Kreis (1983), Weiner and Clawson (1984), Driscoll and Shirey (1985), Bruening and Hoover (1990), and St.John and Pestle (1992).

Kreis (1983), conducted a study of 922 urban high school teachers in 18 different high schools. The purpose in the study was to explore the relationship between perceived security, affiliation, self esteem, autonomy, self actualization, and degree of job satisfaction. The teachers were from major city school districts in northeastern United States. The Brayfield and Rothe (1951) Job Satisfaction Index was used to measure the dependent variable, job satisfaction. The scores ranged from 22 to 90; the highest possible score was 90 and the lowest was 22. Findings revealed the mean score on the satisfaction instrument was 63 which is greater than the neutral position score of 54.
Weiner and Clawson (1984) designed a study to determine the sex-role perception and job satisfaction of 170 randomly selected North Carolina secondary home economics teachers. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) was used as the measure of job satisfaction. Respondents could score as high as 213 on this measure of job satisfaction. A mean of 128 was obtained with a range in the scores from 46 to 197. A range of 46 to 197 indicated that the teachers varied in their level of job satisfaction.

The study conducted by Driscoll and Shirey (1985) focused on determining differences along three professional continuum among three groups of teachers. The professional continuum included job satisfaction, professional concerns, and communication patterns. The three groups of teachers participating in this study were: preservice, beginning, and experienced elementary teachers. First and second year teachers were classified as beginning elementary teachers. Experienced elementary teachers were those with 5 to 10 years of teaching. A total of 60 teachers was in this study, 20 in each group. The Job Satisfaction Rating Scale developed by the researchers was used to determine degree of satisfaction. On a 7 point scale, with 1 representing the highest, the respondents scored 3.1, 3.5, and 3.2 respectively. The average score for the 3 groups combined was 3.0.

Bruening and Hoover (1990) studied secondary vocational educators in Pennsylvania. The stratified random sample included secondary agricultural educators, automotive instructors, carpentry instructors and occupational home economics teachers. Three hundred and thirty-six of the 448 teachers sampled responded. The main purpose in this study was to determine vocational educators' commitment to student organizations, and community involvement. A secondary purpose was to determine their job satisfaction. The Brayfield and Rothe Job Satisfaction Index (1951) that was modified by Warner (1973) was used to measure the job satisfaction of teachers. The possible ranged from 14
to 70. Out of the possible score, findings showed a mean score of 59 on the summated scale.

St. John and Pestle (1992) sampled home economics teachers to determine work and home and family satisfaction in their study. A total of 194 consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers from five vocational regions in Florida participated. Work satisfaction was measured by a 22-item scale developed by the researchers. Respondents indicated their degree of satisfaction on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 = very dissatisfied to 7 = very satisfied. Means were calculated for each of the 22 items. Results showed the means ranged from 6.1 to 3.9. The grand mean for all items on the scale was 5.2.

Dissatisfied

The National Education Association (1980), one of the largest teacher organizations, conducts a survey of its teachers every 5 years. The 1980 survey dealt with teacher job satisfaction and other facets of teaching. The findings from 1,783 teachers revealed more than one-third (35%) of the teachers were dissatisfied with their current job. Of the dissatisfied teachers, 9% of those were very dissatisfied with teaching. Contributing to the dissatisfaction was the school setting. They found teachers in city systems, systems with 25,000 or more students, and in high schools were more dissatisfied than other teachers.

Miller (1991) studied home economics teachers in Indiana. The purpose was to determine why Indiana vocational home economics teachers were dissatisfied with their jobs. Five groups of teachers were included; consumer and homemaking only, occupational only, both consumer and homemaking and occupational, vocational and nonvocational but not occupational, vocational and nonvocational including occupational. The 58 item questionnaire included questions on administrators, other faculty, school, students, and general environment. The range of dissatisfaction scores was 1-5 with low scores indicating dissatisfaction. Data analysis revealed a mean score was 1.8.
Summary

Of the 25 studies reported, only two revealed dissatisfaction of teachers. However, there is a noticeable trend with the level of job satisfaction experienced by teachers. During the late 80s and early 90s, teachers were very satisfied. On the other hand, during the mid 80s teachers were somewhat satisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction is pervasive throughout the country; a trend was not detected among any particular region.

School Organizational Climate

According to Deer (1980), organizational climate is viewed as an increasingly important variable in determining the success of educational innovations in schools. It is considered as a means to improve job satisfaction. Some authorities think improved job satisfaction results in improved productivity. Most studies of organizational climate have been completed with the notion of providing better work environments (Deer, 1980; Johnston & Deer, 1984).

Organizational climate encompasses teachers/co-workers, and administrators. Studies were collected that used the above in various combinations. That is, some researchers employed administrators, others teachers, and some both, teachers and administrators. Thus, this section is divided into three sections: administrators, administrators and co-workers, and co-workers.

Administrators

The studies reviewed suggest that administrators play a major role in the level of satisfaction teachers experience. Berns (1990) and Miller (1991) explored the relationship between administrators and level of job satisfaction. Both researchers found teachers were dissatisfied with administration.

Berns (1990) explored the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher turnover of vocational educators in Northwest Ohio. The study
consisted of 116 former vocational educators and 745 practicing teachers. Of the 116 respondents, 36 had retired and 80 had left teaching for other reasons. The researcher composed a 38 item instrument. Three of the 38 job satisfaction indicators pertained to administrators. The statements dealing with administrators were: "I felt appreciated by administrators for my work," "I was provided adequate administrative support and backing," "The administrators in my school were strong." Findings showed dissatisfaction with the strength of the administrators in their schools was the reason non-retired former teachers and retired teachers left their positions. The former teachers who had not retired rated the above statements a mean of 2.4, 2.5, and 2.4 respectively. The retired teachers agreed the least with the statement, "The administrators in my school were strong" with a mean score of 2.5.

The dissatisfaction of Indiana vocational home economics teachers had been established in an earlier study. Therefore, Miller (1991) set forth to determine the reasons for the dissatisfaction with teaching assignment. The teaching assignments included vocational consumer and homemaking only, vocational occupational only, both vocational consumer and homemaking and occupational, vocational and nonvocational but not occupational, and vocational and nonvocational including occupational. An 80% (267) response was achieved for a single mailing. The researcher developed questionnaire contained 58 items. The section labeled "Administrators" had 18 items. Using chi-square and Pearson correlations, significant relationships were found between 15 of the 18 factors and job dissatisfaction. Further analysis found a difference between five of the eighteen items and teaching assignment.

Administrators and Co-workers

The unit of analysis used in the following studies was administrators and co-workers. Holdaway (1978), Litt and Turk (1985), and Culver (1987) concluded that as satisfaction with administrators and
co-workers increased the level of job satisfaction of the participants also increased.

Holdaway (1978) studied the facets that contributed most to overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction with teaching as an occupation. The instrument constructed by the researcher consisted of 58 facet items. On a 6-point scale, 1 = highly dissatisfied and 6 = highly satisfied, relationships with other teachers and relationships with in school administrators were determined. Findings show a mean of 5.4 for satisfaction with other teachers on the job. For school administrators, a mean of 4.9 was reported. Both means were well above the average of 3.6 on a 6 point scale. In written statements, 19% of the 801 K-12 teachers listed the relationship with other teachers as a source of overall job satisfaction.

Litt and Turk (1985) conducted a study with a group of 291 Connecticut public high school teachers. These teachers had 5 to 15 years of teaching experience. The purpose in the study was to identify those features of teachers' work environment with the best predictive value for the multidimensional concept of stress. Subgroups of teachers were randomly selected based on school setting, subject taught, and gender of the teacher. Two scales applicable to teachers work environment were taken from Deer's (1980) questionnaires for measuring the organizational climate of schools. The two scales were Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Group Behavior and Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Behavior. Analysis of the Teachers' Perceptions of Principal subscale resulted in a positive correlation. A total of 56% of the teachers found the principal important to their job satisfaction. However, the analysis of the Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Group Behavior did not result in a significant correlation with job satisfaction.

In 1987, Culver completed his dissertation work with the development and test of a model of teacher satisfaction. His instrument also included two of Deer's (1980) scales; Teachers' Perceptions of
Teacher Group Behavior and Teachers’ Perceptions of Principal Behavior. The 512 teachers in Virginia could score 8 to 32 points on each scale. The instrument was a 4 point Likert scale and contained 8 items on each scale. The items were summed and averaged. Data analysis revealed scores of 21 and 23 respectively for the co-worker and administrator scales.

**Co-workers**

The next group of studies was concerned with co-workers and their level of job satisfaction. There was concurrence in the five reports in this section that satisfaction with co-workers contributed to the overall job satisfaction of teachers.

The population frame for the Knoop and O’Reilly (1978) study consisted of three urban Ontario school boards with a total of 136 elementary schools. Seventy-five schools were randomly selected. Within each of the 75 schools a systematic random sample was used, every fifth teacher on the staff was selected. Of the 375 possible participants, 311 responded. The instrument used in this study was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Findings from this study showed a substantial positive correlation (r = .51) between satisfaction with work and satisfaction with co-workers.

One hundred seventy secondary home economics teachers helped Weiner and Clawson (1984) evaluate sex-role perception and job satisfaction. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith et al. (1967) was used to measure job satisfaction in six areas. One component of the JDI was a scale on satisfaction with co-workers. A possible score of 0 to 54 could be obtained. Results showed home economics teachers in North Carolina achieved a mean score of 40.8.

Galloway et al. (1985) altered and used the questionnaire developed by Holdaway (1978) to collect data on the 292 K-12 teachers. The instrument contained 42 items and was preceded by the question: "How satisfied are you with the following aspects of teaching?" The responses were coded on a five-point scale from 1 = very dissatisfied to
5 = very satisfied. A Pearson correlation was used to determine associations with overall satisfaction. Results indicated a significant low positive correlation of ($r = .25$) between relationship with other teachers and overall satisfaction.

The next two studies utilized agriculture teachers. The agriculture teachers in Grady’s (1985) study were from secondary institutions in Louisiana. His purpose was to add to the research regarding teachers in vocational agricultural education by assessing job satisfaction in secondary institutions. He used the long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to determine overall job satisfaction. The findings revealed the mean score on the co-workers scale was 18.9 out of a possible 25. When co-workers was placed in a regression model, it accounted for 20% of the variance in the general job satisfaction score.

Kotrlik and Malek (1986) used a mailed questionnaire to gather data from the 355 vocational agriculture teachers in the southeastern United States. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith et al. (1967) was used to collect data. Included in the JDI is a scale entitled "People on the Job." The score on this scale ranges from 0-54. For this group of teachers, a score of 40.5 was achieved.

In contrast to the findings of the previous studies, co-workers did not contribute to the satisfaction of participants in the Driscoll and Shirey (1985) study. Their study of three groups of teachers—preservice, beginning, and experienced-focused on a professional continuum. The authors developed and used the Job Satisfaction Rating Scale to collect data. The findings for preservice, beginning and experienced teachers were the same; co-workers were viewed as the least source of satisfaction on the job.
Summary

The results from the studies in the preceding section speak clearly for the role of administrators and co-workers to overall job satisfaction of teachers. In almost every study, administrators and co-workers played a key role in the satisfaction of teachers. Only two studies showed teachers were clearly dissatisfied with administrators.

Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching

Likelihood of remaining in teaching is likened to commitment to teaching. Commitment, in all types of organizations, has become an increasingly important issue. According to Reyes (1990), commitment has gained attention in recent years because of its affect on performance, absenteeism, and turnover. However, a considerable amount of emphasis has not been given to commitment in education. Some researchers attribute this lack of attention to teacher commitment to the belief that the educational profession is widely known to have high levels of commitment. However, some studies found by this researcher refute that claim.

Six studies were summarized for this section. They were divided on findings: three report teachers likely to remain in teaching and three report teachers likely to leave teaching. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979), Sparks (1979), and National Education Association (1980) were among those reporting teachers likely to leave the profession.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) and Sparks (1979) used similar scales to determine likelihood of remaining in teaching. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe posed the question: “How likely is it that you will still be a school teacher in ten years’ time?” Only 24% of the respondents indicated that it was fairly or very unlikely that they would still be school teachers in 10 years’ time. On a 5 point scale labeled very unlikely, fairly unlikely, neither likely or unlikely, fairly likely, or very likely. The response was scored in reverse 5 to 1, to provide the measure of intention to leave teaching. Results showed the overall mean
response for the 204 participants was 2.3. A mean of 2.3 reflects a rating of fairly unlikely that you will still be a school teacher in 10 years' time.

In Sparks' study, 25% of the teachers sampled indicated that they did not plan to stay in teaching until retirement. An additional 30% of the respondents were uncertain if they would remain in the profession until retirement. When asked about the likelihood of changing professions, 54% reported it is somewhat likely that they will change occupations in the next 5 years. A similar percentage of respondents claimed that they would switch jobs if they could find one with equivalent pay and fringe benefits.

The National Education Association (1980), the nation largest teacher organization surveyed its members. The survey concerned teacher attitudes and practices. A component of the study was the likelihood of remaining in teaching. Findings showed less than half, 43% of the 1,783 teachers planned to remain in teaching until retirement.

Litt and Turk (1985), Metropolitan Life (1989), and Berns (1990) were among the researchers who found teachers were likely to remain in teaching.

The Litt and Turk (1985) study included 291 Connecticut high school teachers who had 5 to 15 years of teaching experience. On a five-point scale ranging from 1 ("have never thought about this") to 5 ("have thought about this very often"), teachers were asked about their intention to leave teaching. An intercorrelations of the dependent variables showed a significant low association of ($r = -.39$) between intention to leave teaching and job satisfaction.

The 2,000 K-12 teachers in the Metropolitan Life Survey (1989) were asked about their likelihood of remaining in teaching. Teachers were asked "within the next five years, how likely is it that you will leave the teaching profession to go into some different occupation?" Four possible choices were available, they were: very likely, fairly likely, not too likely, or not at all likely. Results showed 48% of the 2,000
teachers responded "not at all likely to leave the teaching profession to go into some different occupation."

Berner (1990) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher turnover with 745 practicing and 116 former vocational teachers in Northwest Ohio. When the practicing teachers were asked for their career plans (As far as you know, will you continue teaching in your position until retirement?), 78% of the practicing teachers indicated that they plan to continue teaching in their positions until retirement.

Summary

Again, a trend can be observed on the likelihood of remaining in teaching. The three studies conducted in the late 70s and early 80s reported teachers were willing to leave teaching. However, during the mid and late 80s as well as the early 90s the commitment to teaching returned and teachers were likely to remain in teaching.

Family Background

Four studies were found that included the family background factors. Only one research study was located that dealt with the family background factors and job satisfaction. Therefore, for this summary a link cannot be made between family background characteristics and job satisfaction. The other studies investigated the following family background factors: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's education, and mother's education. Thus, this section is divided into three sections; distance from hometown, parents' occupation and parents' educational level.
Distance from Hometown

Two studies were found that included distance, Grady (1985) and Culver (1987). Grady reported a level of job satisfaction for distance from hometown, but Culver did not make that connection.

In Grady’s study, he set forth to determine overall job satisfaction of the participants. Forty-five of the 50 agriculture teachers from secondary institution in Louisiana participated. A total of eight demographic variables was included in addition to the (MSQ) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. One of those demographic variables was distance from hometown. The results of a least squares analysis of variance showed no significant difference in overall job satisfaction and distance from hometown.

Culver (1987) asked the teachers in his study: "How many miles from where you are now teaching did you (a) grow up, and (b) go to college?" However, he used these factors to describe the sample and did not establish a relationship between job satisfaction. Responses for the distance from where they grew up ranged from as little as one mile to as far away as 6000 miles. An average response was calculated as 213 miles, though 56% were within an hour’s drive (55 miles) of where they grew up, and another 8% were more than an hour but less than 2 hours’ drive (110 miles). Responses for the distance from where they went to college ranged from as little as one mile to as far away as 3000 miles, with an average of 193 miles. Thirty-six percent of the respondents were teaching within an hour’s drive and 18% were teaching between 1 and 2 hours’ drive from where they went to school.

Parents’ Occupation

Culver (1987), Vaines and Arcus (1987), and Norris (1991) investigated mothers’ and fathers’ occupation. Culver (1987) used 512 early career teachers in Virginia to develop and test a model of teacher satisfaction. Teachers responded to the question: What categories below best describe your mother’s and your father’s principal occupations while you were growing up? The findings revealed
approximately two-thirds of the respondents' fathers were skilled workers (35%) or held nonteaching professional jobs (32%). For the mothers, 25% were skilled workers and another 25% were reported to have semiskilled positions. Yet another 23% of the mothers were deceased or not employed outside the home.

Vaines and Arcus (1987) study included home economics majors from Canada. The purpose in Vaines and Arcus was to determine factors that influence choice of majors. Findings showed that during the respondents' school years, most of the fathers were categorized into professional level occupations. As for fathers, about 34% were employed in administrative roles and 28% in professional roles. Only 22% of the fathers were in semi-skilled or unskilled occupations. For the mothers, two-thirds (66%) were unemployed during the respondents' school years.

Norris (1991) included preservice teachers in her thesis study. The participants were enrolled in the College of Human Ecology at The Ohio State University. The preservice teachers were asked what occupations their parents held. Findings indicated the largest concentrations for the fathers were found in the category of business (47%). The next highest area was professional, 23%. Only 16% were laborers. The business jobs were salespersons, accountants, and business owners. The highest percent for mothers was professionals with 26% followed closely by clerical, 22%. Additionally, 18% were in business and 15% were homemakers. Professionals included doctors, nurses, teachers, dentists, lawyers, and engineers. Clerical included secretaries and paralegals.

Parents' Educational Level

The three studies reported in the preceding section also included parents' educational level. Culver (1987) used both black and white teachers to develop and test his model of teacher satisfaction. The teachers from Virginia were early career teachers with 1-7 years of teaching experience. The study contained 250 black teachers and 262 white teachers. The teachers were asked: "What is the highest level of
education that each of your parents has completed?" Results revealed 28% of the respondents' fathers had completed college while an equal percentage, 29, had not completed high school. Slightly fewer mothers (25%) than fathers had completed college. Only 17% of the mothers had not completed high school. However, over half (53%) of the mothers were vocational school completers.

In Vaines and Arcus (1987) study, half of the participants' fathers had no education beyond high school. An even greater number of the mothers, 60%, had no education beyond high school.

Norris (1991) explored the factors which influence preservice teachers at The Ohio State University to select home economics as a major. Her study engaged students in questions on parents educational level. On fathers' education, 25% of the fathers had only a high school education and 25% had an undergraduate degree. However, another 30% had graduate degrees and 11% had some college. As for the mothers, 34% of the mothers graduated from high school, 10% had earned an Associate degree, 26% had an undergraduate degree, and 13% had a graduate degree.

Summary

According to the studies above, teachers are placebound. That is, they attend college and teach close to where they grew up. As for parents' occupations, they are fairly evenly distributed among skilled workers, professional roles, and semi-skilled workers. The educational level of parents varied greatly. In some studies, parents are well educated with undergraduate and graduate degrees. On the other hand, a couple of studies reported over half of the participants' parents have only completed high school.

Demographic

The relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction has been studied by several investigators. This relationship is not well understood as confirmed by conflicting findings presented in the
studies in this section. This section is divided into several categories: educational level, years of teaching experience, age, age and years of teaching, ethnic group, marital status, and number of children living at home.

**Educational Level and Job Satisfaction**

A variety of results occurred in the studies investigating the relationship between level of education completed and job satisfaction. Two studies reported a significant difference between the level of satisfaction and the highest academic degree held by teachers (Weiner & Clawson, 1984; Kotrlik & Malek, 1986). In sharp contrast, two studies reported no significant difference between the level of satisfaction and the highest academic degree held by teachers (Grady, 1985; Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987).

Weiner and Clawson (1984) had as a purpose to assess sex-role preference and work satisfaction. A total of 170 home economics teachers from North Carolina participated. Results of the statistical analysis indicated that the level of education was the only demographic variable related to job satisfaction. The mean score on the Measure of Sex-Role Preference (MSRP) as categorized by degree showed that the teachers with bachelors degrees only were more satisfied with their jobs than those holding master's degrees.

Kotrlik and Malek's (1986) study of agriculture teachers in southeastern United States determined overall job satisfaction. The relationship between job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index and the ten ordinal variables was determined using Spearman Rho Correlations. The results indicated satisfaction increased as educational level increased ($r = .11$).

The next study also used agriculture teachers. However, this author achieved different results from the previous authors. Grady's (1985) purpose was to add to the knowledge base on job satisfaction. In addition to the MSQ, eight demographic variables were included. An examination of the least squares means indicated that no significant
difference in overall job satisfaction was found with respect to highest degree held.

The 100 secondary home economics teacher from Alabama in the Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) study helped establish relationships between satisfaction, stress and demographic variables. The one-way analysis of variance on job satisfaction and highest degree did not reveal a significant difference between level of education and job satisfaction.

Years of teaching and Job Satisfaction

Only one study established a relationship between years of teaching and level of job satisfaction. Grady (1985) sought to determine overall job satisfaction of 45 teachers in Louisiana. A significant difference in overall job satisfaction was found with respect to years of teaching vocational agriculture. An examination of the least squares means indicated that teachers with more experience tended to be more satisfied with their jobs.

Age and Job Satisfaction

Several researchers included the age factor in their study of job satisfaction (Clarke, Gerrity, Laverdiere, & Johns, 1985; Galloway, Boswell, Panckhurst, Boswell, & Green 1985; Lowther, Gill & Coppard, 1985). The above studies revealed a positive relationship between age and satisfaction; as age increased so did the level of job satisfaction.

The sample used in the Clarke et al. (1985) study consisted of 166 randomly selected teachers in northeast Pennsylvania and Binghamton, New York. The Job Descriptive Index was used to collect data. For comparison purposes, teachers were placed into three age groups. The age categories were: 30 and below (category 1), 31 to 50 (category 2), and 51 and over (category 3). Data analyses consisted of t-tests. The t-score comparing category 1 (30 and below) with category 2 (31 to 50) indicated that category 2 was significantly higher at the .05 level. Further analysis revealed the t-score comparing category 2 with category 3 indicated that category 3 was significantly higher at the .05 level.
Galloway et al. (1985) used the instrument developed by Holdaway to determine sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among K-8 teachers. The researchers categorized the teachers into four groups; those were under 30, 30-39, 40-49, and over 50. A series of t-tests were used in the data analyses. Each group was significantly higher than the next at the .05 level.

Lowther et al. (1985) used secondary analysis of data from three multipurpose, national probability studies conducted by the University of Michigan. Data were collected in 1969, 1973, and 1977. The sample sizes were 57, 63, and 62 respectively, for a total of 182 teachers. The age groups were; below 35, 35-50, and 51 and over. Results showed in all three surveys, teachers over age 50 were the most satisfied, and teachers under 35 were the least satisfied.

Unlike the previous studies, Chapman's (1983) findings differed. Through his use of a secondary analysis of data taken by three public universities in Indiana, he explored the objectives of his study. The data set contained both elementary and high school teachers. The multiple regression analyses revealed that differences in age did not significantly predict level of job satisfaction for either elementary or high school teachers.

**Age, Years of Teaching, and Job Satisfaction**

The demographic factors age, and years of teaching experience were explored in some studies. Four such studies were found that contained the forementioned factors.

In studies conducted with 2 year intervals, Kreis (1983) and Grady (1985) found age significantly related to job satisfaction, but years of teaching experience was not significantly related to job satisfaction. A year later, Kotrlik and Malek (1986) found both age and years of teaching experience significantly related to job satisfaction. However, a year later, Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) found years of teaching experience was significantly related to job satisfaction, but age was not.
Kreis's (1983) investigation was with 487 urban high school teachers in northeastern United States. The purpose was to determine sources of job dissatisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Index (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) was used to measure the dependent variable, job satisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Index instrument consists of 18 items. The instrument was modified by the researcher to refer specifically to teaching. Ten demographic questions were posed; among them were age, length of service, and job satisfaction. T-tests and analyses of variance were used to evaluate the relationship between job satisfaction, age and years of teaching. Findings revealed length of service was statistically significant related with job satisfaction whereas, age and job satisfaction were not significantly related.

The study conducted by Grady (1985) used 50 vocational agriculture teachers in Louisiana. He assessed overall job satisfaction. The instrument employed to determine job satisfaction was the long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist (1967). The 50 teachers formed three categories; 0-6 years of teaching experience, 7-14 years of teaching experience, and 15 or more years of teaching experience. Analysis of variance was used to determine differences between overall job satisfaction and selected variables. Results showed a significant difference between job satisfaction and years of teaching, but not age.

Kotrlik and Malek (1986) used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to collect data in their study on overall level of job satisfaction. The researchers surveyed vocational agriculture teachers in the Southeastern states. A random sample of 400 teachers was selected, and yielded a return rate of 355 or 89% of the participants. Spearman Rho rank order correlations were used to determine if significant relationships existed between age, years of teaching experience and job satisfaction. Results indicated significance was achieved between age, years of teaching experience and job satisfaction – age and job satisfaction (.133), and years and job satisfaction (.157).
Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) used secondary consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers in Alabama to investigate the nature of stress and job satisfaction and the extent to which they are intertwined. Results showed significant difference according to years of teaching but significance was not achieved on age.

Other researchers who incorporated the two demographic factors, age and years of teaching experience, into their studies did not report the same findings as the previous studies. Martin and Light (1984), Knoop (1987), and St. John and Pestle (1992) did not find that the level of job satisfaction increased with age and years of teaching experience.

Martin and Light (1984) surveyed 274 Vocational Home Economics teachers in North Dakota. The purpose in the study was to determine teachers’ overall satisfaction with teaching. Results indicate one-third of the teachers had taught 1 to 5 years and another one-third had 6 to 10 years of experience. On age, 40% were 20-29 years, 31% were 30-39, and 13% were 40-49. Findings indicated that no significant differences were found in job satisfaction when age and teaching experience were the criteria.

Knoop's (1987) study on the causes of job dissatisfaction used 874 elementary and 971 secondary teachers from Ontario. The teachers were in four age categories: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 and over. Pearson correlations between job dissatisfaction and demographic factors, age and years of teaching, were all non-significant. Age and years of teaching correlated with job dissatisfaction.

St. John and Pestle (1992) surveyed home economics teachers to determine work and home and family satisfaction. A total of 194 consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers from five vocational regions in Florida participated. Results of an analysis of variance on overall means of the work satisfaction by age and years of teaching revealed no significant differences.
Ethnic Group and Job Satisfaction

Few studies included the factors of ethnic group and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, two studies were located that included these factors. Both studies analyzed reported no relationship between ethnic group and job satisfaction.

Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) used secondary consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers in Alabama to conduct their study on stress, job satisfaction, and demographic variables. Of the 100 teachers in this study, 85 were white and 15 nonwhite. The use of a one-way analysis of variance on job satisfaction and ethnic group did not reveal a significant difference.

Home economics teachers were used to determine work and home and family satisfaction in the St. John and Pestle (1992) study. The consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers were from Florida. Of the 194 teachers that participated in the study, 163 (85%) were Caucasian, 27 (14%) were Black, and 2 (1%) was Hispanic. The results of an analysis of variance showed no significant difference between ethnic group on overall job satisfaction.

Marital Status and Job Satisfaction

A majority of the studies found no significant difference in the level of satisfaction when teachers were grouped by marital status. In studies by Weiner and Clawson (1984), Grady (1985), and St. John and Pestle (1992) the level of job satisfaction did not differ significantly for marital status.

A total of 170 teachers participated in Weiner and Clawson (1984) study of sex-role preference and job satisfaction. The participants were secondary home economics teachers from North Carolina. In addition to the JDI, several demographic variables were included in the study. One of those demographic variables was marital status. Results of analysis of variance showed marital status was not related to overall job satisfaction.
When Grady (1985) used 45 agriculture teachers in Louisiana to determine overall job satisfaction, eight demographic variables were also investigated. Marital status was included in that list of demographic variables. However, a significant difference in overall job satisfaction was not found with respect to marital status.

The participants in the St. John and Pestle (1992) study of home economics teachers were from Florida. A total of 194 consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers from five vocational regions answered questions concerning their satisfaction with work and home and family. Information was collected on 10 demographic factors. Results of analysis of variance revealed no significant difference when the overall means of the work satisfaction responses were compared by marital status.

Two studies reported married teachers were more satisfied with their jobs. Martin and Light (1984) and Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) reported that married teachers showed a significantly greater degree of satisfaction than single, divorced, or widowed teachers.

A total of 274 vocational home economics teachers in North Dakota participated in Martin and Light's (1984) study. The purpose in the study was to determine teachers’ overall satisfaction with teaching. Results indicated a significant difference in total job satisfaction by marital status. Married teachers were more satisfied with their jobs than single teachers.

Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) surveyed 100 secondary consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers in Alabama to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and nine demographic variables. On marital status, results showed the widowed group experienced the greatest satisfaction with their jobs, followed by singles, then married respondents, and last, experiencing the greatest degree of job dissatisfaction was the divorced group.
Number of Children Living at Home and Job Satisfaction

Of the studies reviewed, only two included the factors on number of children living at home and job satisfaction. One study reported significant differences and one study did not find differences.

The purpose in Martin and Light’s (1984) investigation of 274 Vocational Home Economics teachers in North Dakota was to determine teachers’ overall satisfaction with teaching. On number of children, 57 (38%) had no children, 21 (14%) had one child, 33 (22%) had two children, 27 (18%) had three children, and 11 (7%) had more than three children. Results indicated a significant difference was found for total job satisfaction by parental status. Teachers who had children were more satisfied with their jobs than teachers without children.

St. John and Pestle (1992) used home economics teachers to determine work and home and family satisfaction in their study. A total of 194 consumer and homemaking and occupational home economics teachers from five vocational regions in Florida participated. For number of children under 18, 98 (51%) had no children, 50 (26%) had one child, 35 (18%) had two children, 9 (5%) had three, and 1 (.5%) had four. Results of an analysis of variance showed no significant difference between number of children under 18 and job satisfaction.

Summary

Many measurable demographic variables were reported in the preceding section. Apparently, these demographic variables are important factors in determining job satisfaction of teachers. However, the relationship between most demographic variables and job satisfaction is not well established. The findings on demographic variables and job satisfaction are still conflicting. Therefore, researchers are unable to make definite conclusions.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose in this chapter is to describe the methodology. The methodology consists of the research design, the population, sample, and sampling procedure, the instrument used to gather the data, the data collection process, and the data analysis procedure. First, the type of research design is described and the specific objectives of the study are stated. Second, the population, sample, and sampling procedure are explained. Next, the process used to develop the questionnaire is delineated followed by the data collection process. Finally, data analyses are explained.

Research Design

A descriptive and correlational research design was used to conduct this study. Work and Family Life and Job Training home economics teachers in Ohio were described and compared. Additionally, differences were determined between teachers' level of job satisfaction and independent variables. Specifically, the objectives of this study are:

1. To determine if Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:
   a. Vocational characteristics: Satisfaction with teaching, satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with organizational climate, school and co-workers, principal.
   b. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
   c. Family background characteristics: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles,
father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's education, mother's education.

d. Demographic characteristics: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

2. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differs significantly.

3. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differs significantly on the following variables:
   a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
   b. Family background: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's education, mother's education.
   c. Demographic: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

4. To determine which variables predict job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers:
   a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching.
   b. Family background: distance from current position to where teacher grew up in miles, distance from current position to where teacher went to college in miles, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's education, mother's education.
   c. Demographic: income status, educational level, age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, number of children living at home.

5. To determine sources of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction among Work and Family and Job Training teachers.
Population/Sampling Procedure

The target population for this study was secondary Work and Family and Job Training home economics teachers in the state of Ohio. The accessible population was secondary home economics teachers employed in Ohio during the 1992-93 school year.

The State Department of Education in Ohio was contacted by phone to request a list of home economics teachers employed for the 1992-93 school year. In June 1993, a comprehensive list of home economics teachers was received from the Home Economics Section. This list reflected teachers employed as of May 1993.

There was a total of 1,118 home economics teachers employed by the State of Ohio. Ohio has an extensive home economics curriculum offering; there are eight classifications of teachers. Teachers are classified as Impact, GRADS (Graduation, Reality, and Dual-Role Skills), Goals, Displaced Homemaker, Family Life, Transitions, Work and Family Life, and Job Training.

Impact is a program for middle school and junior high students. GRADS (Graduation, Reality, and Dual-Role Skills) deals with pregnant and parenting teens. The remaining four programs - Goals, Displaced Homemaker, Family Life, and Transitions - are designed for adults and non-traditional students. In Ohio, Work and Family Life replaces the traditional consumer and homemaking curriculum. Job Training is known in most states as occupational training. Nationally, Work and Family and Job Training are the two most common classifications of teachers whereas some of the forementioned classifications may be unique to Ohio. Thus, Work and Family and Job Training teachers were chosen for ease of generalization and replication in this study.

The various classifications of teachers are identified by their subject codes. Subject codes of six digits are used to distinguish assignment areas. Those digits were used to establish the population frame for the two desired groups of teachers, Work and Family Life and
Job Training. The list was perused to select secondary Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers. Possible participants, those with the appropriate subject code number, were highlighted in a bright color and then numbered. This procedure was used for each group of teachers, Work and Family and Job Training.

The procedure described in the previous paragraph produced 671 Work and Family Life teachers in grades 9-12 and 267 teachers in the Job Training program. The entire population of 9-12 Work and Family Life and Job Training teachers in the state of Ohio was used to achieve the sample. A stratified random sample was drawn. Based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size table, a simple stratified random sample of 248 Work and Family and 159 Job Training teachers was drawn to represent the population. There was a total of 407 possible participants in this study. Overall, 336 (83%) of the participants responded; 209 (84%) Work and Family and 127 (80%) Job Training Teachers.

Work and Family Life programs prepare students for competence in the important, challenging, and ever-changing work of the family. The ultimate aim of home economics is to strengthen families empowering individuals to take action for the well-being of self and others in the home, workplace, community and world (Kister, 1992). The core course areas in Work and Family are Personal Development, Resource Management, Nutrition and Wellness, Family Relations, Parenting, and Life Planning. Personal Development and Resource Management are designed to meet the needs of ninth and tenth grade students; a combination of Personal Development and Resource Management as a 1 year foundation course is recommended for most schools. This replaces the comprehensive course, Home Economics I. Nutrition and Wellness, Family Relations, Parenting, and Life Planning are designed to meet the needs of tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade students.

Occupationally specific Job Training programs prepare students for paid employment in occupations requiring home economics related
knowledge and skills. There are five types of Job Training programs in Ohio. They are: Early Childhood Education and Care, Clothing and Interiors, Production and Services, Food Management and Production, Hospitality and Facility Care Services, and Multi-Area Services (Ohio Department of Education, 1993). Job Training teachers are highly concentrated in Joint Vocational Schools (JVS).

A joint vocational school is one that specializes in preparing students for paid employment. Ohio is divided into numerous Vocational Education Planning Districts (VEPD) (Hite, 1979). Each district has a school devoted to providing services in the following vocational areas: Agriculture, Business and Office Education, Distributive Education, Home Economics, and Trades and Industry. Students attending these schools are 11th and 12th grades and come from an area high school. These area high schools are known as feeder schools.

All Job Training programs are 1 or 2 year programs and must include a vocational block. The vocational block consists of at least 150 minutes of uninterrupted time for the purpose of providing students with hands-on experience in a real or simulated business or industry setting.

Although job training teachers are generally housed in joint vocational schools, sometimes job training options are taught in the regular high school. In that case, home economics teachers are assigned to teach both Work and Family and Job Training courses. The names of teachers who were categorized as both Work and Family and Job Training were removed from the most populated list, Work and Family.

This research involved human subjects. Therefore, the approval of The Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee was sought. The action of the committee can be found in Appendix A.

Instrumentation

A plethora of instruments has been developed to measure job satisfaction. A pool of those instruments was used in the construction
of an instrument for this study. The researcher felt that previously
developed instruments would have established validity and reliability.
Therefore, several studies and their instruments were reviewed to
determine their appropriateness for this study.

The review of various studies and instruments revealed that some
instruments were designed to be specific for an occupation. On the
other hand, some instruments were designed to have general application
to any job. According to Bentley and Rempel (1980), instruments
designed for other occupations or designed to be applicable to all
occupations have questionable validity when used with a sample of
teachers. Consequently, the Brayfield-Rothe Index developed by
Brayfield (1953), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)
developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), and the Job
Descriptive Index developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) were
deemed inappropriate for this study.

The composite questionnaire for this study contained four parts.
Part I of the questionnaire was the "Satisfaction with Teaching"
subscale. After careful review, the "Satisfaction with Teaching"
subscale of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) was selected to
measure satisfaction with teaching. Permission was granted by Ralph
Bentley to use the "Satisfaction with Teaching" subscale of the PTO
(Appendix B).

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire is designed specifically as a
measure of teacher morale and/or satisfaction. The present form of PTO
was developed in 1980 and contains 100 items with 10 subscales. The
"Satisfaction with Teaching" subscale consists of 20 items and pertains
to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with
teaching. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was developed by Bentley and
Rempel (1980), and has been used in several studies with elementary,
middle, and senior high faculties (Culver, 1987). It has also been
recognized as an instrument well grounded in research.
The second section of the questionnaire is occupationally specific and deals with home economics. Because this study is designed exclusively for home economics teachers, the researcher felt that a portion of the questionnaire should deal with this occupation. This section of the questionnaire measures such factors as management, student/class liability, service orientation, image of the profession, student enrollment and youth organization. The items on this scale were developed by the researcher and entitled "Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics." Items for this section were taken from a focus group interview and a review of literature. A focus group was held in June 1992. This focus group interview took place in the Department of Home Economics Education at The Ohio State University. Current and former secondary home economics teachers, both Work and Family and Job Training attended the focus group meeting.

During the focus group interviews, participants were asked to relate difficulties they had encountered as home economics teachers. They were also asked to divulge past and future problems the profession may experience. The responses were recorded and later analyzed and categorized into main topics. That categorization and the review of literature formed the basis for the questions in Part II.

Part III of the questionnaire measures a teacher's perception of organizational climate. The "Teacher Perceptions of Teacher Group Behavior and Teacher Perceptions of Principal Behavior" were used in this study. There are 16 questions on the two subscales; eight classified as administration and eight dealt with school and co-workers. These two scales stem from Deer's (1980) validation of Finlayson, Banks, and Loughran's (1971) earlier work measuring the organizational climate of British secondary schools. Permission was granted by Christine E. Deer to use two subscales of the Organizational School Climate instrument (Appendix B).
The items in Part IV were developed to evaluate the objectives in this study on likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background, and demographic characteristics. The items on likelihood of remaining in teaching and family background traits were adapted from a similar instrument developed by Culver, Wolfle, and Cross (1990), and the demographic information was developed by the researcher. Permission was granted by Culver to use those items (Appendix B).

Parts I, II, and III of the questionnaire were composed of Likert scales. According to Mueller (1986), items on a Likert scale can be derived from diverse sources. The researcher feels that a variety of sources was explored before compiling the questionnaire. See questionnaire in Appendix E.

Dillman’s (1978) text, *Mail and Telephone Surveys*, served as a guide in designing this questionnaire. The questionnaire took on the appearance of a booklet. It was printed on two different colors of paper, gray and ivory. The colors represented teaching areas. The Work and Family teachers received gray questionnaires and the Job Training teachers received ivory. The front cover of the questionnaire included the title of the study, a map of the state, and the name of the university.

According to Dillman (1978), the first page should begin with queries about opinions on important issues rather than questions about age and gender. Consequently, the satisfaction scales on teaching, teaching home economics, and organizational climate were presented first.

The response section of the questionnaire was characterized by lower case letters for questions and upper case letters for answers. Dillman (1978) feels this is a convenient guide to help respondents through the questionnaire.

The format of the 4-point Likert-type scale ranges from disagree to agree. The scale was anchored at each point. The anchors and values
are disagree=1, tend to disagree=2, tend to agree=3, and agree=4. Satisfaction findings were reported as mean ratings. Mean ratings of 1.0 to 1.50 represent disagree, 1.51 to 2.50 tend to disagree, 2.51 to 3.50 tend to agree, 3.51 to 4.0 agree.

Several items on Part I, II, and III were stated negatively; therefore, they were reverse coded to reflect the appropriate value. On the Satisfaction with Teaching scale, items 6, 11, 13, and 14 were reverse coded. Items 35, 36, 37, 42, 43, and 45 on the School and Co-workers and Principals subscales were reverse coded.

Validity and Reliability

The "Satisfaction with Teaching" subscale of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was validated by Rempel and Bentley (1980) against peer judgments made by fellow teachers (criterion related validity). The peer judgments were obtained from the teachers at the time they responded to the Opinionnaire. Teachers were asked to identify by name on the attached rating form, 3 to 10 teachers whom they considered to have the highest morale. They were also asked to select an equal number whom they considered to have the lowest morale. Based on the peer judgments, high, middle, and low teacher morale groups were identified. To determine the instrument's validity against the peer judgment criterion, mean Opinionnaire scores were calculated for each of these groups (Bentley & Rempel, 1963). Differences among the three groups were in the expected direction and significant beyond the .05 level of significance.

Test-retest was used by Rempel and Bentley (1980) to establish reliability for the PTO. A sample of 3023 teachers was administered the entire questionnaire twice with an interval of 4 weeks. The coefficient for the Satisfaction with Teaching scale was reported at .84. The coefficient for the other nine scales on the PTO ranged from .62 to .88. The coefficient on the entire instrument, 10 subscales, was .87.
The Teacher Group Behavior and Principal Behavior subscales stem from Deer's (1980) validation of Finlayson, Sanks, and Loughran's (1971) earlier work measuring organizational climate of British secondary schools. To validate Finlayson’s work and extend the use of the instruments to other populations, Deer (1980) conducted a study using 10 schools and more than 350 teachers. Deer used principal components factor analysis to check the construct validity of each scale.

The items on the two scales were included for further analyses if their factor loadings were more than + .5 on one factor and less than + .3 on the other factors. Analysis of inter-item correlations showed which of these items were not closely correlated with the factor being measured. Such items were then omitted. For each scale, items with low inter-item correlations were omitted until the alpha coefficient was at least .7. These steps reduced the Teacher Group Behavior scale from 27 items to 8 and the Principal Behavior (Deer renamed “Head Behavior”) from 28 to 8. Each of these derived scales had a reported alpha of .76.

**Pilot Test**

A panel of experts was used to establish content validity for this study. The panel included Jane Vickers and Marla Wyatt, Home Economics teachers; Dr. Pamela Burdette and Dr. Charles Michael Loyd, Assistant Professors of Home Economics Education; and Dong Eun Lee, measurement expert. The individuals were chosen because of their proximity to the researcher and similarities to the sample. The members of the panel were asked to complete the instrument and evaluate the items on 1) which aspect of teacher satisfaction or selected variable was being measured, 2) readability and ease of administration, 3) the amount of time required to complete the instrument, and 4) the appropriateness for the target population in terms of content, and choice of questions.

Additionally, the panel of experts was asked to establish face validity. They were asked to evaluate the instrument on 1) general appearance (does it look suitable for its intended purpose?, and 2)
format. Participants were instructed to write their comments directly on the instrument, as opposed to commenting on a separate sheet of paper.

After the questionnaire was returned, it was revised as deemed necessary by the panel. The following changes were made: the neutral response was removed from the response section which reduced the number of responses from 5 to 4; the response descriptors were replaced by the descriptors used in the PTO; the section on recruitment was replaced by a question on the Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics subscale; a question on youth organizations was added; and the title of the section on commitment to teaching was changed to likelihood of remaining in teaching.

Teachers enrolled in Home Economics Education 846, Home Economics Teaching Strategies and Learning Theory, were asked to complete the questionnaire to establish its reliability. Additionally, graduate students who were not enrolled in the class were also asked to help establish reliability. Those graduate students were also present or former home economics teachers.

After administration of the questionnaire, analysis was run on the subscales using Cronbach’s Alpha. This procedure yields an internal consistency coefficient, and an item analysis. The reliability for this sample, n=21, was as follows: Satisfaction with Teaching .76, Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics -.06, Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers .57, and Satisfaction with Principal -.15.

Cronbach’s Alpha was also run on data from the main study sample, n = 336. Reliability was reported on each of the four satisfaction scales and for each group, Work and Family and Job Training. On the Satisfaction with Teaching subscale, the reliability was .67 for Work and Family teachers and .71 for Job Training teachers. The Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics subscale yielded .58 and .63 for Work and Family and Job Training teachers, respectively. On the School and Co-
Workers subscale, -.0006 was reported for Work and Family teachers and .0014 for Job Training teachers. The Satisfaction with Principal subscale yielded -.32 and -.30 for Work and Family and Job Training teachers, respectively.

The low reliability coefficient on the Organizational climate subscales, School and Co-Workers and Principal, is due to the small number of items on each scale. There are only eight items on each scale. As discussed earlier, Deer (1980) used factorial analysis to reduce the number of items. Therefore, the scale is broad in scope and measures a variety of concepts.

Data Collection Procedures

The data for this research were collected using a mailed questionnaire. A single data collection method; one administration of the questionnaire was used. According to Fowler (1988), self-administered procedures are thought to be best because the respondent is not conscious of giving socially acceptable answers.

A letter was mailed to teachers 1 week before the questionnaire (Appendix C). This letter notified teachers of their random selection to participate in the study. The letter also informed teachers of the forthcoming questionnaire. The researcher's goal was to collect data early in the school year, yet allow sufficient time for teachers to adjust to a new school year. Consequently, the initial letter was mailed on September 4, 1993 which was at least 2 weeks after the new school year began.

On September 11, 1993, a cover letter and questionnaire were mailed to 407 home economics teachers in Ohio, 248 Work and Family and 159 Job Training (Appendix D). See questionnaire in Appendix E. Dillman (1978) claims the enclosure of an incentive rather than the promise of one helps to ensure response. Therefore, an incentive was included in the initial mailing. The incentive was a red bookmark in the shape of an
apple and a pencil inscribed "teacher's pencil." The questionnaire packet also included a pre addressed, stamped return envelop. The cover letter was printed on official Ohio State Home Economics Education Department letterhead. The cover letters were signed in blue ink by the researcher and the researcher's advisor. Blue ink was used so the signatures would stand out from the black print and to show that utmost attention had been given to each participant.

According to Dillman (1978), a follow-up postcard should be sent in approximately 14 days. Thus, on October 1, 1993 a postcard was mailed to 136 participants who had not responded by September 29, 1993 (Appendix F). Dillman (1978) further states that after a 2 week period, a second questionnaire should be sent. Consequently, on October 18, 1993, a letter of reminder and a second questionnaire were mailed to 98 nonrespondents (Appendix G). The data collection process was ended the second week in November; it had continued for 12 weeks.

As questionnaires were received, dates were recorded. This process enables an estimation of nonrespondents by comparing the early respondents with the late respondents (Miller & Smith, 1983). According to Miller and Smith (1983), approximately 15% of the possible sample should be used for this comparison. This percentage was 37 Work and Family and 24 Job Training respondents. The early and late 37 and 24 responses from Work and Family and Job Training teachers, respectively were compared statistically.

A t-test was performed on the four Likert-type scales: Satisfaction with Teaching, Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics, Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers, and Satisfaction with Principal. T-tests were performed for each teacher group, Work and Family and Job Training.

The results of the t-tests on data from early and late respondents are shown in Table 1 for Work and Family teachers and Table 2 for Job Training teachers. Findings revealed no statistically significant
differences between early and late respondents on any of the scales. With the assumption that late respondents are more typical of nonrespondents, generalizing from the respondents to the population is warranted. Therefore, generalizations can be made to Work and Family and Job Training teachers in Ohio.

Data Analyses

Data from the questionnaires were transferred to a floppy disk using MEDIT. MEDIT is a data entry program developed by a Taiwan student. This program was used in a Home Economics Education research class. It allows the user to see line and column of data entry. At the end of the data collection process, the data files were transferred by modem to the mainframe at the Academic Computing Service at The Ohio State University. The data were analyzed to address each specific research objective using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (1988) program.

For objective 1, the following descriptive statistics were used: frequencies, percentages, a measure of central tendency—means, and a measure of variability—standard deviations. To compare the two groups of teachers, t-tests and Chi Squares were performed. t-tests were used for interval or ratio data and Chi-Squares were used for nominal or ordinal data. On the four Likert scales, teacher ratings were computed and averaged for each scale. This average rating represented satisfaction with the subject of a particular scale.

All sections of the questionnaire were used to describe and compare the sample. After the analysis of objective 1, Parts I, II, and III were used to create the dependent variable, job satisfaction. The dependent variable was created by combining the four vocational
Table 1
Comparison of Early and Late Respondents for Work and Family Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Home Economics Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School and Co-Workers Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Comparison of Early and Late Respondents for Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Home Economics Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School and Co-Workers Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
characteristics scales—Satisfaction with Teaching, Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics, Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers, and Satisfaction with Principals. A grand mean was determined by computing the four scale means. The grand mean of the four scales was the measure of overall job satisfaction. The levels that coincide with each mean rating are as follows: 1.0 to 1.50 disagree represents dissatisfied, 1.51 to 2.50 somewhat dissatisfied, 2.51 to 3.50 somewhat satisfied, and 3.51 to 4.0 very satisfied. These descriptors were adapted from a national study conducted by Metropolitan Life (1989).

According to Holland's Vocational Choice Theory (1973), job satisfaction depends on the congruence of person and environment. The first two scales; Satisfaction with Teaching and Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics deal with an act performed by a person. The next two organizational climate scales; Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers, and Satisfaction with Principals deal with the environment. Based on Holland's principle stated above (job satisfaction depends on the congruence of person and environment), the four scales representing one's personality and the environment, were combined for a measure of overall job satisfaction.

On the next objective, One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to determine if Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ on overall job satisfaction. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for objective 3 to determine differences between Work and Family and Job Training teachers' level of job satisfaction and selected independent variables. Those independent variables are likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics, and demographic characteristics.

Stepwise multiple regression was performed to predict relationships existing between job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training home economics teachers and selected variables. Those selected variables were significant to job satisfaction and were the only variables entered the regression model. To determine significant
relationships between the dependent variable, job satisfaction, and selected independent variables a correlation matrix was built. Pearson moment correlations were performed for ordinal, interval, and ratio data whereas, Point Biserial was used when data were nominal. Davis’ (1971) table of association was used to describe the strength of the associations. Davis’ table is as follows: .70 or higher very strong association, .50-.69 substantial, .30-.49 moderate, .10-.29 low, and .01-.09 negligible.

The last analysis was a result of teachers written statements. Teachers were asked to share problems, issues, or concerns they had as a home economics teacher in Ohio. Space was provided on the last page of the questionnaire for teachers’ comments. A total of 164 teachers wrote additional comments to express their concern: 110 Work and Family and 54 Job Training (Appendix F). The comments were categorized into major themes. Those themes are reported in the following chapter with other findings from this study.

The statistical techniques used to analyze each research objective are given in Table 3.
Table 3

Procedures for Attaining Research Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Data provided by questions:</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine if of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. satisfaction with teaching satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with school and co-workers, satisfaction with principal</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-32</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-48</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. likelihood of remaining in teaching</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. family background: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father’s occupation,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s occupation,</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father’s education,</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. demographics: income status, educational level teaching experience, age, ethnic group, marital status, gender, number of children living at home,</td>
<td>51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>Chi-Square, Chi-square, t-test, t-test, Chi-Square, Chi-Square, t-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

Procedures for Attaining Research Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Data provided by questions</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly.</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>One-Way Analysis of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. likelihood of remaining in teaching</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. family background:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income status,</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's occupation,</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's occupation,</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's education,</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother's education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. demographics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational level</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience,</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age,</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic group,</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital status,</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of children</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

Procedures for Attaining Research Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Data provided by questions:</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To determine which variables predict job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. likelihood of remaining in teaching</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. family background:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles grew up,</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles went to college,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income status,</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father’s occupation,</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s occupation,</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father’s education,</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother’s education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. demographics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational level</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age,</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience,</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic group,</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital status,</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender,</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of children</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living at home,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To determine sources of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction among Work and Family and Job Training teachers.</td>
<td>Written Comments</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, findings are presented and discussed. The chapter is organized according to the research questions of the study. First, comparison of Work and Family and Job Training teachers is presented. The two groups of teachers were compared on the four satisfaction scales, likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background traits and demographics characteristics.

Differences were also established for Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The four satisfaction scales were combined for a measure of overall job satisfaction. Differences were determined between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on overall job satisfaction and likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background traits, and demographic characteristics.

Finally, predictions were determined for overall job satisfaction by entering into a regression model those variables significant with job satisfaction. Further analyses were run as needed.

Research Objective 1
To determine if Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:

Satisfaction with teaching, satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with organizational climate, school and co-workers, principal

Likelihood of remaining in teaching

Family background variables: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to school in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.
Demographic variables: educational level, age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, income status, number of children living at home.

Satisfaction with teaching, satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with school and co-workers, satisfaction with principal

Table 4 illustrates the results for Work and Family and Job Training teachers on the four satisfaction scales. The mean score for Work and Family teachers on the Satisfaction with Teaching scale was 3.3 while the Job Training teachers' mean score was slightly higher at 3.5. The Work and Family teachers were somewhat satisfied with teaching, whereas Job Training teachers were very satisfied.

On the Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics scale, the means were 2.7 and 2.8 for Work and Family and Job Training, respectively. The Job Training mean was 2.7 and the Work and Family mean was 2.6 on the School and Co-workers scale. The fourth and final satisfaction scale dealing with Principals yielded means of 2.8 for each group. Both Work and Family and Job Training teachers were somewhat satisfied on all three satisfaction scales.

To detect whether there was a significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on the four satisfaction scales, a t-test was applied. The results showed a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on two of the four satisfaction scales: Satisfaction with Teaching (p = .001) and Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers (p = .03) (see Table 4). In both cases, Job Training teachers had higher means than Work and Family teachers.

Job Training teachers are concentrated in Joint Vocational Schools. Those teachers work toward one goal; preparation of their students for careers. This may contribute to their higher means on the Satisfaction with Teaching and Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers subscales.

The results on the Satisfaction with Teaching scale are consistent with the St. John and Pestle (1992) study of consumer homemaking and occupational home economics teachers in Florida. On a 7 point scale,
Table 4
Comparison of Work and Family and Job Training Teachers on Satisfaction Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Home Economics Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School and Co-Workers Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) n = 209
\(^b\) n = 127

Note: Likert type scale ranging from 1 = disagree to 4 = agree
the overall mean for Satisfaction in their study was 5.16. This mean reflects a fairly satisfied rating. However, to date no studies were found that compared Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching

The likelihood of remaining in teaching for Work and Family and Job Training teachers is shown in Table 5. The majority (61%) of teachers in both teaching areas, Work and Family and Job Training, were interested in remaining in teaching until normal retirement. Only 18% of Work and Family and 23% of Job Training teachers were considering early retirement. Ten percent or less of Work and Family and Job Training teachers were planning to leave teaching soon or leave teaching as soon as something better came along. From these data, home economics teachers are planning to remain in the teaching profession.

Chi-Square analyses were used to determine if differences existed between the two groups. For Chi-Square purposes, the last two categories, something better and leave soon, were collapsed. Thus four categories were created; early retirement, normal retirement, forced due to age, and other. Results of the Chi-Square analysis revealed no statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on likelihood of remaining in teaching. Therefore, the teacher groups were similar on likelihood of remaining in teaching.

These findings are unlike those of Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) and Sparks (1979). Both authors found at least 50% of the teachers planned to leave teaching within the next 5 years. The opposite was true for the participants in this study; 61% are planning to remain in teaching. The time span between when the studies were conducted may contribute to the discrepancies in findings. Possibly 1979 conditions contributed to teachers’ feelings about leaving the profession.

One finding from this analysis does agree with the Metropolitan Life Survey (1989) on early retirement. In their study, approximately
Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages of Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retirement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Retirement</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Due to Age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something Better</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Soon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (3, n = 330) = 3.70, p = .29
26% of the participants were likely to leave teaching soon, that is, within the next 5 years. Whereas, in this study, close to one-fourth (18% and 23%) of the teachers were considering early retirement.

**Family background:** Distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles

Work and Family teachers were working an average of 125 miles from where they grew up as compared to the 172 miles traveled by Job Training teachers. They also traveled 150 miles away from home to attend college, whereas Job Training teachers traveled 194 miles (Table 6). In both cases, Job Training teachers’ travel distances were greater. The sparsity of Joint Vocational Centers may have a bearing on Job Training teachers’ traveling the farthest.

A t-test was applied to determine if there were differences between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles and distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles. Results of the t-tests revealed no statistically significant differences between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on either of the variables.

As for distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, these results differ from those of Culver (1987). In his study which tested a model of job satisfaction with Virginia teachers, he found those teachers held positions that were farther from where they grew up than teachers in the study currently being reported. The teachers in his study worked 213 miles from where they grew up. This is considerably higher than the 125 and 172 traveled by the teachers in this study.

On distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles, the Job Training teachers in this study did
Table 6

Comparison of Work and Family and Job Training Teachers on Family Background Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance Between Location of Current Position and Where Teacher Grew Up in Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>241.4</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>172.4</td>
<td>453.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Between Location of Current Position and Where Teacher Went to College in Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family(^a)</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training(^b)</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>443.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) n = 209
\(^b\) n = 127
parallel those in Culver's. Job Training teachers in Ohio, like the teachers in Culver's study traveled 193 miles from where they grew up to attend college.

**Family Background: Father's Occupation**

According to the data in Table 7, the fathers of these respondents were concentrated in professional occupations. The areas that received the top responses were: nonteaching professional, skilled worker, semiskilled worker, and self employed. Each category named above netted between 19% and 28% of the responses for each teaching area, Work and Family and Job Training. One of the lowest areas for both groups was teacher K-12. Only 5% of Work and Family and 7% of Job Training teachers' fathers were K-12 teachers. This is in keeping with the national phenomenon and concern on the lack of male teachers.

To determine whether differences existed between the two groups on fathers' occupation, a Chi-Square test was performed. The last two categories in Table 7, deceased or absent and other, were collapsed for statistical purposes. A Chi-Square test was run using six categories; K-12 teacher, nonteaching professional, skilled worker, semiskilled worker, self-employed, and other. The Chi-Square test showed no significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on fathers' occupation.

The results of this study are similar to those of Norris (1991) and Vaines and Arcus (1987). In Norris' (1991) study of home economics majors at Ohio State University, nearly one-fourth (23%) of the participants' fathers were concentrated in professional occupations. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents' fathers in Vaines and Arcus' (1987) study of home economics majors were also in professional roles. In this study, 24% and 29%, of the respondents’ fathers were in professional roles; Teacher K-12 and nonteaching professional.
Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages of Fathers' Occupation by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher K-12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonteaching Professional</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Worker</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled Worker</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased or Absent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                        | 209             | 100.0| 127| 100.0|

Note:  \( \chi^2 = (5, \ n = 333) = 3.69, \ p = .59 \)
Family Background: Mother’s Occupation

Table 8 presents the mothers’ occupations for the teachers in this sample. Approximately one-third of the mothers of these teachers were unemployed, Work and Family (31%) and Job Training teachers (33%). A third of the teachers’ mothers’ occupations in each teaching area were concentrated in the top three areas; K-12 teacher, nonteaching professional, and skilled workers. For Work and Family, 35% of the responses were in the aforementioned areas, and 31% for Job Training teachers.

To test for significance, a Chi-Square test was performed. The low frequency counts in some areas; not employed, deceased or absent, and other were collapsed for the Chi-Square test. Results of the Chi-Square reflected no significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on mothers’ occupation.

The mothers in this study share similarities with those in Culver’s (1987) study; both sets of mothers experienced a high rate of unemployment. Twenty-four percent of the mothers in his study were unemployed while 31% of Work and Family and 33% of Job Training teachers’ mothers were unemployed in this study.

Vaines’ and Arcus’ (1987) finding on mothers’ occupations was contrary to this and Culver’s study. They found a considerably greater number (66%) of the mothers of the participants in their study were unemployed. Their percentage of unemployed mothers doubles the percent in the present study.

Family Background: Father’s Education

Regarding fathers’ education, almost half of the fathers were high school completers. Forty-seven percent of the fathers for Work and Family teachers had completed high school. The fathers of Job Training teachers had completed high school at a slightly lesser rate than Work and Family teachers with 43% high school completion. Only 11% and 12% of fathers completed college, Work and Family and Job Training,
Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Mothers' Occupation by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher K-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonteaching Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Worker</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled Worker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased or Absent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (5, n = 333) = 5.66, p = .34
respectively (Table 9).

These findings on college degree differ from those of Culver (1987) and Norris (1991). In Culver's study, 28% of the fathers had college degrees and in Norris study 35% of the participants' fathers had college degrees. Nevertheless, the finding on high school from Vaines and Arcus study (1987) is similar to the present study. Fifty percent of the fathers of the participants in Vaines and Arcus had no education beyond high school.

A Chi-Square test was employed to determine if differences existed between Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The last two categories in Table 9, vocational school and community college, were collapsed to perform the Chi-Square. Six areas were used in performing the Chi-Square test. Those areas were: elementary, high school, college, graduate school, and vocational school. The results of Chi-Square indicated no statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on fathers' education.

**Family Background: Mother’s Education**

Approximately 51% of Work and Family and Job Training teachers checked the response section "high school." Therefore, slightly more than half of the mothers of teachers in this study were high school completers. Only 15% and 12% of the mothers had college degrees, Work and Family and Job Training, respectively (Table 10). For the respondents in this study, a higher percentage of their mothers than their fathers were college completers.

However, the college completion rate is still not as high as the mothers in Culver's and Norris's studies. Twenty-five percent of the mothers had college degrees in Culver's study and 26% in Norris's. The finding in Vaines and Arcus's (1987) study concerning mother's education is compatible to the present study. Over half, 60%, of the mothers of the participants in their study had no education beyond high school.
Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages of Fathers' Education by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or More Years College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Specialty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (5, n = 333) = .72, p = .98
Table 10

Frequencies and Percentages of Mothers' Education by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or More Years College</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Specialty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (5, n = 333) = 1.43, p = .92
whereas, 51% of the mothers in the present study had no education beyond high school.

A Chi-Square test was employed to reveal if differences existed between Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The categories marked vocational school and community college were collapsed to perform the Chi-Square. The Chi-Square test was performed with six areas. Chi-Square analysis revealed no significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on mothers' education.

Demographic: Educational level

The educational level of Work and Family and Job Training teachers is summarized in Table 11. The highest educational level obtained by over half, (53%), of Work and Family teachers was a bachelor's degree. The percent of Job Training teachers with bachelor's degrees was lower, 35%, but when coupled with Associate degrees, the percentage was 47 compared to 53 for Work and Family teachers. Regarding a masters' degree, 36% of Work and Family and 26% of Job Training teachers had reached this level. An additional 20% of Job Training teachers had plus 30 but, only 10% of Work and Family teachers claimed that level of education.

A Chi-Square test was run to determine if differences existed between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on educational level. Because of low frequency counts, the first two categories were collapsed thereby forming three categories for the Chi-Square test. Those categories were: associate-bachelors, masters, and 30 plus. Results of the Chi-Square analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on educational level \( (p = .005) \). There was a tendency for Work and Family teachers to have obtained a higher level of education than Job Training teachers.

The findings from Holley and Kirkpatrick (1989) conflict with results from the present study. Holley and Kirkpatrick found that 53%
Table 11

Frequencies and Percentages of Highest Educational Level by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (2, n = 326) = 9.61, p = .008
of the respondents had master’s degrees which is the same percentage of
Work and Family teachers in this study with bachelor’s degrees.
Therefore, the home economics teachers in Alabama (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1987), had achieved a higher educational level than the home economics
teachers in Ohio. Yet another study’s finding varied with the one from
this study. Weiner and Clawson (1984) study of home economics teachers
in North Carolina reported 71% of the participants held bachelor’s
degrees; a higher percentage of bachelor degree holders than Ohio.
Thus, home economics teachers in Ohio had earned a higher educational
level than those in North Carolina.

When compared to teachers in the general population, the findings
from this study on bachelor’s and master’s degrees were consistent with
the findings from a national study. The nation’s largest teacher union,
National Education Association (NEA) (1980), investigated teacher
attitudes, and practices in a national survey. They found the highest
degree held by over half (52%) of the 1,783 teachers surveyed was a
bachelor’s whereas, 53% are bachelor degree holders in Ohio. However,
slightly more, (43%), than the 36% in this study held a master’s degree.

Demographic characteristic: Years of teaching experience

As for years of teaching experience, the greatest frequency counts
were concentrated in two areas. The years, 15-20, received the highest
tallies; for Work and Family (33%) and Job Training (26%). The second
highest category was 8-14 years of teaching experience (Work and Family
25% and Job Training 24%). Low counts were reported for Work and Family
(5%) in the 1-3 years of teaching experience category, and for Job
Training in the 26 and higher years of teaching experience (4%)
category (Table 12). The small percentages during the first few years
of teaching reflect the findings from the Division of Vocational and
Career Education (1993) that compared the experience distribution of the
secondary Vocational teachers in Ohio. A 5 year period, 1987 to 1992,
Table 12

Frequencies and Percentages of Years of Teaching Experience by
Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  \( t = 2.65, \ p = .009 \)

\( a \ n = 209 \ (M = 15.96) \)

\( b \ n = 127 \ (M = 13.68) \)
was compared. The comparison showed a sharp decline in 5-12 years of teaching experience during 1987 to 1992.

The analysis of central tendency shows a greater difference on years of teaching experience than any other demographic variable. Work and Family teachers had taught an average of 15.96 years to Job Training teacher’s 13.68 years (Table 12). A *t*-test was used to determine if differences existed between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on years of teaching experience. The application of a *t*-test indicated statistical significance (*p = .009*) on years of teaching experience between Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

On years of teaching experience, Ohio’s home economics teachers do not parallel the home economics teachers in Florida (St.John & Pestle, 1992). In Florida, most of those teachers (60%) had 11 or more years of teaching experience; the majority in this study had 15-20 years of teaching experience. However, Ohio’s teachers are more like Alabama’s home economics teachers (Holley & Kirkpatrick, 1984). In Alabama, the largest number of teachers (23%) had 15 or more years of teaching experience.

When home economics teachers from this study are compared to teachers in the general population, they are still disparate. The findings from NEA (1980) showed the majority, 66%, of those teachers had 5-19 years of teaching experience. However, the mean was 13 compared to means of 16 for Work and Family and 14 for Job Training teachers in this study. The median was 11 for NEA which indicates that Ohio teachers are more experienced.

**Demographic characteristic: Age**

Table 13 contains a summary of the findings on age. The most frequently occurring age for teachers in both teaching areas was in the 40-49 year old group. Forty-one percent of Work and Family teachers were between the ages of 40 and 49. A higher percentage, 49%, was
Table 13

Frequencies and Percentages of Age of Participants by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  t = .72, p = .95

a n = 209 (M = 41.4)
b n = 127 (M = 40.5)
reported for Job Training teachers. The second highest frequency count was in the 30-39 year old age group for both teaching areas (Work and Family 27%, and Job Training 26%). The lowest percent was noted in the 20-29 year old age group, 16% and 7% for Work and Family and Job Training, respectively. This seems to reflect that home economics teachers remain on the job longer and fewer beginning teachers are employed.

Relatively small differences among the two groups were noted when means were calculated. The difference in mean age was less than a year, 41.4 for Work and Family teachers and 40.5 for Job Training teachers. When a t-test was performed, statistical significance was not indicated between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on age.

Several studies conducted with home economics teachers explored the age factor. In accord with the findings from this study is St. John and Pestle (1992) Investigation of Work, Home and Family Satisfaction and Stress of Home Economics Teachers in Florida. Fifty-four percent of the respondents were over 40 years of age whereas 64% in this study were over 40.

Reporting, different results on age of respondents are Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) and Martin and Light (1984). The participants in Holley and Kirkpatrick were younger than 40; 39% were in the 31 to 40 year old category. Only 13% of the respondents in Martin and Light (1984) study were over the age of 40.

When home economics teachers in Ohio are compared to the general population of teachers in Ohio, they are younger. The average age of the certificated staff in Ohio public schools was 42.7 (Bower, 1990).

Demographic Characteristic: Ethnic group

The ethnic group of most home economics teachers in this sample is Caucasian. Based on the data presented in Table 14, 94% of Work and Family teachers are Caucasian. Only 2% are African-American, a fraction
Table 14

**Frequencies and Percentages of Ethnic Group by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Work and Family f</th>
<th>Work and Family %</th>
<th>Job Training f</th>
<th>Job Training %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = (2, n = 332) = 13.63, p = .001
of a percent (.5) Asian-American, and 1% Native American. For Job Training teachers; 84% are Caucasian, 12% African-American, less than a percent (.8%) Asian-American and 2% Native American.

The low frequency counts of Asian-American and Native-American made it necessary to collapse those areas for Chi-Square purposes. Therefore, three areas were used in the Chi-Square test; African-American, Caucasian, and Other. The Chi-Square reflected a significant difference (p = .001) between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on ethnic group.

The racial composition of teachers in this study is not representative of the population of Work and Family Life teachers in Ohio. Based on data from Burdette and Brandon (1995), the population of minority teachers is approximately 10% of the total Work and Family Life teachers in grades 9-12.

The findings from previous researchers using home economics teachers indicated that the same was true, that is, home economics teachers are overwhelmingly Caucasian. Eighty-five percent of the participants in both St. John and Pestle (1992) and Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987) studies were Caucasian. Therefore, when ethnic group is considered, home economics teachers are similar to those in Florida and Alabama. From these data, minority groups are underrepresented in home economics.

This finding on ethnic group also echoes the result from a national study conducted by Metropolitan Life (1989). Of the 2,000 public schoolteachers in grades K-12 throughout all states of the United States and District of Columbia, 1,771 or 89% were Caucasian.

**Demographic characteristic: Marital Status**

As findings show, the vast majority of the participants in this study were married. The analysis in Table 15 shows 80% of Work and Family and 70% of Job Training teachers were married. The second highest category for Work and Family teachers was ‘never married’ at
Table 15

**Frequencies and Percentages of Marital Status of Participants by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square = \( (2, n = 334) = 5.61, p = .06 \)
10%. The Job Training teachers differed from the Work and Family teachers on their marital status because the second highest category for them was divorced (17%).

The response section labeled "divorced" and "widowed" was collapsed because of low frequencies in each teaching area. The Chi-Square test was performed to detect differences between Work and Family and Job Training teachers. Results revealed no statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on marital status.

According to results from studies utilizing home economics teachers, overwhelmingly home economics teachers are married. Seventy-two percent of the participants in St. John and Pestle (1992) study were married, 79% in Holley and Kirkpatrick (1987), 68% in Martin and Light’s (1984), and 73% in Weiner and Clawson (1984).

**Demographic: Income Status**

For status regarding income, the frequencies and percents are shown in Table 16. The response category "co-primary income earner" was the title that overwhelmingly represented both Work and Family and Job Training teachers. More than two-thirds, 71% of the Work and Family teachers and 61% of the Job Training teachers were co-primary income earners. Only 29% of Work and Family teachers were primary income earners; a comparatively higher number, 39%, of Job Training teachers was primary income earners. The higher percent of Job Training teachers as primary income earners results from the number of males employed in the Job Training positions.

The use of Chi-Square was required to determine significance between the two groups of teachers. When the Chi-Square test was applied, a statistically significant difference ($p = .04$) was achieved between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on status concerning income. More Work and Family teachers were co-primary earners than Job Training teachers while more Job Training teachers were primary earners.
### Table 16

**Frequencies and Percentages of Status in Regard to Income by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Status</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Income Earner</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Primary Income Earner</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Chi-Square = \((1, \ n = 335) = 3.92, \ p = .04\)
St. John and Pestle (1992) did not report an income status for the home economics teachers surveyed in Florida. However, they did report income levels. Fifty-five percent of the participants reported an income of $25,000 or less and 49% reported incomes of $50,000 or more.

**Demographic characteristic: Number of Children Living at Home**

The number of children living at home for Work and Family and Job Training teachers is shown in Table 17. From the data, the largest number of children for Work and Family and Job Training teachers was in elementary and high school. Each group of teachers had between one and four children in elementary school and between one and two children in high school. The lowest count for children living at home was in the career category for Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

A t-test was run to determine if differences existed between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on number of children living at home. The results of the t-test revealed no statistically significant differences between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on number of children living at home.

Although nearly a decade later, the findings from this study are similar to those from Martin and Light (1984). They found 54% of the participants had between one and three children living at home. St. John and Pestle (1992) also found 49% of their participants had between one and three children.

**Research Objective 2**

To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly.

**Overall Job Satisfaction**

A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if differences existed between the two groups of teachers on overall job satisfaction. The results in Table 18 showed a statistically significant difference ($F = 6.598$, $p = .010$) between Work and Family and Job Training teachers
Table 17
Frequencies and Percentages of Number of Children Living at Home by Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Work and Family</th>
<th>Job Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College(^d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career(^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means were computed using raw data

\(^a\) t = -.36, p = .72
\(^b\) t = 1.83, p = .07
\(^c\) t = .05, p = .96
\(^d\) t = -.25, p = .81
\(^e\) t = .10, p = .92
Table 18

One-Way Analysis of Variance on Work and Family and Job Training teachers by Overall Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>6.598</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on overall job satisfaction. Job Training teachers had a higher overall mean (the grand mean of the four satisfaction scales) than Work and Family teachers and thereby, they were more satisfied with their jobs than Work and Family teachers. The grand means were 2.96 and 3.06 for Work and Family and Job Training teachers, respectively. These means represented somewhat satisfied overall job satisfaction. Therefore, Work and Family and Job Training teachers are somewhat satisfied with their jobs with Job Training teachers more satisfied with their jobs than Work and Family teachers.

Research Objective 3

To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:

Likelihood of remaining in teaching.

Family background variable: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to school in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.

Demographic variable: educational level, age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, income status, number of children living at home.

Likelihood of remaining in teaching and Job Satisfaction

The likelihood of remaining in teaching variable was coded into two levels. The levels were: those who planned to remain in teaching (normal retirement, early retirement, forced) and those not planning to remain in teaching (leave soon or until something better comes along). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was then used to determine if one’s likelihood of remaining in teaching was related to overall job satisfaction. The analysis in Table 19 showed on separate ANOVAs, likelihood of remaining in teaching was statistically significant for each group of teachers, Work and Family and Job Training. Thus, teachers who planned to remain in teaching were more satisfied than those who planned to leave soon.
## Table 19

Analysis of Variance on Work and Family and Job Training teachers by Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work and Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Job Training**                      |    |     |     |      |      |
| Likelihood of Remaining in Teaching   | 1  | 1.46| 1.46| 13.1 | .000 |
| Error                                 | 123| 13.65| .11 |      |      |
| **Total**                             | 124|     |     |      |      |

*a* 7 missing cases  
*b* 3 missing cases
Family background variable and Job Satisfaction: 
distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up 
in miles, distance between location of current position and where 
teacher went to college, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, 
father’s education, mother’s education

Analysis of variance was used to determine overall job satisfaction 
of Work and Family and Job Training teachers on the family background 
variable (Table 20). The family background factors entered into the 
model were distance in location of current position and where teacher 
grew up in miles, and distance in location of current teaching and where 
teacher went to college, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, 
father’s education, and mother’s education.

For statistical purposes, the nominal level family background 
factors were treated as dummy variables and other factors were ordered. 
Father’s occupation and mother’s occupation were recoded as professional 
and nonprofessional. Father’s education and mother’s education were 
ordered from lowest to highest or elementary school to graduate school. 
Distance in location of current position and where teacher grew up in 
miles, and distance in location of current teaching and where teacher 
grew to college were categorized into 100 mile intervals.

Separate ANOVAs for Work and Family and Job Training were run to 
establish the significance of each factor and the group of factors 
together on job satisfaction.

In terms of Work and Family teachers, two of the six variables 
entered were statistically significant. The significant variables were 
distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up 
in miles (F = 4.57, p = .004) and distance between location of current 
position and where teacher went to college (F = 3.08, p = .03).

Teachers who currently teach and went to college less than 100 miles 
from where they grew up were more satisfied with their jobs.
Table 20

Analysis of Variance on Work and Family and Job Training Teachers by Family Background Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Work and Family&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; n=209</th>
<th>Job Training&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; n=127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Grew Up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 7 missing cases

<sup>b</sup> 8 missing cases
The main effect, the combination of the six family background factors, was significant \((F = 1.63, p = .05)\) for Work and Family teachers. Thus, family background was related to overall job satisfaction.

For Job Training teachers, the analysis did not reveal any statistically significant variables nor was the main effect significant. This analysis indicates that the family background variable does not contribute to the overall job satisfaction of Job Training teachers.

Demographic characteristics and Job Satisfaction:

- Educational level, age, years of teaching experience,
- Ethnic group, marital status, income status,
- Number of children living at home

Table 21 presents analysis of variance and overall job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers on demographic variables. The following demographic factors were entered the model: educational level, age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, income status, and number of children living at home.

In order to run ANOVA, ethnic group and marital status were treated as dummy variables. The coding was as follows: ethnic group, 1 represented minority and 2 represented Caucasian; marital status, 1 represented married and 2 was those not married. As interval variables, age and years of teaching experience were grouped into 5 and 9 year intervals. Changes were not necessary for the remaining factors; there were only two choices for income status, educational level was already ordered, and number of children living at home was a ratio scale.

Of all the factors entered into the model for Work and Family teachers, none was statistically significant. However, the main effect, the seven demographic factors together, was significant \((F = 1.72, p = .04)\). Therefore, demographic characteristics were not related to the job satisfaction of Work and Family teachers separately, but when combined they were related to the satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.
Table 21

**Analysis of Variance on Work and Family and Job Training Teachers by Demographics Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Work and Family&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; n=209</th>
<th>Job Training&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; n=127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children At Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> missing cases 10

<sup>b</sup> missing cases 13
Regarding Job Training teachers, only one factor, marital status was statistically significant ($F = 4.48$, $p = .04$). The teachers who were married were more satisfied with their work than those who were not married. The main effect was not statistically significant for Job Training teachers.

Research Objective 4

To determine which of the following variables predict job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers:

Likelihood of remaining in teaching

Family background variable: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to school in miles, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education.

Demographic variable: educational level, age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, income status, number of children living at home.

**Predictor Variables and Job Satisfaction**

A stepwise multiple regression model was used to determine which variables predict overall job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers (Table 22). A correlation matrix was constructed from the dummy coded and ordered independent variables to reveal factors significant with overall job satisfaction. Significant factors were then entered into the regression model. The significant variables entered into the model for Work and Family teachers were: likelihood of remaining in teaching, distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, income status, ethnic group and years of teaching experience. The significant variables entered into the model for Job Training teachers were: father’s occupation, years of teaching experience, age, marital status, educational level, income status, and distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles.
Table 22

**Stepwise Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Partial R</th>
<th>Model R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Family Teachers n=209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles</td>
<td>.1759</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.0309</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training Teachers n=127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.1042</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning Work and Family teachers, the analysis revealed one significant variable, distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles. This variable accounted for only 3% of the variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction. This is a very small variance but it echoes the high satisfaction with teaching and organizational climate (environment of the school) scales.

The analysis also revealed one significant variable, marital status, for Job Training teachers. This variable accounted for 10% of the variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction. Like Work and Family teachers, Job Training teachers' ratings were high on the satisfaction subscales.

Research Objective 5

To determine sources of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction among Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

To ensure that teachers had an opportunity to fully express themselves, the participants were asked to elaborate further on their satisfaction or dissatisfaction as home economics teachers in Ohio. The results of these qualitative data are reported below as themes. Many concerns were expressed however, a theme was declared only if an item or statement appeared repeatedly in the written data.

Although the teachers wrote extensive comments (see Appendix G), their statements can be synthesized into several major themes. The comments are classified and discussed according to teaching area. There were nine major themes for Work and Family teachers. Those themes are: love of teaching, love for the subject matter, problem students, quantity of paperwork, youth organization Future Homemakers of America (FHA) is time consuming, unfavorable attitude toward initiation of the new curriculum, funding allocated for home economics, inadequate time for the number of class preparations, and lack of concern by administrators for home economics.
The Job Training teachers did not have as many themes as the Work and Family teachers. However, five major themes appeared in their statements. Those themes are: love of teaching area, love of subject matter, quantity of paperwork, time demands for youth organization, Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO), and lack of job security.

Work and Family and Job Training teachers were alike in the enjoyment of teaching as well as love for the subject matter. Both these themes are easily and clearly detected throughout the written data. Work and Family and Job Training teachers repeatedly stated that they enjoyed teaching and loved the variety of subject matter.

The Job Training teachers like the Work and Family teachers claimed the amount of paperwork required in home economics was excessive. According to these teachers, teaching is difficult because of the paper trail they are required to keep. However, the new EMIS (Education Management Information System), a computer system, is becoming helpful in reducing the amount of written reports.

Both groups of teachers experienced problems with students. However, their problems were not similar. Work and Family attributed their problems to a lack of student motivation. They complained that students did not want to learn and subsequently created management (discipline) problems in class. On the other hand, Job Training teachers dealt with special needs students (learning disabled). Job Training teachers were becoming burned out with the number of students who were identified as Special Education in their programs. They felt as if their creativity was stifled and they could not move as rapidly as they desired with Special Education students.

FHA/HERO is the vocational student organization for home economics. It provides opportunities for students to develop leadership and citizenship skills through classroom, home and community activities. HERO activities emphasize preparation for jobs and careers and the balancing of work and family roles. Unfortunately, both groups of
teachers felt that the youth organization took entirely too much time. They also felt that the cost in human effort far outweighed the benefits to both student and teacher.

For Work and Family teachers, there were four factors that did not appear in Job Training teachers' comments. All the factors were related and one connected to the next. The first was the initiation of the new curriculum. Generally, teachers were not in favor of the direction of the new curriculum; however some did feel the new curriculum was moving in the right direction. The resistance to the new curriculum is in keeping with the general phenomenon of educational institutions being regarded as slow to change (Zaltman, Florio & Sikorski, 1977; Epler, 1982).

Within the last 2 years, the State Department of Education in Ohio has developed and is implementing a new curriculum for Work and Family Life program. However, Work and Family teachers perceived the new curriculum as a move from hands on to hands off activities, from skill oriented to value oriented. The students couldn’t participate in lab classes. Therefore, Work and Family teachers were concerned and afraid the new curriculum would result in declining student enrollment.

The decline in student enrollment leads to the next concern for Work and Family teachers; amount of money funded to home economics. Programs are funded based on the number of students. The teachers felt the new curriculum would lead to a decrease in enrollment which would result in a reduction of funding for their programs.

The third factor Work and Family teachers were concerned with was the number of daily preparations. It was not uncommon for one teacher to have five preparations daily. Sometimes they were responsible for other subject areas, and the most common area was science. Work and Family teachers found it hard to plan and prepare adequately for this heavy load of classes.
Work and Family teachers were forced into teaching other areas because of decreased home economics enrollment. There was a perception that principals plan the master schedule so that student enrollment in home economics is reduced. Therefore, the fourth and final issue was lack of concern by administrators for home economics programs. Teachers felt that principals were not interested in home economics and were more interested in academics than in vocational education.

Job Training teachers were concerned about job security. Their jobs are based on the number of students enrolled in the program. In public schools, home economics is an elective and the job training program is an option within the total program. Only interested students select the job training program. The students at joint vocational schools participate in the vocational programs as an extension of the educational opportunities of their home school (feeder school). Therefore, it is possible that some years fewer students chose the vocational education option which would result in a decline in enrollment. The Job Training options are: Early Childhood Education and Care; Clothing and interiors, Production and Services; Food Management and Production; Hospitality and Facility Care Services; and Multi-Area Services. The job training program may be organized as 1 or 2 year programs for juniors and/or seniors. The job training options are characterized by in-school laboratories, field sites, cooperative work experience, or a combination of the three.

The majority of concerns identified from the qualitative data did not parallel those from the focus group interview. However, they did share similarities to findings from Rossman (1982). According to the findings from Rossman's study, teachers declared the following added stress to their jobs: inadequate facilities, after-school work with Future Homemakers of America (FHA) projects, pressure from parents, low faculty morale, declining enrollments, and excessive paperwork.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Job satisfaction is an extensively researched topic. During the last decade, job satisfaction has become a subject of increased interest in the educational arena. However, the job satisfaction of vocational educators and particularly home economics educators remains relatively unexplored. According to some researchers, lack of job satisfaction can lead to absenteeism, low performance, and teacher turnover.

The data used in this correlational study were collected through a mailed questionnaire with Ohio home economics teachers. The major purpose in this study was to describe and compare Work and Family and Job Training teachers on selected variables. A second purpose was to determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differed significantly. Five research objectives guided this study and formed the foundation for reporting the findings.

Population and Sample

The sample in this study was from the population of home economics teachers employed in Ohio during the 1992-93 school year. Work and Family and Job Training teachers were extracted by subject codes from the total list of home economics teachers. This list formed the population frame for this study. A total of 671 Work and Family and 267 Job Training teachers made up the frame. From that frame and based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size table, a simple stratified random sample of 248 Work and Family and 159 Job Training teachers was selected.
Data collection began after introductory letters were sent early in September, 1993. The questionnaire and an incentive followed the introductory letter. A reminder postcard was mailed to 136 nonrespondents and a second questionnaire was sent to 98 nonrespondents. The process resulted in 209 (84%) Work and Family and 127 (80%) Job Training teachers responding to the survey for a total of 336 (83%).

**Instrumentation**

A mailed survey was used to collect data from Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The questionnaire consisted of four sections. Parts I, II, and III were designed to gather information on the vocational characteristic variable-Satisfaction with Teaching, Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics, and Satisfaction with Organizational Climate; School and Co-workers and Principal, respectively. Part IV collected information on the remaining variables in the study-likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics, and demographic characteristics. Permission was granted by three authors (Bentley, Deer, and Culver) to use portions of their instruments in the development of a questionnaire for this study. After the instrument was developed, it was validated by graduate students and faculty members in Home Economics Education at The Ohio State University. Revisions were made according to the panel's review.

A pilot study was conducted to test the final draft with respondents similar to those who participated in the study. Students in Home Economics Education 846, Home Economics Teaching Strategies and Learning Theory, were asked to help establish reliability. Cronbach's Alpha was run. The reliability coefficient on each scale is as follows for Work and Family and Job Training, respectively: Satisfaction with Teaching, .67 and .71; Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics, .58 and .63; Satisfaction with Co-workers, -.0006 and .0014; and Satisfaction with Principals, -.32 and -.30.
**Procedure**

A letter was sent to the 407 possible participants 1 week prior to mailing the questionnaire. The letter notified the teachers of their random selection to participate in a research study exclusively for home economics teachers. It also informed them of the forthcoming questionnaire. A week later, the questionnaire and an incentive were mailed to 407 possible participants. A total of 336 questionnaires was returned by the end of the data collection period.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected were analyzed to address the five research objectives on Work and Family and Job Training home economics teachers. Responses to the questions were summed and reported using traditional descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and measures of central tendency. Chi-Square tests and t-tests were used to compare the two groups of teachers and determine significant differences.

One-way analysis of variance was used to determine if Work and Family and Job Training teachers differed significantly on level of overall job satisfaction. Analysis of variance was used to determine if the level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differed significantly on selected variables. Stepwise multiple regression model was used to predict relationships existing between job satisfaction and selected independent variables for Work and Family and Job Training.

A correlation matrix was built by correlating the dependent variable with the independent variables. The dependent variable was created by averaging the four satisfaction scales. The dependent variable was an interval level measurement scale. Several of the independent variables were nominal and had to be dummy coded in order to build the model. Those variables dummy coded were likelihood of remaining in teaching, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, marital status, and ethnic group. Some independent variables were ordered to
permit meaningful interpretation. Those variables were father’s education, mother’s education, and educational level. Independent variables significantly related to the dependent variable were entered into the regression analysis.

**Findings**

**Research Objective 1**

To determine if Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:

a. Professional characteristics: Satisfaction with teaching, satisfaction with teaching home economics, satisfaction with organizational climate, school and co-workers, principal

b. Likelihood of remaining in teaching

c. Family background characteristics: distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college in miles, income status, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, mother’s education

d. Demographic characteristics: age, teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, gender, number of children living at home, educational level

Work and Family teachers were somewhat satisfied with teaching (M = 3.3) and Job Training teachers were very satisfied with teaching (M = 3.5). When a t-test was used, the results showed a statistically significant difference (p = .03) on Satisfaction with Teaching between Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

Both Work and Family and Job Training teachers were somewhat satisfied (M = 2.7 and 2.8, respectively) on the Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics scale. A t-test revealed no statistically significant difference on Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics between Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

Somewhat satisfied is the rating for Work and Family and Job Training teachers on the Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers scale. Those means were (M = 2.7 and 2.6) for Work and Family and Job Training, respectively. However, the results of a t-test showed a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers
on Satisfaction with School and Co-Workers. A tenth of a point
difference was statistically significant; however, no practical
significance is evident.

A mean of 2.8 was attained for both groups of teachers on the
Satisfaction with Principal scale. This mean represents a rating of
somewhat satisfied. When a t-test was applied, the results showed no
statistically significant difference on Satisfaction with Principal
between Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

In terms of likelihood of remaining in teaching, the majority (61%)
of teachers in both teaching areas were interested in remaining in
teaching until normal retirement. A Chi-Square showed no statistically
significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers
on likelihood of remaining in teaching.

On distance between location of current position and where teacher
grew up in miles, Work and Family teachers traveled an average of 125
miles and Job Training teachers traveled 172 miles. The performance of
a t-test revealed no statistically significant difference between the
two groups of teachers on distance between location of current position
and where teacher grew up in miles. As for distance traveled to attend
college, Work and Family traveled an average of 150 miles and Job
Training traveled 194 miles. The use of a t-test revealed no
statistically significant difference between the two groups of teachers
on miles traveled to attend college.

The participants' fathers were well represented in the various
occupations. Between 19 and 23% of the respondents in each teaching
area were in nonteaching professional, skilled worker, and semiskilled
worker categories. Yet, the highest percentage for Work and Family was
self-employed with 28%. Chi-Square analysis showed no statistically
significant difference between the two groups of teachers on father's
occupation.
For mother's occupation, approximately one-third of the mothers were unemployed for both groups of teachers. Another third were in the top three occupations; K-12 teacher, nonteaching professional, and skilled workers. A Chi-Square test reflected no significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on mothers' occupation.

Almost half of the fathers were high school completers. There were 47% and 43% for Work and Family and Job Training, respectively that had completed high school. Only 11% and 12% had completed college. The results of Chi-Square indicated no statistically significant difference among Work and Family and Job Training teachers on fathers' education.

Slightly more than half, 51%, of both Work and Family and Job Training teachers' mothers had completed high school. A relatively small percentage of mothers, 15% and 12%, had college degrees, Work and Family and Job Training, respectively. Chi-Square test revealed no significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on mothers’ education.

Clearly, most of the teachers in this study were over the age of 30 and below age 50. Forty-three percent of Work and Family teachers and 53% of Job Training teachers were in the 40 to 49 year old group. The second highest frequency count occurred in the 30-39 years of age category for Work and Family and Job Training teachers. The former group’s total was 29% and the latter group’s was 19%. The lowest percentage was in the 21-29 year old group. A t-test was performed on the raw data and statistical significance was not indicated between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on age.

The majority of respondents in both teaching groups were married. Eighty percent of Work and Family teachers and 70% of Job Training teachers were married. For Work and Family, 10% were never married and 17% of Job Training were divorced. Results of a Chi-Square test
reflected no statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on marital status.

In terms of the highest educational level obtained, over half, 53% of Work and Family teachers had a bachelor’s degree and 36% had a master’s. The percentage for Job Training was 47 when bachelor’s was coupled with associate degree. Twenty-six percent of Job Training teachers had a master’s. When a Chi-Square test was performed, a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on educational level was achieved. Work and Family teachers could claim a higher educational level than Job Training teachers.

Overwhelmingly, both groups of teachers were co-primary earners as might be expected since the majority (80% and 70%) are married. Seventy-one percent of Work and Family and 61% of Job Training teachers were co-primary earners. Chi-Square was applied and showed no statistical significance.

Slightly more than half of Work and Family teachers and half of the Job Training teachers had between 8 and 20 years of teaching experience. Thirty-three percent and 26% of Work and Family and Job Training teachers, respectively had between 15 and 20 years of teaching experience. The second highest count was 8–14 years of teaching experience (25% and 24%). The lowest count for Work and Family was 1–3 years of teaching experience and 26 and above years for Job Training. When raw data were used, the average years of teaching experience for Work and Family teachers was 15.96, and 13.68 for Job Training. Therefore, Job Training teachers had slightly less teaching experience than Work and Family teachers. A t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on years of teaching experience.

On ethnic group, 94% of the sample was Caucasian, 2% African-American, and a fraction from other ethnic backgrounds for Work and
Family teachers. Job Training's ethnic make-up was 84% Caucasian, 12% African-American and 2% other ethnic groups. Chi-Square reflected a statistically significant difference between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on ethnic group. More Work and Family teachers are Caucasian than Job Training teachers.

The greatest number of children living at home for Work and Family and Job Training teachers was in elementary and high school. The majority of the participants had one or two children in elementary or high school. The performance of a t-test showed no statistical significance between teachers on number of children living at home in preschool, elementary school, high school, college, or with a career.

**Research Objective 2**

To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly.

With respect to overall job satisfaction, Job Training teachers were more satisfied with their jobs than Work and Family teachers. A one-way analysis of variance revealed a statistically significant relationship ($F = 6.598$, $p = .010$) between Work and Family and Job Training teachers on overall job satisfaction.

**Research Objective 3**

To determine if level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers differ significantly on the following variables:

a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching

b. Family background variables: father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, miles grew up, miles went to college, income status.

c. Demographic variables: age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, gender, number of children living at home, and educational level

ANOVA was run for overall job satisfaction by likelihood of remaining in teaching, both Work and Family and Job Training teachers achieved significance. The teachers who planned to remain in teaching
had higher job satisfaction than those who planned to leave teaching soon.

In terms of overall job satisfaction by family background, only two factors were significant for Work and Family teachers. Distance between current position and where teacher grew up in miles, and distance between current position and where teacher went to college were significant. Teachers who worked closer to home or attended school closer to home were more satisfied in their jobs. However, the same did not hold true for Job Training teachers. None of the factors was significant with overall job satisfaction for Job Training teachers. The main effect, the combination of six family background factors (distance in location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, and distance in location of current teaching and where teacher went to college, father’s occupation, mother’s occupation, father’s education, and mother’s education), was significant for Work and Family teachers. Job Training teachers could not claim significance for the main effect. Thus, family background traits were factors associated with overall job satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.

On overall job satisfaction by demographic traits, one factor was significant for Work and Family teachers, number of children living at home. Those teachers with children were more satisfied with their jobs. For Job Training, only marital status was significant. Teachers who were married were more satisfied. The main effect was significant for Work and Family teachers. However, the main effect was not significant for Job Training teachers. Thus, demographic traits were related to the overall job satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.

Research Objective 4

To determine which variables predict job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers;

a. Likelihood of remaining in teaching

b. Family background variables: father’s education, mother’s education, father’s occupation, mother’s
occupation, miles grew up, miles went to college, income status.

c. Demographic variables: age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, gender, number of children living at home, and educational level

Only one variable predicted job satisfaction for each group of teachers. Distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles accounted for 3% of the variance in job satisfaction for Work and Family teachers. For Job Training teachers, marital status accounted for 10% of the variance in overall job satisfaction.

**Research Objective 5**

To determine sources of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction among Work and Family and Job Training teachers.

The qualitative data revealed several themes. Work and Family and Job Training teachers had five themes. Work and Family had an additional four themes whereas, Job Training had only one. The themes in common seem to be generic to home economics teaching. On the other hand, the additional themes were specific to the teaching area. Both Work and Family and Job Training teachers expressed the following concerns: love for teaching, endearment to the subject matter, quantity of paperwork, and consumption of time by the youth organization (FHA/HERO).

The concerns expressed by Work and Family teachers only were: unfavorable attitude toward initiation of the new curriculum, inadequate time for the number of class preparations, funding allocated for home economics, and lack of concern by administrators for home economics. The one concern expressed by Job Training teachers only was lack of job security.

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions are derived for Work and Family and Job Training teachers in Ohio. Work and
Family and Job Training teachers are similar with respect to their level of Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics and Satisfaction with Principal. However, they are significantly different on Satisfaction with Teaching and Satisfaction with School and Co-workers. Job Training teachers had higher means than Work and Family teachers, and therefore are more satisfied with teaching and more satisfied with school and co-workers.

Work and Family and Job Training teachers are alike on likelihood of remaining in teaching, family background characteristics and three demographic factors (age, marital status, and number of children living at home). They are, indeed, different in terms of the following demographic factors:

1. Educational level of Work and Family teachers is higher than that of Job Training teachers.
2. Although many Job Training teachers are co-primary earners, more Work and Family teachers are co-primary income earners than the former group.
3. Both groups of teachers are well experienced; however Work and Family teachers have more experience teaching than Job Training teachers.
4. A greater percentage of Work and Family teachers is Caucasian as compared to Job Training teachers.

With respect to overall job satisfaction, Job Training teachers are more satisfied than Work and Family teachers. Work and Family and Job Training teachers are similar on likelihood of remaining in teaching. However, they are different on the following family background and demographic factors:

1. Distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles is related to job satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.
2. Distance between location of current position and where teacher went to college is related to job satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.
3. The main effect, the six family background factors (distance in location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles, and distance in location of current teaching and where teacher went to college, father's occupation, mother's occupation, father's education, and mother's education) contribute to overall satisfaction of Work and Family teachers.

4. For Job Training teachers ethnic group is related to level of job satisfaction.

5. The main effect, the seven demographic factors, contributes to the overall satisfaction for Work and Family teachers. The factors which make up the demographic characteristics variable are: educational level, age, years of teaching experience, ethnic group, marital status, income status, and number of children living at home.

6. Distance between location of current position and where teacher grew up in miles is a predictor of job satisfaction for Work and Family teachers.

7. Marital status is a predictor of job satisfaction for Job Training teachers.

Holland's (1973) Vocational Choice Theory is reflected in the conclusions from this study. According to Holland, in order to achieve job satisfaction there is a match between personality and environment. Apparently, a match was achieved for both Work and Family and Job Training teachers; they are somewhat satisfied with their jobs. Of the six personality types, Holland characterized teachers as social type. Therefore, teachers are expected to see themselves as friendly, social, and possess social competencies such as helping others. This description for social personality type was easily detected in the ratings on the Satisfaction with Teaching and Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics scales, somewhat satisfied. Teachers' written comments also echo the same sentiments.
Additionally, the theory claims that members of a vocation have similar histories of personal development. The teachers in this study share similarities on all six of the family background characteristics and three of the seven demographic characteristics.

The theory also maintains that members of a profession will respond similarly to many situations and problems. Work and Family teachers exhibited this principle by reacting strongly to the implementation of the new Work and Family Life curriculum. On the other hand, both groups of teachers shared the same feelings toward the youth organization, FHA/HERO; too time consuming.

The statements in the preceding paragraphs verified Holland’s (1973) theory. However, some findings from this study could also imply an extension of his theory. The writer postulates that an individual may be classified as a particular personality type, but not exhibit that characteristics as determined by a measurement. The writer further theorizes that the rating may be affected by factors and forces which influence the chosen occupation at the time of the measurement. A typical example is home economics teachers and their resistance to the new curriculum. Although teachers’ written statements reflect satisfaction, the satisfaction rating on the curriculum and youth organization items tend to lower the overall rating on the Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics scale.

Implications

The findings in this research have implications for those who work with Work and Family and Job Training teachers, namely; school administrators, state staff, and teacher education departments.

For school administrators, data clearly indicate that home economics teachers are satisfied with teaching as a profession and enjoy the subject matter. However, they are not satisfied with the emphasis placed on home economics. They reportedly are overloaded with extra
responsibilities and paperwork. Efforts could be made to reduce or minimize some of the paperwork and responsibilities. For example, new technology makes it possible for some paperwork to be computerized. The EMIS (Education Management Information System) should expedite the performance of paperwork.

The review of the literature indicates that administrators are key figures in teacher job satisfaction. Thus, school administrators should make every effort to be knowledgeable about the home economics programs. Home economics teachers could make efforts to inform school administrators about their programs. Such information can be gained through home economics related activities—FHA and vocational education week. With the knowledge that school administrators are key to a teacher’s job satisfaction, these administrators should be involved in activities that enhance ultimate relations with their teachers.

For state staff who govern the curriculum and the youth organization, the findings in this study suggest that home economics teachers are not pleased with the new Work and Family Life curriculum. The new curriculum in Ohio can be classified as an innovation. According to one author, seven years is generally the time it takes from innovation to implementation. This study was conducted on the eve of the first set of core materials; teachers had just began to use the new curriculum. It is obvious from teachers’ comments that they need help in adjusting to the new curriculum. Rogers and Adhikarva (1979), took the concept of innovation and developed it into a process. Their model of change process could be utilized to help teachers adequately adapt to the new curriculum. According to Rogers and Adhikarva model, individual go through 5 general stages: agenda-setting, matching, redefining, structuring, and interconnecting. The state staff could identify where the new curriculum is in this process and take measures to ensure its full implementation.
Additionally, armed with the knowledge concerning the new curriculum, attempts should be made to include teachers in the decision making process. State staff who plan the curriculum and teachers who implement the curriculum should compromise on the direction of the new curriculum. The state staff could host an inservice to handle and address teacher concerns. In this inservice, state staff and teachers could work to help make the new curriculum hands on. Through such an inservice, successful teachers could be identified who could teach and/or aid other teachers. Although teachers are satisfied with teaching home economics, their continued displeasure over the curriculum might change that rating.

In regards to FHA/HERO, an evaluation of the events to determine its benefits to students and home economics programs is warranted. The results could be viewed in relation to the teacher’s total program and responsibilities. Decisions should be made according to the results of the evaluation.

As the findings indicate, working with special needs students was a widespread concern among home economics teachers. According to Adelman and Taylor (1983), the number of individuals diagnosed as special needs has increased dramatically. Currently, 4 to 7% of the school-aged population is served in a special education program and that percent is expected to increase (Adelman & Taylor, 1983). Therefore, this issue should become a larger focus in the preservice education of teachers. During undergraduate education, preservice teachers could learn to work with special needs students. Students considering home economics education as a major should be aware of the possibility of working with special needs students. Students should be armed with this information and it should become part of their decision making process. As for inservice teachers who work with special needs students, characteristics and problems of these students could become the focus of workshops and
special courses. These are direct implications for home economics teacher education programs.

Findings also indicate that Work and Family and Job Training teachers are more alike than different on family background and demographic characteristics. This is an indication to teacher education departments on the calibre of students, preservice teachers, that will enter their departments.

Teacher education departments can also utilize the findings to address the problem of teacher shortage. Those aspects of the job that satisfy teachers can be used to recruit preservice teachers as well as inservice teachers. Efforts could be made to alleviate the job dissatisfiers through the undergraduate education program and inservice workshops. If dissatisfiers are not eliminated or made bearable and dissatisfaction continues, soon it will spill over to students. Without any effort, teachers who are not satisfied will nonverbally communicate it to students. This will not help to increase enrollment in home economics teacher education and, thereby add to the shortage of teachers.

Overall, the findings of this study indicate that the participants were ambivalent about their jobs. They received good feelings as teachers, but they also experienced frustration and displeasure from the curriculum, the youth organization, the school administrators, extra responsibilities, and problem students. As educators, there is still much to be learned about teacher job satisfaction.

Recommendations

After findings were compiled and conclusions drawn, some recommendations can be made for further study.

This study should be conducted with home economics teachers in other states after minor revisions are made in the instrument. The short form of Deer "Perception of School and Co-workers and Perception
of Principal" should be replaced with the long form. The short form contained eight items, whereas the long form consisted of 27 and 28. Low reliability was achieved on both scales of the short form. Deer factor analysis to reduce the number of items. Thus, the eight items were not repetitive rather broad in scope. However, low reliability may be overcome if the long form was used.

Conduct a longitudinal study to examine the degree of job satisfaction over time. This recommendation is a way to determine whether attitudes towards the implementation of the new curriculum have changed.

Part II of this questionnaire "Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics" should be re-administered to measure change in attitudes on certain aspects. The specific aspects are curriculum and youth organization. After evaluations and revisions are made, the researcher feels a second measure is appropriate. By the time the second measure is taken, teachers may have moved into a different stage of Rogers and Adhikarva (1979) model of innovation to change process.

Compare the Satisfaction with Teaching ratings of teachers by varying years of teaching experience. Those who just graduated from preservice programs should also be included. This measure would determine whether teachers who have taught longer enjoy higher levels of job satisfaction.

Several factors emerged from qualitative data. Therefore, an instrument could be developed to measure concerns emerging from qualitative data and administer instrument periodically in the future to determine what happens to level of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction over time on the identified factors.
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LETTERS OF CONSENT TO USE INSTRUMENTS
2741 N. Salisbury St. 3212  
West Lafayette IN 47906

July 22, 1992

Bettye P Smith  
347 Campbell Hall  
1787 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210-1295

Dear Bettye,

From your letter, I assume that you already have a set of PTO material from which to get the materials needed for your research.

Yes, you have my permission to use the "Satisfaction With Teaching Position" from the PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE in your research.

Sincerely,

Ralph R. Bentley
6 August 1992

Ms Bettye P Smith
347 Campbell Hall
1787 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1295
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dear Ms Smith,

In response to your request to use the coworkers and principal scales for your research. I am delighted you are able to use them and give you my permission to do so. I would be pleased to receive a copy of your results.

I do not know of the article by Steven Culver to which you refer but I would like a copy if that is possible.

Best wishes for your research project.

Yours sincerely,

Christine E Deer
Professor and Head, School of Teacher Education

UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
SYDNEY

Kuring-gai Campus
Eton Road
Lindfield NSW 2070
Australia

Postal address
PO Box 222
Lindfield NSW 2070
Australia

Tel (02) 413 8200
Fax (02) 416 7174

Corporate address  15-73 Broadway Broadway NSW 2007 Australia
Postal address  PO Box 123 Broadway NSW 2007 Australia
Tel (02) 330 1990 Fax (02) 330 1551
Radford University
Radford, Virginia 24142
(703) 831-5819
TDD (703) 831-5128

Director, Student Assessment Programs

July 9, 1992

Bettye P. Smith
347 Campbell Hall
1787 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1295

Bettye:

Enclosed is a copy of the survey we sent to early-career teachers. As indicated in the AERJ article (to which I think you are referring), the first 20 questions come from one of the subscales on the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. The next 16 items come from an article by Deer in 1980 (cited in the paper). The rest of the survey is pure invention on our part and you’re certainly free to use as much of it as you can.

I’d be happy to answer any other questions you may have or to review the instrument you come up with. satisfying research experience.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Culver
Director, Student Assessment
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INITIAL LETTER
September 3, 1993

1- 2-
3-
4-
5-

Dear Ms. 2-,

Welcome to the 1993-94 school year! We hope you had a relaxed and enjoyable summer and are looking forward to a good year.

You have been selected on a random basis to participate in a research study. This study exclusively focuses on home economics teachers and pertains to your job satisfaction.

The purpose in this study is to determine and compare the level of job satisfaction of Work and Family and Job Training teachers. This study grew out of current issues, concerns, and problems faced by home economics educators.

In less than a week we will mail you the study questionnaire. Please help us with your candid and immediate responses.

Thank you in advance for your input and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bettye P. Smith
Ph.D. Candidate

Joan E. Gritzmacher, Ph.D.
Professor and Advisor
APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER
September 10, 1993

1-
2-
3-
4-
5-

Dear Ms. 2-,

Approximately a week ago you received a letter informing you of your selection to participate in a study of home economics teachers. Please help us by responding to the enclosed questionnaire and returning it in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

The questionnaire contains information on your satisfaction with teaching, your school and co-workers, administrators and home economics related factors. This research is an attempt to fill the current void of information pertaining to the job satisfaction of home economics teachers. Completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes.

Your responses will be treated with complete confidentiality. The number on the questionnaire is for the purpose of the researcher following-up on participants who do not respond. The results of this study will be made available through a summary report. Please indicate if you wish a copy of the summary by checking the appropriate box on the questionnaire.

Please return your completed questionnaire by September 24, 1993. If you have any questions, feel free to call me at 318/352-1748. You may call that number at any time of the day or night.

Thank you for helping. Enclosed is a special thank you.

Sincerely,

Bettye P. Smith
Ph.D. Candidate

Joan E. Gritzmacher, Ph.D.
Professor and Advisor
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE
Job Satisfaction

Home Economics Teachers

The Ohio State University
Survey of Work and Family and Job Training Teachers

Part I-Satisfaction With Teaching

Directions: This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your satisfaction about your work as a teacher. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly. Please circle the letters to indicate your answer to each of the statements.

D = DISAGREE
TD = TEND TO DISAGREE
TA = TEND TO AGREE
A = AGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Circle One)</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Teaching gives me a great deal of satisfaction.       D   TD   TA   A
2. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society. D   TD   TA   A
3. I love to teach.                                       D   TD   TA   A
4. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching. D   TD   TA   A
5. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability. D   TD   TA   A
6. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching. D   TD   TA   A
7. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding. D   TD   TA   A
8. I feel that I am an important part of this school system. D   TD   TA   A
### Part II: Satisfaction with Teaching Home Economics

The next items are concerned with home economics job-related factors. Please circle the letters indicating your satisfaction with each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel successful and competent in my present position.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The &quot;stress and strain&quot; resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Most of the actions of students irritate me.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My students appreciate the help I give them with their school work.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I really enjoy working with my students.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I have sufficient time to shop for groceries, supplies, and equipment for lab classes (food, clothing, art, etc.).</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I am comfortable with the flexibility of my students' involvement in lab classes and/or on field trips.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I like providing services to my school for special occasions (e.g., open house, etc.).</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I find myself defending my subject matter to others (co-workers, principal, parents, community people).</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I feel the image of home economics held by others is positive.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am happy with the number of vocational forms I need to complete during the school year.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am not opposed to making home visits at the end during the school year.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am in favor of the curricular changes in the state.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I like the variety of subjects to teach.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I like working with my FFA or FIMO chapter.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the enrollment in my classes and/or department.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am willing to encourage students to enter college and major in home economics teacher education.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III: Organizational Climate

The next items deal with your perceptions about your school, your principal, and the people with whom you work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

School and Co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO DISAGREE</th>
<th>TEND TO AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. The school is proud of its school.

34. The morale of the staff at our school is high.

35. Teachers of certain subjects do not mix freely with other members of the staff.

36. Teachers get together in small select groups.

37. School equipment is inadequate to meet demands.

38. There is no real problem if additional materials and books are required.

39. We are continually trying new ways of contact with parents.

40. Teachers in this school have regular contact with teachers of their subject in other schools.

41. Our principal encourages teachers to contribute suggestions to the running of the school.

42. Our principal discourages teachers who want to try out new ideas.

43. Our principal sees all school problems from one point of view.

44. Our principal sets a good example by working hard.

45. Our principal never attempts to deal with a problem until circumstances force him/her to take action.

46. Our principal takes pains to deal with problems at the earliest possible stage.

47. Our principal helps teachers to solve their personal problems.

48. Our principal develops a real interest in our welfare.
Part IV

A. Likelihood of Remaining in the Teaching Profession

The question below reflect one's likelihood of remaining in teaching. Indicate which best describes your feeling.

48. How long are you likely to remain in teaching? (Choose one)

   a. UNTIL ELIGIBLE FOR EARLY RETIREMENT
   b. UNTIL NORMAL RETIREMENT
   c. UNTIL FORCED TO RETIRE DUE TO AGE
   d. WILL PROBABLY CONTINUE UNTIL SOMETHING BETTER COMES ALONG
   e. DEFINITELY PLAN TO LEAVE TEACHING AS SOON AS I CAN

B. Family Background

The following questions deal with your family and your family background.

50. Approximately how many miles from where you are now teaching did you:
   a. GROW UP?_________(MILES)
   b. GO TO COLLEGE FOR BACHELOR'S DEGREE?_________(MILES)

51. In terms of earning an income in your household, what is your status? (Check one)

   PRIMARY INCOME EARNER
   CO-PRIMARY INCOME EARNER

52. What categories below best describe your mother's and your father's principal occupations while you were growing up?

   (Circle number of one choice in each column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. What is the highest level of education that each of your parents has completed?

   (Circle number of one choice in each column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. About Yourself

54. Educational level (Circle one)
1 ASSOCIATE DEGREE
2 BACHELORS
3 MASTER'S
4 PLUS 30
5 PH.D./ED.D

55. Years of teaching experience_________YEARS

56. Teaching area (Circle number)
1 CONSUMER HOMEMAKING/WORK and FAMILY
2 JOB TRAINING HOME ECONOMICS
   _______ EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE
   _______ CLOTHING AND INTERIORS, PRODUCTION & SERVICES
   _______ FOOD MANAGEMENT & PRODUCTION
   _______ HOSPITALITY AND FACILITY CARE SERVICES
   _______ MULTI-AREA SERVICES

57. Present age:_________YEARS

58. Ethnic group (Circle number)
1 AFRICAN-AMERICAN
2 ASIAN-AMERICAN
3 CAUCASIAN
4 HISPANIC
5 NATIVE AMERICAN

59. Present marital status (Circle number)
1 NEVER MARRIED
2 MARRIED
3 DIVORCED
4 SEPARATED
5 WIDOWED

60. Gender (Circle number)
1 FEMALE
2 MALE

61. Number of children living at home.
   _______ NONE
   _______ PRESCHOOL
   _______ IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (K-8)
   _______ IN HIGH SCHOOL (9-12)
   _______ IN COLLEGE
   _______ OUT OF SCHOOL WITH CAREER

Please use this space and the next page if needed to further elaborate on your satisfaction as a home economics teacher. Your comments will be appreciated. Thank you for your contribution to this project.

Comments:

Would you like to receive a copy of the summary report of this study? Yes _____ No _____
APPENDIX F

REMINDER POSTCARD
September 28, 1993

From: Bettye P. Smith and Joan E. Gritzmacher, Ph.D

To: 1-2-

RE: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Last week we sent you a questionnaire seeking information about your job satisfaction. If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not completed the questionnaire, please do so today.

Your input is very important to this project and will be greatly appreciated. If you have questions, please call me at 318/352-1748. Thank you!
October 18, 1993

Dear Ms. [Name],

About three weeks ago we solicited your help to determine the job satisfaction of home economics teachers in Ohio. As of today we have not received your completed questionnaire.

This study was undertaken as an attempt to fill the current void of information pertaining to home economics teachers’ job satisfaction. Little is known about what home economics teachers find satisfying in their work.

Please help us by completing and mailing your responses. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. If you have already completed the questionnaire, thank you and please disregard this request.

Your cooperation and help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bettye P. Smith  
Ph.D. Candidate

Joan E. Gritzacher, Ph.D.  
Professor and Advisor
APPENDIX H

TEACHER COMMENTS
Teacher Comments for the following statement:

Please use this space and the next page if needed to further elaborate on your satisfaction as a home economics teacher.

**Work and Family Life Teachers**

I am enjoying the vitality of teaching home economics.

I liked teaching my subject but always felt I was an underdog. I guess this made me try harder to be a good teacher. I see students I have had real often and have had many rewards seeing that they are successful. I do feel that often times the state supervisors do not keep up with the many things good and active departments accomplish. In Ohio a teacher can teach 30 years and never be recognized for anything unless they make application and validate their own accomplishments. Who knows what's going on in the state??

I deeply feel that our profession is a needed one, however the upper administration mainly feels that we should do away with it. This attitude is coming from male, catholic, aged 50-65 years old whose wives are supposed to stay home and take care of them. This attitude is very common in our area.

I am the sole home economics teacher and am having problems coping with the 5 preparations plus PHA/HERO in grades 8-12 not to mention the added stress of the new curriculum.

I am not happy with being forced to teach the new Work and Family Life curriculum. I feel that in a few years we will return back to the basics. Students enjoy and need to learn the skill areas. Our enrollment has suffered since we no longer teach hand on skills. I have not found one home economics teacher who is happy about the changes. School systems are only adopting these programs because they need the state funding.

One area where Work and Family Life teachers feel is of concern is the stability of our jobs in relation to enrollment and tracking. We hear rumors that we will no longer be employed by local schools or that students will only be tracked academically or vocationally without any room for home economics.

I enjoy teaching home economics very much. Working with young teenage students is a great pleasure for me. They need someone to listen to them and help them cope with their problems. I am one of them.

With new EMIS system we have no vocational forms to fell out. I am not happy with direction of new curriculum in home economics. Other academic areas are going to hands on, why are we going the other way? Neighboring states are moving to more hands on in home economics.

Since I am certified to teach Biology and General Science, I have been required to teach in that area in addition to home economics. I am suspicious that schedule is deliberately manipulated to decrease home economics enrollment in order that I am free to pick up an overload in science. I am currently teaching 3 classes in home economics along with college prep Biology and 9th grade Life Science. Five courses of this nature require an extremely large amount of time for class preparation and evaluation. My days are averaging 10 hours at work not including home visits.
In home economics there is presently no continuity in names—we have Work and Family, Impact, Home Economics and Human Ecology. That confuses a lot of outside people. Many vocational forms are ridiculous and not set up so that they are easily workable documents.

I also feel that the new curriculum that is being phased in will drive many students away from home economics.

My major complaints about teaching: students that don’t want to be here and learn; large classes, 20 to 25 in a lab class is too many, I can’t do a good job for that many; and school starts too early. I would prefer the 9-5 hours of business.

I find teaching home economics a very satisfying profession. I, like most teachers, find that my satisfaction for teaching is the students. My dissatisfaction comes from our school administrators that are more concerned about their careers than whether a student learns. It comes from a State Department that doesn’t meet my students needs. An example that I could give you concerns FHA/HERO. In the skill events there are many events for the vocational HERO chapters. The Work and Family chapters find their events cut and not replaced. These chapters never had the number of events that the HERO chapters had to begin with. Considering the Work and Family chapters make up more than 50% of the memberships something should be done to allow them to participate. This is just one example.

Overall I have enjoyed my teaching career. I especially enjoy working with the students in a lab situation where they have hands on experiences. Some of my students are not good with book work etc. and the lab experience gives them a feeling of accomplishment and improves their self esteem. As of now, our students are enrolled in a year long home economics course where they receive all 6 areas of home economics. With the new curriculum they could end up in only 1 semester and perhaps only learn Foods. I feel our program we have now prepares these students much better for life than taking what they want in the new curriculum. Our enrollment is over 50% males and I know when they get to pick and choose semester classes, they will choose the food classes. Now, they are exposed to Parenting skills, Consumer Education, Clothing and Textiles, Personal Development, Housing, and Foods. Doesn’t this make much more sense? I cannot understand the reasoning for the new curriculum.

I love my job! I just hope it is around in 10 years. I am concerned with all the restructuring of high schools, our profession may be lost.

I have always been happy with the wide variety of topics we taught in home economics and the ever changing information we had to offer students. The new state curriculum has little to do with traditional home economics. It should be called Social Adjustment and be taught by people with counseling degrees. Don’t misunderstand—I know that the job the State Department is trying to save is mine—but I hate the new Personal Development and Resource Management units. It is impossible to interest 13-14 year old in these concepts. And I don’t expect the other units to be any better when they are completed. Given a choice, in high school, would you have willingly signed up for these courses? NOT!

I very much enjoy interaction with the students in my classes. I am thrilled when they are successful and accomplish goals that they have set. I am disappointed with the emphasis on FHA/HERO and the time it has taken the State Department to make changes that we have addressed in our programs years earlier. Home visits and student organizations are a thing of the past for high school students. They are working, no one is
at home and it isn't safe for a woman to do these visits. We made changes 8 years ago with regard to decision making and this changing family structure. I see the function of the home economist becoming a consultant with aide to other programs in the school which requires life skills and too much younger children who have greater home and personal responsibilities.

The new curriculum is moving far far away from the necessary skills for homemaking. I feel that what I trained for in college is no longer valued in this curriculum. I feel more like a guidance counselor. My class enrollment suffers year after year because hands on experiences are what students learn from best and expect in the home economics department, but are not getting.

I'm really disturbed with the new curriculum. It's so sad to see so much stress on these students in today's society! I can't believe how our profession is eliminating one to sew, cook, the house, the playschool! Where also are they going to get these skills!! You can't tell me they are getting it at home! They are not! I wish you ladies would take time to do an observation of every teacher you sent this to and get a more thorough feeling of what may happen to our home economics profession before it is too late. Greatly depressed! Keep me on your list for further questionnaires.

My parents and family had a lot of influence on my career choice. I also chose home economics because I wanted a career where I could help people. My biggest disappointment is the constant battle with the image of home economics as a dumping ground, fluff, or unimportant. After teaching 9 years people still question if I had to earn a college degree!! I have been "riffed" 4 times in my career. I have had to be flexible and willing to relocate to keep a job.

I enjoy teaching home economics and I believe it is an important part of the school curriculum. Unfortunately, our present administration does not agree completely with this. In fact, they have pointed at the possibility of phasing out our programs. I think the community will support us and support keeping the home economics program. State mandated changes make the future uncertain for vocational home economics in high schools. We are feeling the pressure in this rural county to conform to state standards. Although I am not resisting the change, I worry about future course offerings, etc. affecting my position.

Getting very discouraged with the increase in paperwork and new minimum numbers required for funding considering that we are a small school.

I love teaching and the variety of subjects I cover. Most of my frustration as a teacher comes from the constant changes in rules and curriculum at the state level. These changes take place all too often. As an example, three years ago our district wrote a new home economics curriculum (2 teachers). We got help from the State Department (a supervisor). She told us we were going in the right direction with our curriculum and plans. The day our curriculum was approved by our Board of Education we got a letter from the state department telling us of the new curriculum we were to start work on. A whole summer's work down the drain. Can't something be done about these constant changes?

I love teaching! For 21 years our high school building has had 3 full time home economics teachers. Since one retired last summer, our principal decided to make our department a 2 teacher department even though our enrollment doubled. He is pushing academic curriculum and is trying to do away with vocational. We dropped all 3 vocational units
this fall! I am trying to keep a positive attitude but it is very hard working under strained conditions with a narrow minded principal.

I feel we must be a real inspiration for our young people and be an excellent role model.

State Department needs to meet with presently working Work and Family Life teachers not only hear but listen to our concerns. We are the ones working with children everyday—not sitting in an office. They need to get realistic!! Get off the bandwagon of idealism and into the world of realism.

Being a teacher would be more satisfied if we were recognized as professionals and had more control over curriculum choice!

I enjoy teaching home economics; the variety and the closeness I get to the students I have. It is a very people-oriented field which led me into school counseling as a masters program. If I have an opportunity to pursue that as a career, I will, but I attribute home economics to my interest in helping students on a different level. I would miss the close contact with students the networking with other home economists and the professionalism our field has. I would not miss grocery shopping, lab equipment care, and the fight to constantly change our image.

I love my job. I look forward to starting each new school year and even getting up each day. My students are good kids who show respect and I have parental support. I’m sure my answer would be very different if I was teaching in an inner city school or even a different community. Administration is supportive of our program and teachers are helped with discipline problems in class.

I find it very difficult to recommend home economics as a teaching profession. The students see how much work I put in on my teaching and FHA/HERO, and they say there’s no way I would want to have all that responsibility! I really feel that it’s because of all the work that’s involved that we now have a shortage of home economics teachers. Also there are so many other career opportunities now available to women!

We are now academic and I don’t care for my overwhelming numbers: 186

We have a new principal at our school whose goals seem to be to further himself. He makes many decisions that do not include teacher input or department chairperson input. He has made good changes in our school. He expects lots of extra time and work from us. The principal is not a people person and lacks social skills. Our school and school system is large and sometimes unpersonal. We also lack a good superintendent. It’s difficult to work with people in leadership positions who are inexperienced and unable to handle our size school and school system. Because of the size of our school, the staff has a hard time being close and supportive. Our department is divided in 3 buildings. This presents communication problems.

The profession is rapidly changing. Some of the changes are not in the best interest of students or students’ interests. Therefore, enrollment is suffering and districts are closing entire departments! Home economics teachers jobs are at risk and the insecurity of our future is at stake.

I really like the new Work and Family Life curriculum. Single period class offerings have attracted more college bound students to our classes. With a more heterogeneous mixture, achievement seems to be
high so far. Enrollment is up, too. Our department is getting stronger and I regret that I am close to retirement!

I feel the students were more satisfied with more labs. Students are constantly asking when they will get to make something. I try to work these into IEE's and FHA but it is a constant struggle—especially 9th graders who can't see how some of the Work and Family things we do will relate to them later on.

I think the new curriculum will help get home economics teachers away from cooking and sewing and perhaps improve the image of home economics, but I have some concerns that skills are needed and do need to be taught.

My job satisfaction is adversely influenced by lack of administrative pride and leadership.

There needs to be a national program to market home economics. Those of us who are in the classroom dealing with students can see how important this area of study is to fostering positive family and community life. A few minutes of discussion with other teachers in the lounge illustrates that the home economics teacher has a unique and highly-skilled means of understanding student needs based on their behaviors. We have an opportunity to really hear what kids are saying.

Although I love teaching and am satisfied with my job, I will definitely seek a new position if the violence in my school continues to increase.

I am pleased with my chosen profession and current teaching position. Rural area inadequacies, (supplies, equipment, building facilities, parental apathy) are very discouraging. Teaching salaries are low.

My satisfaction as a teacher tends to depend on the attitude of the students I have in class. If they come in willing to learn then we all are more satisfied. It can be depressing to have to spend time reminding students of acceptable behavior. In the same semester the feeling of satisfaction can vary from class to class as you go through the day.

While teaching home economics was a rewarding and profitable career when I was single and then married without children, I now feel as though my role as a mother/wife requires my full attention. I do not plan to teach as long as I have children at home; however, I will be teaching them everyday. (What an awesome privilege!) In the future I will most likely keep my certificate valid in case I do decide to return to the job force at a later date.

I have become very frustrated over the last few years at the money amount I have received for my budget. I have to watch very carefully how much I spend, yet my enrollment is very high. It seems that the school is putting money that I should be receiving into their general fund.

Home economics need to continue to keep up with changes in society. We are dealing with many problems associated with these changes in the family structure, etc. We need to continue this! I feel our profession is more understanding of our students's family situations and maybe that is why our profession is so fulfilling—. FHA is a very satisfying part of my job!

A new principal this year, has rattled the bush and made changes that have improved the attitude of staff and students. Until this year
getting texts, equipment, supplies, etc. has not been any problem—we are currently tightening the belt.

May I make a comment? Questionnaires like this are always frustrating for me because they never really allow me to express my intent. This one is better than most, however. I love teaching and I love home economics. It’s all I’ve ever wanted to do since I had my first home economics class in Junior High. It has made a quality difference in my life and that of my family’s. However, on the job, I do less and less teaching everyday and more and more other stuff that I hate. What you mean by teaching may not be what teaching is to me. If you mean teaching in the traditional term of imparting knowledge and skills, helping others moment by moment; then yes, I love it when I get to do it. If you mean tons of paper work, constant discipline, constant confrontation, wearing yourself out jumping the hurdles administration and supervisor put in front of you (because they haven’t been on the front line in years!), then no, I’m hating it more and more. This is my 20th year in the classroom. I just didn’t fall out of a tree.

I can definitely say that I love my job and see it as actually the most practical course taught in schools today and as a necessity as our new course of study reflects the OCAPS so necessary to life. What we are teaching is so important and progressive that I can look back and see so many areas home economics began addressing first and then others got on the bandwagon i.e.-consumer education, decision making, career exploration, job seeking skills or so. I am truly concerned that some districts are requiring more and more academics (that are necessary to carriers and well rounded knowledge) but are not requiring the courses necessary to everyday life—decision making and problem solving; relationships, budgeting, parenting, work expectations etc. To let these be absorbed by some other area of the curriculum, English, Social Studies, Math does not assure that they are being taught by persons trained for teaching the aforementioned skills as home economists are.

The new curriculum bothers me the most. We get one curriculum in place and start using it then are changing before the last one is even cold. For the ones that have been here many years, this new curriculum is like studying Greek. We were not trained for this 20 years ago. Yes, times are changing but in rural America some things don’t change as fast. Band-aid sessions here and there do not help. It would be nice if we could have a week long course to help us through the new. Off-campus in regional or VEPD areas with family schedules it is hard to spend a week on campus.

Society (as a whole) is not focused on education as the way out of poverty and ignorance. From listening to my students, their only concern is making enough money to get by and possibly getting a GED, no motivation at home and this is generational. These are the types of students (at risk) that are enrolled in our program. A lot of the new curriculum (OCAPS) is important, but we still are not targeting the student with OCAPS that fit a high reading level and subject depth. Our students are lucky to have a level of a 7th grader. I water the material down to a point, but would love to teach it as is. Many comments from students and parents concerning the state testing for Voc Ed Work and Family Life is negative. I also feel this is very unnecessary. The students have so many tests, this only adds to their anxiety. I have had students tell me that they will not take any of our courses if they have to take tests.

I enjoy my job even though there are frustrations. As Work and Family teachers we need to promote our profession constantly. Sometimes I am around teachers who only speak of the changes as negative as we are
losing but do not try to improve the programs in our schools. We have made gains in our district-required program in 7th and 8th grades and parenting (funded). My principal does have a problem understanding the numbers 12-25 for required class size. He does not understand why it makes a difference. If the present teachers do not promote the program through total participation (FHA/HERO-volunteering to serve as mentors and workshop leaders) they will defeat the positive efforts. I feel another reason for a lack of people going into the profession is that we receive extended service pay (I have 20 days in the summer) I used over 30 days this summer and this did not include anything during the school year. We do not receive a supplemental pay for FHA/HERO which is where most of the days come from. Some teachers receive the same funding from the state and do no FHA/HERO. This is horrible PR for our total program which is supposed to require FHA/HERO. With regards to supplemental pay, we do as much coaching as some athletic coaches or academic team coaches. Contact me if you want more.

At this point in time, I am very frustrated with the new OCAPS. We finished the revision of the curriculum last spring and this is the first year with the new issues. I feel as though, at times, I am teaching Sunday School! The kids are bored with some of the new required information and so am I. I’m not sure, if I’ll feel this way in June. If I do want to continue in home economics. I didn’t go into this field to teach many of the areas that are now required. I feel incompetent in some areas; I want the Nutrition, Fitness and actual Food Preparation back again. I also miss the interior design. We’re going to lose these kids because home economics is now, to me, like any other class. I am very discouraged and may consider a career change.

I like to teach and work with my students. I want to know how to better teach my students to let them be better prepared for what comes up in their lives. I like seeing them learn. The hard parts are often having a decent room and good equipment. This is the best kept place I’ve ever seen. And I have the most support from staff. This is the first place out of 3 schools. I think there needs to be better support for home economics. Plus colleges are still working with the idea of a nice good WASP student. Very little is said about how to adapt curriculum to special needs students who are our major area or concentration of students. Teachers could use classes in dealing with LD (learning disabled) and DH (developmental handicap) students.

I would like a neutral point for some questions that I did not agree or disagree. For some questions it would depend on circumstance. I do not recommend teaching for really good students, but do with some African Americans who are good students and like school and may have a tougher time in job market. Plus we need more in city schools. I like teaching, but it is frustrating at times. For the education needed, you could earn more in another field in a career made. When I was divorced at age 42, where else could I earn a living that would be comparable. I had 4 children so that experience helped me. I like kids. Within some of the schools, teachers are not treated like professionals; from administration to students. So frustrations can be high. But the good parts are good. Most of the students are great; the rooms, facilities, budgets, schedules, number of students, can be frustrating. I doubt if there isn’t one teacher who doesn’t go home some days and want to go elsewhere or wonder if they can keep it up—no matter what their age. Too many egos to satisfy from educators, administrators.

Working full-time in the past was very difficult to manage along with a family. Right now the numbers in our program are down so I’m half-time. I find I enjoy my job more when I’m half-time. There’s time to do some of the extras I like to do, like pick grapes so Advanced Foods can make
jam. I feel I’m a better teacher when I’m half-time. Some of our staff at this school resent us (2 home economics teachers) for having fewer classes and smaller class sizes. There was even an article in the school newspaper last year about the inequities among the loads of various teachers. It’s coming from only 1 or 2 teachers, but it may have hurt our program. We’re trying to remain professional about it and do the best job of teaching we can.

FHA clubs are very difficult to build in the inner-city schools. I believe they are important and can have a lasting influence on the students’ lives. Some study and modifications should be tried to make the program work in the inner-city environment. The same program that works in suburban schools and rural schools has conditions that are unworkable. Perhaps part of the problem is lack of parental support and involvement. Fund raising is difficult because of theft and lack of money. Collecting dues from students is virtually impossible. My career as a home economics teacher is drawing to a close and I am filled with sadness. I like what I do and feel so fortunate to have had this career. I am saddened that home economics is being taken out of many high school programs. Everything we teach students will help them to have a better life if they will apply it. I feel very fortunate to have had a career that had so much influence in my life and in the lives of my children. I hope it can play some part in my student’s lives. I believe we have a professional responsibility to convince the Ohio School Board that home economics has a place in high school curriculum and certainly needs to be required. Both Art and Music are required for graduation and by comparison, many more of life’s needed skills are taught in home economics.

I really enjoy what I teach and upon questioning my students’ parents I find that they really see a need to offer home economics to today’s teen. Many state that it should be a required course. The problem I’m experiencing is with the upper administration (above principal). Currently, my budget is .00. My department cannot spend anything above the student’s lab fees. It is very frustrating to try to teach a program with nothing (no money for curriculum revision, no teaching materials, no new equipment or replacement of equipment). In short, I feel that home economics is holding on literally by one fingernail. With the current push for the Ohio Proficiency Testing and the remediation requirements, I feel that we are losing students. The new curriculum (foods area) will make us lose many students because they can only take 1 course. Many of my students really enjoy both our Creative Cuisine class and our Nutrition class. Thanks for listening to me complain; it’s been a really bad week for home economics in my district. I’m usually not this negative or rambling.

New curriculum, yuk, students still want to do lab activities; cook and sew. The state may think we need to change, but the students sign up for the labs and then we have to convince them that the new curriculum is what they need. They don’t want to hear it, enrollment will drop. Writing the new curriculum is also a lot of work, something our teaching staff doesn’t need. Who is going to pay for these tests? This is a lot of money, our and many other school boards don’t have. I think this new curriculum deserves more than one question in this survey.

The recent changes in Ohio’s mandated vocational curriculum have not been good changes for our department. We recognize the importance of the subject matter, but find it difficult to convey this idea to students who are pushed toward academic classes and to those who are not familiar with our classes. State changes in curriculum and class size have lead to the loss of a teacher’s position. We feel these changes will lead to more loss of job in the near future. Limiting students to
one class in each area is a mistake. It does not allow for real in
depth experiences and learning opportunities. Your questionnaire is
well written. Best wishes in your research.

How do I always get these random surveys. A co-worker told me if I
filled out the 1st one I received 4 years ago, I'd get one every 6
months. He was right. Please randomly select someone else from now on.

I enjoy teaching home economics. It has not always been that wonderful.
It has taken me 3 years to get the job I wanted (location) and 10 years
to get the department that I want with labs, class size, curriculum,
rappor, and equipment. Home economics is a time consuming demanding
job. One must be willing to put the time and energy in the job to make
it fulfilling. My wish list would include more class room, better
computer software and hardware, and time to learn and do self study
other than at home. Recognition from professionals at the state and
college level that we value families and that all demands they have on
us are taking us away from our own families. If I taught math I could
just go home, instead of getting groceries have FHA meetings, etc. To
understand that because society is not teaching or giving our young
people a lesson that it's now home economics job to solve all of the
societies problems. For example, teenage pregnancy, conflict
management, manners, etc. self esteem. This gives us so much pressure.
What's the most important? Can I do it all? Please tell me that we are
doing ok with our limitations. Each year we add another society problem
to solve. When do we teach the BASICS? I am only one. I don't believe
you really hit the real problems with home economics teachers with this
survey.

I find my schedule frustrating. I have 3 rooms; high school home
economics, high school Principal of Science, and 7th grade-middle
school. Two schools; I have 1 c and p; I don't feel confident in
teaching science.

I feel that the lower level students are pushed toward home economics
and discipline problems that are under achievers end up in our classes.
Often students entering school throughout September are also placed in
home economics without asking if the student has an interest in the
subject.

I have enjoyed teaching home economics my entire career. I changed from
nursing to home economics early in college and have never regretted it.
However, I do not like what the state is doing to our course of study,
taking out the skill areas for values. I think without thinking ahead
to the consequences. In 10 years, they will find out that kids have no
better values, and no skills.

I feel that the present home economics curriculum might not be well
suited for all students and this needs to be considered by the teacher
when planning her own program; area, and type of student must prevail.
I enjoy teaching and I really enjoy home economics subjects.

I find the work very challenging and rewarding. I really enjoy what I
do and any small accomplishment is very rewarding.

I enjoy teaching very much. I spent several years at home when my
children were small for which I am grateful. I think the field of home
economics is an excellent career choice for women and men because of the
variety of job possibilities.

Part II # 26 glad for no plan of work, but new curriculum's course of
study writing is very time consuming.
The most frustrating aspect of my job is lack of support. People view life skills as very important, but they don’t associate home economics with the teaching of them. I see the Work and Family curriculum as being the most valuable to the students and the name away from home economics was a nice change.

I find the students much harder to control and much less motivated than in years past. I am always surprised at how students talk to and cut on their own friends. Self-esteem seems to run very low in the students our department gets. Outside of school problems in these kids’ lives make it difficult for them to enjoy school.

I enjoy teaching home economics, it is fun and creative!

I would not recommend teaching as an occupation because it is difficult to find employment. Students with high scholastic ability have the opportunity to go into careers that are in much higher demand.

I can honestly say that I have never been bored with my teaching experiences; overwhelmed at times, because of high enrollment or extra responsibilities. I grew up and went to school in this district. This is the only job I have ever had. The successes outweigh the failures. I am very satisfied as a home economics teacher.

I feel the state’s new curriculum will either need to change back to more skills or more and more districts will stop offering home economics.

I like many of the ideas in the new curriculum. However, I do not like the structure that students cannot take several parenting classes, etc. In many ways, home economics has lost its identity. Many of our topics are currently being taught in health. I do think there is a lot of stress and anxiety over the changes.

I am extremely proud of my profession. I encourage students to consider teaching.

I love teaching but I feel in the area of home economics there is so much extra work; FHA, home visits, grocery shopping, Action Project, that it is very difficult to be a good teacher. I am the only home economics teacher handling 4 preparations each semester. Currently, I am attending college with a major in Elementary Education and I plan to switch as soon as I have completed my certification requirements.

I am very pleased with my teaching and working with students. I am concerned about the administrators. Home economics is not a respected field in this small town. We are thought of as study hall monitors.

I do not like the current trend away from hands on. Enrollment is down in Nutrition Wellness class because title itself is not appealing. Maybe have one that is Science credit and another that is really lab oriented/cooking. Students in this area are more interested in doing than what nutrition really is.

Home economics is a very important area of teaching. Our young people desperately need a sound Work and Family program. The changes being made are inspirational. Now if we can only get our administration at the local level to consider our area important as a teaching model instead of extra funding, and provide us with updated text books and equipment.
I enjoy teaching, but I will probably try something else before I retire. How will I know I won’t like something even better unless I try? As I get older, I may enjoy teaching less, but for now I like educating students.

This is a confusing era for us with the curriculum changes as well as state and federal changes for the schools. I strongly believe that teachers who have modernized their departments and have kept current are dealing with the changes. Those teachers who refused to change their lesson plans and still teach Tailoring and Food Preservation are having great difficulty with the curriculum change, with administration, with PH, etc.

Easy to fill out survey. I’m very interested in seeing the summary of the study.

This was a very easy survey to comprehend, with directions easy to follow. It was not too time consuming.

I do not feel as much emphasis should be put on FHA. Not all areas are as good as others for this club. Some schools are saturated with clubs. I think it is unrealistic for funding to be contingent on whether you have an FHA chapter. I also think it is difficult to have FHA in all semester classes. Economically, FHA is out of reach for some especially if they don’t want to be in skill events.

In addition to being a classroom teacher, I feel it is important to be involved with students in an extracurricular capacity. You get to see students in a different light, help them achieve non-classroom goals, know parents and the community better. I am Student Council Advisor as well as FHA. Equal importance in participation on school committees or teams like building leadership team, interdisciplinary committees, etc. The more involved you become the more ownership you have, also stressed.

I really enjoy teaching. I really resent FHA activities. I feel like a Girl Scout leader. We keep having these required FHA items shoved down our throats with no additional time or pay. I find it interesting that we are emphasizing the family while at the same time FHA takes me away from mine more and more.

I love the subject area and working with my students. My frustrations, that drain my energy, are: state mandates especially new set; people, including school administration; lack of understanding of home economics; society’s lack of support and understanding of education; pressure and conditions teens are living under.

I don’t like the curriculum change it takes the hands on away from the students.

The Personal Development area of Work and Family Life is too much like what is being taught in Health and Psychology class. Our students are not interested in it, therefore are bored. I agree they need to learn this, but its’ too hard to teach when I haven’t had this in college since 25 years ago when family relations were different. My students are ones who need more hands on activities. They need an interesting class that they really like instead of a boring one.

I feel lucky to have the principal I have these last 3 years. Others were not caring, concerned, aware, or involved. My lower job satisfaction correlated to some of those students who are a serious problem to the order of the classroom. Disruptive and becoming more violent. We have gang problems too. Generally we fear guns and that
type behavior. Many teachers believe unruly children should be removed to another type setting for their education. We don't have an SBN Program here. We have just begun inschool suspension and Saturday school.

I like teaching, however I would like to join the ranks of Vocational Administration. Teaching is very challenging and demanding! Nevertheless, I am still glad I entered the profession and my specific subject, Work and Family Life, allows me to give education which has definite help for LIFE! It is practical and will be able to be applied in all of life situations!

I really enjoy teaching home economics but I think the students enjoy the foods area the most and we are supposed to do less of this. I have enjoyed teaching but if I had chance to do it over again I would probably pick another career field, such as a research person in science.

I enjoy the diversity of the curriculum.

Love the Work and Family areas. I am not sold on competency based programs, unless a trade area! Local districts are competent to establish guidelines. All education, skills and learning can not be measured or measured immediately.

I do not like new state curriculum. Recently our school district gave over vocational units to JVS which resulted in loss of benefits and pay cut. Felt singled out and abandoned by our school district because of this.

The state has eliminated so much of the vital skills from the curriculum which many students enjoy, sewing for instance and food preparation. Once home economics was made elective at the high school level, recruitment of students in the department is challenging.

I do not like the direction of more theory and less lab work. The hands on experience has much more of an impact in the learning process. We need more training in parenting to pass on to the young parents we have to deal with in classes.

It is frustrating to see how students are being discouraged from taking our classes especially if they are college bound. Now career awareness is being done by academic teachers on vocational lab computers.

#27 Never with any student alone, often times parents are overwhelmed with all they have to do. So the last thing they want to be bothered with is a teacher. My door is always open. #28 Hard for students to forget traditional home economics. They also get it in DARE/and QUEST, they don't want it again.

I enjoy working with young people at school and I gain satisfaction in helping them learn new things. However, most students enrolled in home economics classes are non-college bound and are poorly motivated to learn. The majority do not really get involved in the learning activities I provide and that is frustrating.

Not enough time. Not enough support from parents. Slow motion in getting mailings and response from home economics State Department almost October and still no FHA/HERO packet. How are we to start?

I feel that some of the changes at the state level will greatly decrease class enrollment. The very things that attract students to the program
are those that are being changed at the state level. An example cutting down on Foods lab preparations. The students want to learn food preparation and we learn by doing.

I really enjoy teaching home economics especially the hands on. I fear as the curriculum changes there will be less of this.

I feel that during home visits we get great support from parents. We also get great support from our Guidance Department who see a real need for our program.

I am pleased with less vocational reports to complete each year. I love teaching in this field but with the new curriculum I'm not sure. I feel each county should be accountable to the needs of their students and have the expertise to know what their students' needs are. There are times it's difficult to get supplies and may have to be done on my own time. I'm in a rural school and errands are sometimes impossible to do during 1 conference period of 48 minutes. I do have 2 conference periods but they are not together. This also makes home visits difficult. So many of our students are embarrassed to have us in their homes. I will not go into a home I'm not invited or unwelcomed. I prefer to make phone contacts or speak with them while they may be at school to pick up their child. Home visits at the end of the year are difficult if for grading a project since grades are usually already in and sent out or ready to pick up the last day of school. I feel home visits are an out-dated part of this field. Our students have few electives to choose from and I'm afraid when the new curriculum takes effect we'll be losing students who would like to be in a home economics class, to study hall since we presently have three levels of a comprehensive home economics class (I, II, advanced). We won't be able to do this next year. Another area I'm not thrilled about is FHA. I personally do not find it exciting so its difficult to portray enthusiasm to a class or FHA club. Many recommend doing it in class each week but I find that to be time wasting. Its' too difficult to get every thing you feel they need to know into a year with all the testing now the state requires. This takes away from class time. Another reason I'm not excited with FHA is the name. This is 1993 and we're still using Future Homemakers of America. With less than 25% of women staying home, we need a new name, a new strategy. Nothing infuriates me more than the home economics teacher who is so out dated with her ideas that she's unable to teach today's problems of our students and keep up in the modern world.

Our school system is in a pinch for money, as are most schools, and have tried to pass a levy 3 times with no success (this in the past year). Availability of additional materials, etc. is not feasible at this time. I am very happy in my job and plan to teach for a long time. I am very involved with my students' learning and the activities in which they participate. This survey came at a very busy time and I apologize for taking so long to return it.

Overall I enjoy teaching and helping students with FHA activities. I still enjoy the kids overall. The things that make my job difficult are as follows: we teachers are trained professionals and we should have general guidelines from the state regarding curriculum but we should be able to choose what is relevant for our students. I am disappointed in the new curriculum due to the fact that so many hands on skills and activities are being removed. That is the part that I and many students enjoy the most. Its so rewarding to hear students say I never sowed anything by myself before or my parents were so impressed by the pie, cookies, or casserole I took home. These experiences help build self confidence in students that other experiences do not. I realize we are
in an ever changing world and we have to keep up with the times, however there is relevance even today for some sewing and cooking. People still need to repair clothing or make a costume for a child in a play. People still need to know how to prepare food, nutritious meals and select nutritious food at the grocery and when eating out. The reason this survey is over due to the lack of time a teacher has to prepare her lessons. So much time is required to fill out more and more paperwork and forms at the local county and state levels of education. Also more emphasis is put on presenting a creditable front than doing a creditable job!

I love to teach, however over the 25 years since I first began there are fewer and fewer minutes in the day to teach. FORMS-FORMS-RULES-RULES- LIABILITY-STATE LEGISLATIVE WE CAN’T DO THAT ANYMORE-DISCIPLINE-DISCIPLINE. By the time all the red tape is taken care of I don’t have any time or energy to truly teach. Also parents who instill the love of learning for learning sake have just about evaporated from the face of the earth. I spend a lot of emotional energy and class time motivating students. They have so many problems at home that they carry over to school.

#28 State curriculum changes seem to be aimed at large urban schools where a home economics teacher only has a student once in 4 years. I have many students wanting to take all of my classes and with this new curriculum there is too much overlap-e.g. Life Planning 3.0.2, Nutrition-Wellness 4.0.1; same thing. Personal Development 1.0.3, Life Planning 3.0.2, Nutrition and Wellness 4.0.1, Family Relations 5.0.6-ALL STRESS. Making them feel better by successfully completing projects and courses make them eliminate more stress than by talking about it all the time. #41 and 42 White, male power reigns; suggestions are always asked for but are not implemented. #28 Back to the state curriculum-how is one to objectively measure or give an exam covering two thirds of the new curriculum? #30 I teach six totally different preaparations a day and six different ones second semester. I was told to set up 12 FHA chapters and run them all. How would your Education Theory classes handle that? Please note, I do love teaching and am committed to my students that’s why I’m still in the classroom. It is just a plain fact, however that some days I barely keep my nose above the water line.

Random thoughts---I’ve been teaching the new OCAP’s all along, basically. I am concerned that we will not be offering the clothing construction and food preparation skills students take home economics I for (not enough time). There is not Jr High program in our school. Parents tell me on home visits that they want their child to learn to cook and/or sew. I’m planning to offer my time after school hours for students who want to do a clothing construction project. This is the 1st year going by the Personal Development and Resource Management OCAP’s. People remember best what they do, and even if sewing and cooking labs are limited. Home economics/Work and Family will still be known for sewing and cooking, I believe. Most of my students have not been in 4-H, even if it is a rural community. If we don’t offer practical experience and parents are too busy to teach, will these skills die? On the other hand, I can understand that today’s society people are too busy to sew and cook. So maybe this is for the best; time is such a concern. I’m trying to go by the recommendations for PD/RM year course, and I’m already 1 week behind. Sometimes I feel like I’m glossing over information. But then, I firmly believe that process is important, not memorizing info and spitting it back on a test. But there has to be some of this to encourage learning retention. I think that I’ll be better able to judge after I’ve taught it for a year or two. Our course of study is being adopted this year so next year will be our first official year. I am concerned that our 2 teacher
department will drop to 1. Our Board of Superintendent place a great emphasis on academics. They’re invested heavily in Satellite Learning. That along with post secondary enrollment options, 1/2 day JVS programs, etc, take students that could be enrolled in our classes. With only 6 funded classes, will the board be willing to keep 2 teachers, even if there is enrollment for non funded electives? We plan to offer a semester Foods, Clothing, Housing, and Exploring Childhood classes with pre-requisites of funded classes. We’ll see next spring. I like the Resource Guides. At first glance, some of the info seems a bit high level for freshmen. We’ll see as the year goes on. During the past several years, I’ve come across more rude, apathetic and disrespectful students than all my previous years combined. This is a big concern. Many students would rather be anywhere but school and could care less how well they do. Other teachers in my school have noticed the same thing. It affects the tone of class and interferes with students who are there to learn. My school cut extended time from 20 to 10 days, last year. We still try to continue our program especially FHA, as before, so we’re putting in close to 20 or more days. Home visits have always been mostly after school and in the evenings during Sept and Oct. They are valuable, but sometimes I wonder what I’d be like without the Action Project and home visit requirements. Even with 2 planning conference periods, work never gets close to being done. My student teacher say FHA’s like another job. But I do love it all! I’ve always embraced change and followed guidelines from the State Department. I feel fortunate that home economics teachers have such excellent leadership from the State Department and many opportunities to network via FHA activities and teachers conferences.

**Job Training Teachers**

Teaching Vocational Job Training is very different than home economics. I am very disturbed at some home economics teachers at the local high school teaching Child Care; incorporating a preschool for 2 weeks in the program and doing style shows with preschoolers; having other high school students vote on who is best. This is not teaching the career aspect intended. If home economics teachers are going to have any credibility in the career training. They need to learn the professional aspects of the Job Training. I am well satisfied with what I do and the accountability I have. If home economics is to survive they need to re-train teachers, not just re-name curriculum.

I worked in industry for twenty five years, worked on my degree, did well financially, but needed a change. I changed careers and entered education at times I feel some of my co-workers don’t try hard enough, get petty, and are negative. It is very frustrating, if it isn’t fun any more, quit and find a new job. Teaching is more than a job, teaching to me is a way of life. My school has become my company and yes I’m a company person. I work very hard to promote my program and my school—not everyone knows about us yet! McDonalds also believes this—if not, way do they continue to promote the golden arches? Lastly, allow me to share one more story—when my spouse and I go out for an evening to dine or a party I am always warned, please, honey don’t tell people what you do or where you work its so boring. Well, I do anyway and don’t believe its boring!

I would have better satisfaction if the students had better basic academic skills at the 11th or 12th grade learning about fractions and measuring equivalents at that age is too late. I can also become dissatisfied when your program becomes labeled as special education. It is very frustrating to try to recruit regular students when your program
is labeled. Recruiting and worrying about whether or not you will have a job each year is sometimes not worth the hassle. Having the summer months off are nice but the stress of worrying about job security is tough. I have a very good supervisor who is not the principal. This has helped me to feel less stress or pressure. It has allowed me to feel more confident about my work. Her encouragement helps to get you through the rough times. Club organization are good but Future Homemakers of American. Home Economics Related Occupations concepts ideas for organization are good, the name stinks. The requirements for a job training teacher out of industry are a cause of dissatisfaction for a 1st year teacher. You must put everything into it to last. One final area of concern is the student discipline problem. A classroom is not the same, like when I was in school you seem to spend 1/2 your time in discipline matters 1/4 in administrative duties, grade book, lesson plans, 1/4 to actually teach. As teachers get older the amount of enjoyment in teaching goes away.

I think the image of the home economics teacher has improved somewhat, but we are still looked at as fringe, personnel. As a vocational educator we need to constantly work at improving our skills so that students have better training to compete in today's job market. The difficult part of my job has to do with students' attitudes and personal problems. Almost every day I spend time dealing with emotional concerns of my students which takes away from teaching job skills. This is time consuming and stressful. But as students begin to trust me and our school there is significant improvement and therefore, time spent is more rewarding.

I initially taught food management job training for 11 years. Inner city. I became tired and dissatisfied, I quit. I worked in the food service industry in management for 3 years. I realized how much I missed young people and teaching and job training so I decided I wanted back in teaching. I am presently in my 2nd year in the Food Management Culinary Arts department. I am so glad to be back teaching. I realize how much I missed teaching and how fulfilling it is.

I am presently fulfilling a dream of mine to teach home economics in the high school department that I graduated from. If some of my responses to your questions do not seem to correlate, let me explain our present, local school situation. Our district had a 2 year but-out last year. We have 32 new teaching personnel and 3 new principals and a new superintendent for 93-94. Many changes are taking place, therefore morale is not good! Our high school principal is a female-an out-of-state person, and also the first female administrator in this district. I feel she is working very hard and making changes which have been needed for a long time, however she is making change too fast and many are not ready for this. There is much distance between most staff and the principal. I, myself am very happy in my teaching assignment and with most of the students. I hope my response was not too late to mess up your survey!

Information for furthering education classes needs to be sent to teachers on a continual basis in order to have knowledge of furthering education. Need to have inservice with other teachers in your program in order to discuss and exchange ideas for teaching (my teaching is becoming stale). Am feeling much burnout and with present situation, not all courses in home economics education available in evenings so those of us who want to specialize in area other than education can fulfill career goals.

Recently I switched from job training restaurant management to middle setting work and family in the same school dropout.
I enjoy the teaching part of my job, I enjoy being with my student most of the time. What I don’t like is all the politics that go on in the school systems. If we were truly there to help the student it would be a wonderful job, but we have to worry about head counts and how many other classes (employability skills) we have to teach and our related classes which we need a cut down to one.

I have just changed areas written home economics. I am excited about the change-makes the job more interesting. I would be happier in my job if: there were less paperwork (reports, reports, reports); there were less supervision and be allowed to work on own; there were more preplanning into new programs as to student selection etc (the mechanics); home economics were more for all students not just severely disadvantage (if I get a class of these it’s ok but 6-8 is enough). My intelligence, creativity etc. are hampered by the system-on always behind in paperwork. I sometimes fear the violent, mentally ill student-I resent these students being in class when I have other disadvantaged students who are willing to learn and care ready to try but are not given my best time because I have to deal with sever trouble makers. This problem may even out in years to come as I demand more say in student selection, but that does not help me now. I am in favor of parenting classes for all students. I believe in the home economics field-there is no more important area than human and family relations for people; I just feel I can’t get to the subject matter.

I have enjoyed my career in home economics and would do it again. I feel it is a worthwhile teaching job and that I have helped a lot of students. It’s a shame all students don’t have the chance to take home economics especially in these times of declining family life. Young people need what we have to offer more than ever.

My work in the field of home economics has been both a joy and a means of self support. Home economics training provided me with three career choices. For 2 years I worked in the field of interior design, then taught general home economics in a private school, later job training child care and part time instructor at a two year college in early childhood. My sister and cousin graduated in home economics from Ohio State one with a Master and one Ph.D. We are very proud of our profession.

I am pleased with my job in general, however their are two areas that sincerely upset me. They are: lack of professional restaurant attitude. Too much home ecie becky is performed at the state level; Guidance counselors who do not encourage students to partake in vocational classes.

No amount of training can prepare an individual for the realities of the profession. Few people understand the multi-roles teachers play each and every day. We are encouraged to specialize in one subject area. Yet that one area may not be what we devote the majority of our time to: building self esteem; teaching teamwork and socializing skills; teaching organization and study skills; overcoming family dysfunction; and counseling.

I want to work with a higher intellectual student at the college level. A placement or PR position would suite me also. I found that my biggest asset is the recruitment of students. We were forced to do it ourselves now I’m just good at it. While other programs went down in enrollment my program went up. You give me a vocational school I guarantee I can increase the enrollment higher than it ever was.
Generally, I'm very satisfied with teaching. It is discouraging to see the increase in problems students have before they even come to class. It seems that subject matter is now of secondary importance; more pressing problems must be dealt with first, pregnancy, drugs, lack of home life, etc.

I would be less anxious if I could employ my Child Care students. The pay is poor, no job security, split shifts, part time, and no benefits.

I truly enjoy teaching.

I truly enjoy my work—even though it is very intense and demanding. I am proud to be a part of the growth in the area of Early Childhood Education.

We believe in the concept that to achieve optimum skill levels in our students we must operate a quality program for children. It has been difficult at times to convince our school administration of the need for this commitment.

Early childhood Education and Care has grown in our school district because of teacher commitment and struggle. Each inch we have gained we have fought the mighty battle to achieve! Students have a difficult time using divergent thinking and this slows related class experience. Students pay for books and supplies. Customer account pays for everything that could relate to the Children's Center.

I am very happy training students to work as Child Caregivers. It is personally rewarding when I see them employed, and my program growing. It's getting a good reputation for quality workers and I feel great seeing the students succeed. I was beginning to grow restless in consumer homemaking after 13 years and this has been a positive change for my career.

I love teaching. For me it is more than a job. I love to see my students growing and changes their way of life. I thank you God for my job. Thank you for letting me share my feelings.

I think we need to help students in vocational home economics and impact get back to basics—they need it and no where else will they get it.

I am satisfied with home economics education for myself, however I feel most teachers do not have as much respect or appreciation as they should. I also think we tend to put emphasis on some more unimportant aspects of home economics—such as student organizations.

I enjoy teaching the Child Care program in a vocational school. My frustrations about my job include unmotivated students who don’t see a need for working or education. The enrollment problem is also very stressful at the beginning of each school year. If a minimum number of students are not enrolled in the program. I risk losing my job or bumping someone else from their job if I have to be moved elsewhere.

My present position is the best of all the jobs I have experienced. I am teaching multi-handicapped high school students Vocational Job Training in a community setting. It is most rewarding to see these students go to gainful employment.

As a teaching profession goes coming from industry the time off is quite a relief, but there are lots of other job duties and schooling that one does not realize. The stress and pressures are totally different.
I feel like I have a lot of freedom in the field of home economics. I happen to also work with Special Needs students and I feel very comfortable with the combinations of the two. It works well. I do worry about the future of Work and Family at a normal school setting. I am at a vocational school.

Working with vocational education students is extremely rewarding. I have many special needs students each year, and to see the progress they make over the course of the year gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction. Seeing regular education students, and the higher level of LD/DH develop leadership skills, and work successfully with the lower functioning is also rewarding. I love teaching. I can’t think of anything else I’d rather do.

The big focus seems to be Grads. Although I feel offering programs for pregnant and teen mothers—this should not be our major focus in home economics. I feel our home economics programs are outstanding. Let’s push and publicize those.

I love my job! I do, however, feel pressured to continually learn more and more about the Elder Care field and there just aren’t enough hours in a day! I also feel dissatisfaction with OVA and the State Department of Education. They are continually making demands for documentation and then 6 months later change the format. They also don’t seem to have time to recognize the potential of Elder Care programs and are not interested in what we are doing!

I feel what helps for satisfaction on the job are: administrative support that allows creativity and change for improvement; administration that strives for excellence in staff and students; be self motivated to do continuing education; be involved in professional organizations related to your field; and attend conferences and network.

There doesn’t seem to be enough time either during or after school to complete duties assigned. Although Regional Rallies are very important, it takes a teacher a tremendous amount of personal time to organize. School personnel take advantage of the home economics department. We are taken for granted; exploited!

I like teaching home economics. It provides me with more opportunities to work one on one with my students. I love the Job Training aspect of the program. State Department provides ample support.

I do not get along with my partner, communication problem. She may feel I am a threat when in reality I just want to teach my classes and take home a pay check. There is a lot of side work involved in teaching and as a some new teacher it interferes with the teaching of my class.

I have been delighted with my job for many years. I would not be happy as a home economics teacher, but I love being an Early Childhood teacher in a career center and touching many lives, for the better I hope.

My field is Early Childhood and Montessori certification. Early Childhood Education and Care, however is listed under home economics. There are home economics teachers teaching Early Childhood Education who are not educated in this field and in my opinion not qualified to teach in this area.

I became a non-traditional student in my late 40’s. The home economics department encouraged me through undergraduate and graduate school. I worked from the day of graduation to present.
I feel that the State Vocational Department favors Work and Family teachers when in reality they should give equal support to Job Training. One very important example is the area of extended time.

I really enjoy Job Training especially the depth of subject matter and the fact that most students really like the area and many are employed in the field.

Thank you Bettye, for allowing us to be part of your study.

There is a need for clothing classes, cooking classes, and independent living class to be included back into the home economics curriculum.

I love to teach. I can make a great deal more money in the field, but I would not consider changing.

Each year the paper chase gets worse. I spend more time each year on secretarial paper, more than seems to enhance teaching. I hope I’m not a norm. I selected teaching for the wrong reasons. I’ve never been very happy in the classroom and it has nothing to do with students, administration, or anything else. My heart has just never been in it.

Working with FHA/HERO is my greatest personal reward.

I am a Certified Working Chef and Certified Culinary Educator through the United States Department of Education and the American Culinary Federation.

I feel so fortunate and am so thankful that this teaching position in the Job Training foods area opened up. I am very satisfied and feel this is just a small part that I can contribute to the youth. Before entering the teaching field, I had worked as a Dietetic Technician hospital. This surpasses all in job satisfaction.

I coordinate the teacher aide program. It is Child Care Job Training. It is a successful program that draws directed and motivated students. I thoroughly enjoy my job. I would like to see parenting required for graduation.

I am not a true home economics teacher. My certification is Elementary/Early Childhood Education. I went back to school to obtain job training on my certification.

I love what I do. It is a wonderful occupation.

I would like to see a name change and better reflect the new image. There is far too much paperwork to do and used to keep track of students. Too much time is taken from the educational day to do testing and offer services outside the classroom. I have a hard time changing curriculum when ever the State Department gets a new idea. The last change did not include teacher input, OCAPS. Wow—what a mess. Besides all this I really enjoy teaching.

I am extremely satisfied with the profession. I have some concerns with the opinion of other educators about home economics education. It presently does not appear to be a subject area treated with value and respect. The academic subject areas due to the proficiency tests, have become the major thrust.

This is my first year of working as a full-time teacher. I have also worked as a tutor and a substitute teacher. At this point in the school year, my experience has been primarily positive. I am getting ready to
take more classes so I can gain a greater knowledge in my teaching area.

I checked I wasn’t sure how long I’d stay in teaching. Any other job I would take would still be in the home economics field. All of the other teachers in the county are hard working, and it seems to be a common bond. Home Economics teachers are hard working.

The reason I didn’t answer your first questionnaire was I have left one school and they did not send my mail to the new school. If I had answered these questions at the former school, my answers would have been very different! I am very pleased at this new school.