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ABSTRACT

Business education in Georgia has experienced a shortage of teachers for the past several years. Some relief was realized due to the decline in the economy; however, a threat exists of that shortage reemerging as the economy improves. The purpose of this study was to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to measure job satisfaction levels.

A systematic random sampling method was used to select participants from a list provided by the State Department of Education of all business education teachers in Georgia. Survey packets were sent to a sample of 594 secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools with a 49.3% rate of return (N=293). Dillman’s (2000) tailored design method was used as a guide for this study.

This sample was predominately female (80%), married (78.6%), received their certification through a traditional route (73%), held a master’s degree, and were an average age of 43 years. Georgia’s secondary business education teachers indicated a high level of general
job satisfaction (78.63). Many (43.3%) indicated they plan to retire as soon as they have taught for 30 years. Over one-half (51.4%) intend to leave the profession within ten years. A Pearson correlation matrix indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between general job satisfaction and salary. One-way ANOVAs comparing the intent to remain variable with the individual intrinsic and extrinsic MSQ scales indicated that the groups varied on the ability utilization, achievement, advancement, and responsibility intrinsic scales. Extrinsic scales indicating a statistically significant effect when compared with the intent to remain variable were company/school policies and practices and working conditions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction has been a topic of interest to business leaders in hopes of improving job production for decades. Job satisfaction can be defined as the degree to which a person’s work fulfills the individual’s needs (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). The idea is that the more satisfied a worker is with his or her work, the more focused he or she will be on producing more work and receiving that feeling of satisfaction. “Each of us strives towards some goals more persistently than towards others” based on the perceived amount of satisfaction the goal will provide (Beck, 2000, p. 31). Courses of action are chosen based on the potential to provide the greatest value or the most satisfaction. Teachers choose to stay in the profession or leave it based on an individual perception of the level of satisfaction continuing to teach will provide compared with other opportunities. “We look to the future, at the potential outcomes of choosing different possible courses of action” (Beck, 2000, p. 26).

Our nation is faced with an increasing shortage of teachers. Trapps (2001) expected the nationwide shortfall to reach 2 million teachers by 2011. This shortage results from a combination of retiring teachers, increasing student enrollment, and switching professions (Riley, 1999). With this shortage comes the challenge of recruiting quality teachers. In recent years, the teaching profession has experienced a low retention rate, with new teachers dropping out of the profession at a rate of 50% by the end of their first five years (Bobek, 2002; Coeyman, Jonsson, Teicher, & Wiltenburg, 2001; Hope, 1999; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003). “Many schools have not been able to retain the teachers they do hire”
(Coeymen et al., 2001, p. 1). Teachers are leaving the classroom to pursue other careers within three to five years of entering the education field (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Dawson, 2001; Ingersoll, 2002). This revolving door effect has led to an increased need to not only recruit new teachers, but to retain those new teachers and veteran teachers as well.

Due to the teacher shortage in Georgia, the Georgia Student Finance Commission expanded the HOPE Scholarship Program to include the HOPE Teacher Scholarship. The HOPE Teacher Scholarship is designed to help recruit potential teachers by paying for their education in return for years of service after degree completion. Despite this effort, shortages persist in many content areas including business education. The scholarship program is limited to fields identified as critical shortage fields such as science, math, English as a second language (ESOL), and special education (Georgia Student Finance Commission, 2002). The Georgia HOPE scholarship program has also implemented a program to pay for graduate work to enable teachers to seek advanced degrees and to allow persons interested in teaching to complete teacher preparation programs and earn professional certification while teaching.

Age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree held, salary level, marital status, certification route, and school location, were variables found in the literature review as the demographic variables commonly considered in studies of job satisfaction in general and job satisfaction of teachers. The literature was inconsistent in the results indicating which demographic variables had an effect on job satisfaction. Hadaway (1979), Stitt (1980), and Collins (1998) considered similar variables in their studies of job satisfaction of business educators and agriculture education teachers. Collins included age and years of experience teaching agricultural education in his study of job satisfaction of agricultural education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and found
none of these variables to be significantly correlated with the teacher’s degree of job satisfaction. Goetze (2000) looked at age, gender, highest education level, years in current position, years with current employer, years of work-related experience, and years in primary work location in her study of the impacts of job satisfaction, satisfaction with life, work environment, and selected demographic variables on the intent of workers in both traditional and non-traditional work environments to remain with a human relations/payroll organization and found no relationship between the variables and the level of general job satisfaction. Others (Beck, 2002; Bright, 2002; Ely, 1993; Haddad, 1989; Haywood, 1980; Stiles, 1993) considered age, education level, gender, number of years taught, and number of years in present school and found no effect on the level of job satisfaction. Harris & Associates (1995) considered school location and found suburban and rural teachers to be more satisfied with their jobs than urban teachers. Adams (1999), Barber (1980), Birmingham (1984), and Funderburg (1996) found gender to indicate that female teachers were more satisfied that male teachers. Conversely, Bishop (1996) found males tend to be more satisfied than females. The variable age was found to be related to job satisfaction by Funderburg and Barber indicating that older teachers at the secondary level were less satisfied with their jobs than younger teachers. Wofford (2003) found younger teachers to be more satisfied than older teachers and that job satisfaction increases linearly with age. Education level attained by the teacher indicated no relationship with job satisfaction according to Barber, Givens (1988), and Randall (1987). Years of teaching experience was found to affect the level of a teacher’s job satisfaction (Barber; Bishop; Givens; Randall; Richardson, 1983). Salary level was found by Barber, Bishop, Givens, Johnson (1995), and Randall to have an effect on the level of job satisfaction. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) normative data groups included “demographic characteristics of the norm group, including such variables as sex
[gender], age, education and tenure information” (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967, p. 5).

**Purpose of the Study**

The shortage of teachers in general and business education teachers in particular is expected to continue over the next decade (Pascopella, 2001). Georgia’s HOPE Teachers’ Scholarship placed business education on their critical shortage list in spring 1999 and business education remains on the 2002-2005 list (Georgia Student Finance Commission, 2004). The purpose of this study was to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. Business Education for the purpose of this study is defined as a secondary level school curriculum or program which offers students the opportunity to explore and prepare for occupations in the field of business (programs include: accounting, banking and finance, computer technology, web design, etc).

Much literature exists concerning job satisfaction and teacher job satisfaction. While there is a growing body of knowledge about job satisfaction of teachers and a limited body of knowledge concerning job satisfaction of business education teachers, there have been few studies completed concerning the job satisfaction of secondary business education teachers in Georgia. Since Business Education continues to remain on Georgia’s critical shortage list, it is important to study the job satisfaction and retention of Business Education Teachers in Georgia. Ruhland (2001) conducted a nationwide study of attrition and retention factors that influence newly hired secondary business education teachers. She found teacher retention to be influenced by five factors: a pleasant working condition, a positive teaching experience, a sense they are doing a good job, positive interactions with students, and adequate time to complete job
responsibilities. She further found a significant difference in those five factors among those who did not enter teaching or chose to leave as compared with those who remained in the teaching profession.

**Research Questions/Study Design**

In accordance with the purpose of this study, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. **What is the level of satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools based on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?**

2. **What is the relationship between job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools and personal and professional variables identified in the literature that may have an effect on the job satisfaction of teachers?** Those variables include: age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree attained, and salary level.

3. **What is the comparison between the intent to remain in the classroom of Georgia secondary business education teachers in public schools and select intrinsic and extrinsic scales of job satisfaction as identified by Herzberg?**

The data was collected using a personal data questionnaire and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The MSQ was used to gather job satisfaction data from Georgia secondary business educators. A personal data questionnaire surveyed attributes including age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree attained, salary level, marital status, route to certification (traditional or alternative), location of school currently teaching in (rural, urban, suburban) and intent to remain in the profession. Results of this study provide insight into key aspects of job satisfaction of
Georgia teachers who choose a career in secondary business education and their intent to remain in the field. The instruments were sent to a sample of the business education teachers on a list of secondary business education teachers provided by the Georgia Department of Education.

**Theoretical Framework**

The Theory of Work Adjustment developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) and the Two-Factor Theory developed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) provided the theoretical framework for this study. The Theory of Work Adjustment was developed at the University of Minnesota for use in the Work Adjustment Project that started in 1957. The major objectives of this project consisted of the development of diagnostic tools for assessing the work adjustment (job satisfaction) potential of applicants for vocational rehabilitation and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes. These tools included the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ), Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire (MJDQ), Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scales (MSS), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ).

The Theory of Work Adjustment addressed a variety of issues related to work adjustment including vocational choice, personnel selection, work motivation, employee morale, worker productivity, and job satisfaction (Weiss et al.). Weiss et al. theorized that job satisfaction is dependent upon how closely a person’s abilities match the requirements of the job and the degree to which the person’s needs are met by the reinforcers in the work environment.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was published in 1967 and revised in 1977. It is a well-known, often-used instrument and is well recognized as one of the best indications of job satisfaction. Normative scores for various occupational groups are included in the manual for the MSQ. Normative scores for teachers were only used as a part of the analysis in this study due to the length of time between when the norms were calculated and the date of
this study. Scores from each MSQ scale are converted to percentile scores to rate each individual’s level of satisfaction using the normative charts in the MSQ manual. Percentile scores of 75 or higher represent a high degree of satisfaction, scores of 26 to 74 represent average satisfaction, and scores of 25 or less represent low satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967). Percentiles were used in this study to determine the point scale for levels of satisfaction using the raw data.

The MSQ is written on a fifth-grade level, takes an average of 15-20 minutes to complete, and is self-administering (Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ long form consists of 100 items that measure 21 scales, the level of general job satisfaction and the levels of satisfaction on 20 scales. Each of the 20 satisfaction scales is measured by 5 items on the MSQ instrument. Twenty items including one from each of the 20 scales measure the general satisfaction scale. Responses to each item are on a five-point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied (a response of 1) to very satisfied (a response of 5). The total score for any individual scale may range from 5 to 25, with five indicating very dissatisfied and 25 indicating very satisfied. The 20 individual scales of the MSQ are ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social services, social status, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), variety, and working conditions.

Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1959) categorized variables affecting a worker’s job satisfaction into two factors: motivators or intrinsic factors and hygiene or extrinsic factors. Motivators or intrinsic factors include items such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. These motivators or intrinsic factors produced job satisfaction for the participants of the motivation to work study conducted by Herzberg (1966). Hygiene or
extrinsic factors are the major environmental aspects of work and may lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg). These extrinsic factors include pay, job security, work conditions, supervision, and interpersonal relations. According to Herzberg, “factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual’s need for self-actualization in his work” (Herzberg et al., p. 114). Table 1 lists the intrinsic and extrinsic MSQ scales used in this study.

Factor scales of the MSQ that correlate with Herzberg’s motivation or intrinsic factors include Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Recognition, and Responsibility. MSQ factor scales that correlate with Herzberg’s maintenance or extrinsic factors include Company/School Policies and Practices, Compensation, Co-Workers, Supervision-Technical, Supervision-Human Relations, and Working Conditions. Herzberg theorized that individuals were motivated more by intrinsic factors than extrinsic factors in their work. The Theory of Work Adjustment, which the MSQ was originally designed for, includes the idea that individuals are motivated more by intrinsic factors. Factor analysis of the MSQ for teachers indicated, “the first factor was ‘intrinsic satisfaction’” and “accounted for about two-thirds of the common variance” (Weiss, et al., 1967, p. 23). Emphasis was placed on Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory since it focused on job satisfaction where the Theory of Work Adjustment included job satisfaction only as a part of the whole theory.
Table 1

*Intrinsic and Extrinsic MSQ Scales Studied*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scale Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Ability utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Company policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision-human relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision-technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The general job satisfaction scale was also used in this study.

**Significance of the Study**

The theoretical significance of this study is its contribution to the understanding of job satisfaction of Georgia secondary business education teachers. The literature on job satisfaction and teacher job satisfaction had not focused on the secondary business education teachers and their satisfaction. By understanding the satisfactions of Georgia secondary business education teachers, educational leaders can provide more satisfying experiences in the work environment and help to retain quality teachers in the classroom as required by the *No Child Left Behind* education bill (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003).
This study is of practical significance to teacher educators, school principals, and career and technology supervisors seeking to recruit and retain dedicated business educators for the secondary classroom and individuals researching factors determining job satisfaction and their relationship to the retention of teachers.

Determining job satisfaction for an individual who chose teaching as a career, and more specifically to teach secondary business education, and remain in the field can provide insight into how to retain those quality candidates who enter the field. With the passing of the *No Child Left Behind* education bill, recruiting teachers who will remain committed to the classroom beyond only a few years and providing quality preparation programs and early years support is a challenge that must be addressed.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

The review of literature relevant to this study drew upon basic job satisfaction theories, teacher recruitment and teacher retention. Teacher shortage literature was included in this chapter as well.

Job Satisfaction

The literature on job satisfaction in general and teacher job satisfaction specifically provided the basis for using Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory to examine the job satisfaction of business education teachers. Maslow’s hierarchy, Herzberg’s Two-Factor and Vroom’s Expectancy Theories were the most prominent theories found in the literature for the study of teacher job satisfaction. Maslow’s hierarchy outlined the need stages of the individual. Vroom’s expectancy theory allowed for the idea that the individual will be motivated to complete a task if the outcome is both probable and desirable. The outcome satisfies a need of the individual.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Job satisfaction can be defined as the degree to which a person’s work fulfills the individuals’ needs (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). “Perhaps the most widely accepted description of human needs is the hierarchy of needs concept developed by Abraham Maslow” (Certo, 1997, p. 384). Maslow (1970) popularized the theory that motives are ordered from more basic to less basic needs. These needs are organized into a fairly definite hierarchy based on the principle of relative prepotency (Maslow 1987). Maslow’s theory implied that gratification is as important a concept as deprivation in motivation theory. A hierarchy of motives flows from physiological
needs such as hunger, to safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and need for self-actualization (Beck 2000, Certo 1997, Maslow 1987). Maslow stipulated that lower level needs must be met before upper level needs even come into play in a person’s life and that the same hierarchy applies to all individuals. “If all these [physiological] needs are unsatisfied, and the organism is then dominated by the physiological needs, all other needs may become simply nonexistent or be pushed into the background” (Maslow, 1987, p.16). Once these physiological needs have been met, other higher needs dominate the organism (Maslow, 1987). “Each of us strives towards some goals more persistently than towards others” (Beck, p. 31). Beck suggested that each individual has his or her own hierarchy of motives and that this hierarchy drives the choices an individual makes. Motivation plays a role in satisfaction in that “our actual on-the-job experiences influence our motivation and future behavior” (Petri, 1986, p. 350). Motivation is what gets an individual to exert the energy to accomplish a task; satisfaction is the feeling an individual experiences after the accomplishment is complete. If an individual approaches a similar task in the future and recalls the feeling of satisfaction, he or she will be more likely to perceive the task to be achievable and thus be more motivated to exert the energy to accomplish the new task. “A positive response to the correct completion of a task would certainly provide appropriate job satisfaction and serve as a motivator” (Stitt, 1980, p. 15).

**Schaffer’s Job Satisfaction Theory**

Schaffer (1953) developed a theory of job satisfaction based on psychological needs. Those needs included recognition, interpersonal relationships, achievement, dominance, social welfare, self-expression, socio-economic status, moral values, dependence, challenge, economic security, and independence. The strongest needs were determined to be challenge, achievement, and social welfare (Schaffer). The theory stated that an individual’s job will meet certain needs
for that employee and satisfaction will occur only if the individual employee believes the needs
to be important.

**Vroom’s Expectancy Theory**

Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory was based on the idea that an individual will perform
a certain act based on the perception of the outcome to be caused by that act. Vroom defined
expectancy as “a momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be
followed by a particular outcome” (p. 17). Expectancy is the perceived probability that a
particular amount of effort will be instrumental in achieving a goal valued by the individual
(Beck, 2000). Robbins (1997) described the theory:

> Expectancy theory argues that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends
> on the strength of an expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome and on
> the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual. (p. 57)

When choosing between alternatives involving uncertain outcomes, an individual’s behavior is
affected by his or her preferences as well as the degree to which he believes in the probability of
these outcomes (Vroom).

**Theory of Work Adjustment**

Another theory of job satisfaction is the theory of work adjustment (Dawis & Lofquist,
1984). The theory of work adjustment developed out of the research of the Work Adjustment
Project at the University of Minnesota. The major objectives of this project consisted of the
development of diagnostic tools for assessing the work adjustment potential of applicants for
vocational rehabilitation and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes. These tools included
the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ), Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire
(MJDQ), Minnesota Satisfactoriness Scales (MSS), and the Minnesota Satisfaction
Questionnaire (MSQ). The theory of work adjustment is a broad theoretical formulation which addresses problems related to work adjustment including vocational choice, personnel selection, work motivation, employee morale, and worker productivity (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). The theory was based on the concept of “correspondence between individual and environment” (p.54). Lofquist and Dawis (1991) defined correspondence as a “harmonious relationship between the individual and the environment” (p. 22). The individual brings with him or her certain skills and in return receives certain rewards from the work environment. These rewards include wages, prestige, and personal relationships (Dawis & Lofquist). The theory states that job satisfaction is dependent upon how closely a person’s abilities match the requirements of the job and how well the person’s needs are met by the reinforcers in the work environment (Stewart, 1984).

The MSQ was developed at the University of Minnesota for use in the Work Adjustment Project that started in 1957. Weiss et al. theorized that job satisfaction is dependent upon how closely a person’s abilities match the requirements of the job and the degree to which the person’s needs are met by the reinforcers in the work environment. According to Herzberg, “factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual’s need for self-actualization in his work” (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 114).

The MSQ was published in 1967 and revised in 1977. Normative scores for various occupational groups are included in the MSQ manual. Scores from each MSQ scale are converted to percentile scores to indicate each individual’s level of satisfaction using the normative charts in the MSQ manual. Percentile scores of 75 or higher represent a high degree of satisfaction, scores of 26 to 74 represent average satisfaction, and scores of 25 or less represent low satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967).
The MSQ is written on a fifth-grade level, takes an average of 15-20 minutes to complete, and is self-administering (Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ long form consists of 100 items that measure 21 scales, the level of general job satisfaction and the levels of satisfaction on 20 scales. Each of the 20 satisfaction scales is measured by 5 items on the MSQ instrument. Twenty items including one from each of the 20 scales measure the general satisfaction scale. Responses to each item are on a five-point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied (a response of 1) to very satisfied (a response of 5). The total score for any individual scale may range from 5 to 25, with five indicating very dissatisfied and 25 indicating very satisfied. The 20 individual scales of the MSQ are ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social services, social status, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), variety, and working conditions. The scales used for this study were ability utilization, achievement, advancement, company/school policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, recognition, responsibility, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), and working conditions. These scales were used because of their correlation with the intrinsic and extrinsic factors identified by Herzberg’s (1966) Two-Factor theory.

The MSQ has continued to be used through the years as a valid and reliable measure of job satisfaction. Studies of job satisfaction of which used the MSQ include Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967), the study for which the MSQ was developed; Hadaway (1978), Stitt (1980), Collins (1998), Goetze (2000), Alexeeff (2001), and Hancer (2001). Hadaway (1978), Stitt (1980), and Collins (1998) used the MSQ to measure the job satisfaction of teacher educators or career and technical teachers.
Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) categorized variables affecting a worker’s job satisfaction into two factors: motivators or intrinsic factors and hygiene or extrinsic factors. Motivators or intrinsic factors included such items as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. These motivators or intrinsic factors produced job satisfaction in the participants of the motivation to work study conducted by Herzberg (1966). Herzberg et al. (1959) conducted open-ended interviews with 203 accountants and engineers in the Pittsburgh area. The interviewers asked the accountants and engineers to discuss specific occasions where they felt particularly good or bad about their jobs. Analysis of the incidents revealed that intrinsic aspects of the job were related to the positive or good feelings about the job. Hygiene or extrinsic factors are the major environmental aspects of work and lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg). These extrinsic factors include pay, job security, work conditions, supervision, and interpersonal relations. The hygiene aspects of the job are related to the incidents of negative or bad feelings about the job reported in the interviews (Herzberg et al., 1959). Man’s need for self-actualization or growth depends on achievement in tasks that have meaning to the individual. “The motivators are task factors and thus are necessary for growth; they provide the psychological stimulation by which the individual can be activated toward his self-realization needs” (Herzberg, p. 78). The attitudes of the participants in Herzberg’s study toward the job exerted an extremely important influence on the way in which the job was done. Performance improved when job attitudes improved. It is primarily the motivators that serve to bring about the kind of job satisfaction and improvement in performance industry seeks (Herzberg et al.). Herzberg et al. noted “the profoundest motivation to work comes from the recognition of individual achievement and from the sense of personal growth in responsibility” (p. 125). Neither individual achievement nor a
sense of personal growth in responsibility is likely to flourish too well in a bureaucratic situation (Herzberg et al.). Implications of the study show an emphasis on the positive rather than a negative approach to the individual’s morale. Since it is the motivators that produce job satisfaction, “our emphasis should be on the strengthening of motivators” (Herzberg et al., p. 132).

Herzberg’s study of the motivation to work focused on the attitudes that participants held toward their jobs. Although attitudes are not the sole predictors of behavior, they can predict behavior rather well if they are measured properly (Beck, 2000). Beck lists the following factors that determine the extent to which attitudes predict behavior: the attitude measure is specific to an object or issue, the attitude measure is reliable (using standard measures of reliability such as evidence from previous research), non-attitudinal considerations do not override accurate attitude statements, survey sampling is appropriate, and the attitude does not change between the time the measure is collected and the predicted behavior is to occur.

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Strong motivation is “an essential ingredient in the formula for good teaching and depends fundamentally on the strength and quality of the satisfactions that can be derived from the enterprise itself” (Bess, 1977, p. 245). Due to the intrinsic nature of the work itself and the sense of accomplishment derived from it, the profession of education can provide much satisfaction to those employed in it (Medved, 1982). Studies of teacher job satisfaction focus on many differing aspects. Some look for levels of job satisfaction at a given point in time. Others seek to compare teacher job satisfaction in different geographical areas, rural or urban school settings, men and women, or teacher job satisfaction combined with other factors (Collins, 1998). Stiles (1993) studied the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job
satisfaction in the Gwinnett County public schools while Collins focused on describing the job satisfaction of agricultural education teachers in Georgia and to identify factors that might have influence on the possibility of them leaving the profession. Stiles found that there was a significant relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Collins found that approximately half (50.9%) of agricultural education teachers in Georgia’s public secondary schools had a low degree of general job satisfaction. According to Podsen (2002), “teachers measure their job satisfaction by such factors as participating in decision making, using their skills in ways that are valued, having freedom and independence, being challenged, expressing their creativity and having opportunities to learn” (p. 10).

Lortie (1975) completed a sociological study of teachers in Dade County, Florida, that dealt with varying organizational issues of teaching work and teacher sentiments toward daily tasks. He posited that although teachers are not unique in all aspects, teachers share a “special combination of orientations and sentiments” which are derived from occupational structure and “the meanings teachers attach to their work” (Lortie, p. viii). Results of Lortie’s study indicated that teachers consider psychic or intrinsic rewards as their major source of job satisfaction. The factor indicated as providing the most reward to teachers is “to feel that they have ‘reached’ their students” (Lortie, p. 106). According to Thompson (1979), “the answer to teacher motivation lies in intrinsic motivation. And intrinsic motivation belongs to self-determining teachers. It does not come from money” (p. 43). Maslow (1970) stated that higher, self-actualization needs only come into play after lower level needs are met. Salary levels and extrinsic rewards must be adequate to satisfy hygiene needs (Frase, 1989). Sullivan (2001) indicated that:

In order to maximize teacher motivation, conditions should be created that lead the teacher to perceive that he/she is competent of achieving the goal(s), is autonomous in
directing his/her energies, and that he/she feels emotional/socially/professionally
cconnected to the individuals related to the accomplishment of the goal(s). (p. 11)

Warr (1991) used a combination of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Brayfield and
Roth Index (BRI) to assess job satisfaction of secondary teachers in vocational/technical
education in the United States. The Job Descriptive Index asks respondents to respond to
questions concerning the feelings and perceptions the respondent has about the school in which
he or she teaches. There are sections related to teaching, pay, supervisor, promotion, and
coworkers. The Brayfield and Roth Index uses question about jobs. Warr found that satisfaction
with pay, supervision, age, and teaching were indicators of job satisfaction of
vocational/technical teachers. Overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with co-workers were
found to be prediction factors for intent to leave the profession.

Job Satisfaction of Business Educators

Little research that focused on business education teachers who remain in the classroom
or their job satisfaction was found. Teacher job satisfaction has been shown to be a predictor of
teacher retention (Shann, 1998) and a determinant of teacher commitment (Shann; Shin & Reyes,
1995). In a nationwide study of attrition and retention factors that influence newly hired
secondary business education teachers, Ruland (2001) found secondary business education
teachers to be influenced by five factors: a pleasant working condition, a positive teaching
experience, a sense they are doing a good job, positive interactions with students, and adequate
time to complete the job responsibilities. She further found a significant difference in those five
factors among those who did not enter teaching or chose to leave as compared to those who
remained in the teaching profession. With the current teacher shortages, especially in the area of
business education, it is important to determine what satisfies the needs of business education
teachers and motivates an individual to remain in the classroom. Georgia’s shortage has experienced some relief due to the decline in the economy (Blair, 2003; Sausner, 2003; Stripling, 2003). The shortage is likely to return when the economy begins to recover.

**Teacher Recruitment**

With the teacher shortage comes the challenge of recruiting quality teachers. “From New York City to Los Angeles, the world of urban teacher recruitment is getting more cutthroat while the country braces to attain more than two million teachers in the next 10 years” (Pascopella, 2001, p. 38). The problem is not that qualified teachers are so hard to find, but that there are better options than working in school systems that ignore individuals’ professional needs such as mentor support, on-the-job training, and professional development (Hinds, 2002). Many states and school districts are employing innovative and aggressive recruitment strategies, including signing bonuses, subscriptions to professional magazines, subsidized mortgages, job-sharing arrangements, laptop computers, and health club memberships (Peske, Liu, Johnson, Kauffman, & Kardos, 2001; Shure, 2001). Cities like New York and Atlanta are looking to the business world to fill teaching vacancies (Pascopella). The National Association of State Boards of Education (2002) found that 19 states and the District of Columbia offer incentives for recruiting teachers. Georgia has three incentive programs: a loan forgiveness program for teacher education students of programs in subject areas identified by the state as having a critical shortage of teachers, a signing bonus for teacher recruits willing to teach in high priority school, and incentive pay for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification.

California, Chicago, New York and North Carolina are looking abroad for teachers to fill teaching positions (Pascopella; Coeyman et al.). The Department of Labor and the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) opened the door for foreign recruitment in 1999 when the
federal government agreed to grant H1-B visas for foreign nationals to teach in American public schools (McCoubrey, 2001). As part of Chicago’s Global Educator Outreach Initiative, 44 international teacher candidates from 22 different countries were sponsored for the INS H1-B visas in 2000; and the initiative received 4,000 applications from over 90 different countries in 2001 (McCoubrey). Candidates were required to pass a written and oral English exam and be interviewed by the Chicago Public School system before they were hired.

In Georgia, international teachers are used in several metro Atlanta school systems including the City of Atlanta and Clayton, DeKalb, Douglas, Fayette, Fulton and Gwinnett counties (Burch, 2003). The Cobb County School Board recently voted to work with recruitment agencies that recruit internationally (MaryKay Fermanich, personal communication, March 28, 2003). The Cobb County plan would bring about 20 teachers from foreign countries to teach in local classrooms and live in the local communities for a period of three years (Burch).

Recruiting from abroad allows schools in the United States to draw from a pool where there is a surplus of teaching professionals, especially in the math, science, and technology areas (McCoubrey, 2001). One drawback to hiring foreign teachers is similar to those expressed for some other alternative certification programs: not enough preparation before the teacher is put in the classroom. According to McCoubrey, “Teaching is a demanding job, and many recruits have difficulty adjusting to American students and teaching styles” (p. 34). Another problem seems to be retention of these recruits due to homesickness and difficult adjustments. Seven of the 44 recruits in Chicago’s initial program returned to their home countries (McCoubrey). Some concerns expressed by members of the Cobb County (Georgia) Board of Education included language barriers due to thick accents and cultural differences that might cause foreign teachers to overreact to minor student behavior problems (Burch, 2003).
Alternative Certification

Most traditional teacher preparation programs require a four-year degree program that culminate with a student teaching experience. These programs are not providing enough candidates to fill classrooms throughout the United States and are causing many states and districts to look to alternative avenues for certification (Pascopella, 2001). Alternative teacher certification programs “rose out of a need for not only more, but also better, teachers” (Feistritzer, 1999, p. 2). About 10% of public school teachers hired during the past decade were initially hired without a license, and many more were hired on substandard certificates (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Alternative teacher certification began as a somewhat controversial concept. When the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) (2003) began surveying states concerning alternative routes for licensing teachers in 1983, only eight states reported having any way for individuals to become certified to teach other than the traditional college teacher education programs, compared with 46 states and the District of Columbia which now have alternative routes for teacher certification. Governors, state commissioners of education, deans of education and other political and educational leaders are in favor of some form of alternative certification (Feistritzer). Some states generate a large percentage of their new teachers from alternative route programs (Berry, 2001). People from various educational backgrounds and walks of life have the opportunity to become teachers through alternative teacher certification routes (Feistritzer).

In order to speed the process of getting teachers into the classroom, alternatives to the traditional certification and licensure are being used widely. Alternative certification programs are designed to meet the educational needs of working professionals and expedite the licensing process for individuals interested in teaching who already have a bachelor’s degree and expertise
in a particular subject matter (Glenn, 2003). Feistritzer (1999), president of NCEI, testified before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, “Alternative routes for preparing and licensing teachers are attracting large numbers of highly qualified, talented and enthusiastic individuals to the teaching profession” (p. 4). The individuals attracted by alternative certification routes are highly educated, life-experienced adults who want to teach and are interested in improving America’s educational system.

Alternative programs vary according to content, duration, rigor, and support. Many programs offer teacher candidates a short training course in classroom management, development of lesson plans and instruction, and an introduction to education, followed by education courses taken at night or on weekends during their first two years of teaching.

According to Berry (2001), there is a need for more alternative routes to teacher preparation and licensure in order to attract mid-career recruits into teaching, “but they must be good programs” (p. 33). Effective alternative preparation and licensure programs should last from 9 to 15 months and set the stage for novice educators to enter the teaching profession. These programs should include the following characteristics:

- Strong academic and pedagogical coursework that provides teachers with the subject matter and teaching knowledge needed to help students reach the state’s curriculum teaching standards;
- Intensive field experience in the form of an internship or student teaching under the direct daily supervision of an expert teacher;
- A requirement that candidates meet all of the state’s standards for subject matter and teaching knowledge for a standard certificate before becoming a teacher of record; and,
A guarantee that new teachers meet all of the state’s teacher quality standards, including passing the same assessments given their traditionally prepared counterparts. (Berry, p. 35)

Alternative certification programs in most states have entrance requirements that are at or above the requirements for those who received training through traditional preparation programs. Similar characteristics are emerging in all alternative routes that are being developed: hold at least a bachelor’s degree; pass a screening process which includes passing tests, interviews, and demonstration of mastery of the content to be taught; begin teaching early, usually full time, to be engaged in on-the-job training; complete professional education coursework or experiences while teaching; work with mentor teachers; and meet high performance standards (NCEI).

One national alternative route to teaching is Teach for America. The Teach for America program, created in 1990, recruits, trains, and places recent college graduates in low-income schools throughout the United States (Tell, 2001). The program requires the participants commit to remain in their school placement for at least two years. Teach for America is not without criticism. Tell described two counts of criticism that have been directed at the program: a lack of adequate training for such demanding conditions and that two years is not long enough to make substantial changes in schools that are already in a vulnerable situation. “Almost all of them [the teachers] have chosen to continue working far beyond their two years of service to expand opportunities for children in low-income communities,” is the response to the time period criticism from founder of Teach for America, Wendy Kopp (2000, p. 48). Sixty percent of the Fall 1999 Teach for America alumni group were still working full time in education, 37 percent are still teaching in 2000 (Kopp). Massachusetts has a similar training program called the Massachusetts Institute for New Teachers that is modeled after the Teach for America program.
This program, where one fifth of the new recruits leave teaching after the first year, has not enjoyed the same success keeping their recruits in the classroom as Teach for America (Tell).

Another program that follows the Teach for America model, Troops to Teachers, places military veterans in the classroom (Finn & Madigan, 2001). The Troops to Teachers program was launched in 1994 by the Department of Defense. Georgia is one of several states that have hired veterans for their classrooms utilizing this program. Offices for the Troops to Teachers program are housed in the Departments of Education in 20 states, those states with the most military bases. The Troops to Teachers program offices assist military veterans to “navigate the complexities of becoming licensed to teach and find a job where they want to live” (Bradley, 1998, p. 2). Troops to Teachers provides financial assistance for eligible individuals interested in moving from the military to a second career in teaching in the form of a stipend to help pay for teacher certification costs or a bonus to teach in a high-needs school (Georgia Troops-to-Teachers, 2003). Eighty percent of the participants hired between 1994 and 1997 were still teaching as of 1998 (Bradley, 1998).

In response to the shortage in Georgia caused by the “many teacher retirements planned and Georgia’s colleges producing significantly fewer educators than needed,” Georgia state officials designed an alternative route to certification to attract candidates with subject knowledge, but in need of teaching skills (Blair, 2001, p. 24). The Teach for Georgia program, now called Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (TAPP), seeks to train people from other professions for four weeks and then place them in the classroom while they work toward a master’s degree in education (Pascopella, 2001). Some schools participating in the TAPP program include Albany State University, Georgia State University, Georgia Southern University, Kennesaw State University, and North Georgia College and State University
(Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2002). TAPP participants can earn a master’s degree from these institutions during their first few years teaching. Participation in the TAPP programs requires a bachelor’s degree in an appropriate field, undergraduate grade point average (GPA) of 2.5, a passing score on the PRAXIS I or exemption scores, a criminal background check, and an offer of full-time employment in a teaching position from a participating school system to be considered eligible for the program (Georgia Professional Standards Commission).

The TAPP program requirements span over two years and include attendance in a minimum number of seminars during each year, content course work if needed, passing the program-area PRAXIS II, an achievement portfolio, and assessment from a teacher-candidate support team.

The program initially attracted such a large response to the e-mail address set up for non-teachers interested in the program that the e-mail server shut down (Coezman, Jonsson, Teicher, & Wiltenburg, 2001). After an extensive literature search, no data were found that reported the success rate of this program.

A Guide to Alternative Certification: Beginning a Career in Teaching for Mid-career Professionals (2003) listed three other programs recognized by the state of Georgia: the Business-to-Teaching program at the University of Georgia, Atlanta P.L.U.S. through Atlanta Public Schools, and Georgia Responds at the Georgia College and State University. These programs provided a more flexible manner for career changers to gain the required course work in order to become certified teachers in Georgia. These programs allowed an individual to obtain a provisional certificate so that the individual can begin teaching while finishing required coursework for full certification. A provisional certificate was a conditional certificate that indicates that the individual had completed subject content requirements, but needs to satisfy the
teacher education requirements to receive professional certification (A Guide to Alternative Certification, 2003).

Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Recruiting new teachers only partially addresses the teacher shortage issue. With the rising attrition and teacher shortages, “the general public should be gravely concerned about the retention and nurturing of high quality teachers” (Bobek, 2002, p. 202). Teacher retention is as important as teacher recruitment. Ingersoll (2002) compared the recruitment and retention issue to trying to fill a bucket with holes in the bottom. Since many new recruits leave the profession within five years, the shortage will continue to grow because the bucket never gets full. Retention of teachers is essential to meeting the long-term needs of our schools. “Retention, rather than recruitment, may lie at the heart of the teacher-quality issue” (Olson, 2000, p. 16).

New teachers improve dramatically during their first few years of teaching; and therefore, retaining teachers long enough for them to reach their full potential is critical (Olson). One-third to one-half of all new teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Hope; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003), thus retention of newly recruited teachers and veteran teachers becomes an issue that must be addressed. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) confirmed this in a recently released report titled No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America’s Children. According to NCTAF, “the real school staffing problem is teacher retention. Our inability to support high quality teaching in many of our schools is driven not by too few teachers entering, but by too many leaving” (p. 8). Increasing student enrollments, smaller classes, and retirements were often given as reasons for teacher shortages and that the supply of new teachers is not sufficient to keep up with the demand. NCTAF reported that the supply of teachers dramatically increased during the late
1990s and that “the problem is that we are losing teachers faster than we can replace them” (p. 22).

Chapman (1984) developed a model that suggested that teacher retention is a function of a teacher’s personal characteristics, educational preparation, initial commitment to teaching, quality of their first teaching experience, professional and social integration into teaching, and external factors. Together these six factors “influence career satisfaction, which in turn, relates to teachers’ decisions to remain in or leave teaching” (Chapman & Green, 1986, p. 273).

Chapman (1984) reported that individuals who had taught continuously reported a higher initial commitment to teaching, were more likely to have obtained additional education, and more often believed their educational experiences were well utilized in their employment than those who left teaching within five years or never taught. Chapman and Green surveyed 1,043 graduates of the University of Michigan who had received a teaching certificate at the time of their graduation. Survey respondents were classified into four groups: those who had taught continuously since graduation, those who started teaching after graduation but had taught intermittently, those who started teaching but then left the profession, and those who never taught. The results of the study supported Chapman’s model of retention, initial career commitment and early work experiences contribute to teacher retention. Chapman and Green (1986) also reported: “the results suggest that the attention administrators give to assuring the quality of professional life that new teachers experience can have long-term impacts on the career development of those teachers” (p. 277).

There are many reasons teachers leave the classroom. New teachers give these reasons for leaving: student discipline problems, lack of recognition and support, and low pay (Glenn, 1999; Olson, 2000). Ingersoll (2002) stated:
The data suggests that improvements in the conditions of the teaching job, such as increased support for teachers, increased teacher salaries, reduction of student misbehavior and enhanced faculty input into school decision making, would all contribute to lower rates of turnover. (p. 43)

Teacher support is a critical issue. Forty states addressed this issue by requiring or encouraging districts to create induction or mentoring programs for new teachers (Glenn, 1999; Olson, 2000). Induction programs are planned staff development for new teachers and teachers new to a school or district. Clement (2000) described induction as “an umbrella covering three areas—orientation before the school year begins, support seminars for the new teachers that are held throughout the first (and possibly second) year, and the mentoring of new teachers by trained veteran teachers” (p. 76). Orientation meetings provide the newly hired teacher with information about the district and school policies and procedures needed to do their job. Clement suggested providing a notebook with all the orientation handouts so new teachers can refer back to them as needed, but warns against making it an encyclopedia. The reference “should be user friendly” (p. 86). Continued support for new teachers is provided through seminars scheduled throughout the school year. Support seminars provide “ongoing training in teaching skills, further orientation to the school district and the teaching profession, and emotional support to the teacher” (Clement, p. 90). According to Clement, seminar topics might include organization and communication skills, stress management, classroom management strategies, teaching strategies, and dealing with students’ social and emotional problems. The Georgia Systematic Teacher Education Program (GSTEP) is a federally funded program that provides integrated, coherent teacher education experiences that begin when the student enters college and continue through their second year of teaching. GSTEP is a collaborative effort between Colleges of Arts and
Sciences and Education and practitioners to increase their involvement in the preparation of teachers. Curriculum, induction, early community experiences, and program evaluation are the four focus areas of GSTEP (Georgia Systematic Teacher Education Program, 2003). University, P-12, and agency partners in GSTEP include Albany State University, University of Georgia, Valdosta State University, Barrow County Schools, Clarke County Schools, Cook County Schools, Dougherty County Schools, Jackson County Schools, Madison County Schools, Professional Standards Commission, Board of Regents, Coastal Plains RESA, Northeast Georgia RESA, Southwest Georgia RESA, Oconee County Schools, Oglethorpe County Schools, and Valdosta City Schools.

The concept of mentoring is popular in many areas of business. Celebrities and politicians proclaim the advantages of mentoring, and young executive seek mentors as a means to climb the corporate ladder (Clement, 2000). Mentoring is a program where veteran teachers provide new teachers with structured support during their first few years of teaching. “Mentoring is a hot topic because of the potential for growth when a beginner is paired with a veteran who can serve as a guide, role model, friend, confidante, and even teacher to the novice” (Clement, p. 115). Its origin goes back to Greek mythology when Mentor, half-god and half-man, taught Odysseus’ son while Odysseus was away during the Trojan War (Olson, 2000). Mentors today, as Mentor in the days of Greek mythology, are to be a source of wisdom, right action, and support. The effective alternative certification routes discussed earlier include a mentoring aspect. In an interview for the Los Angeles Times, Segun Eubanks with the National Education Association explained,

A mentor is not somebody you have a cup of coffee with every other week to talk about your problems. A mentor is someone who is going to help you on a regular basis to
improve your skills and give you some feedback and help you with your craft in the classroom. (Trapps, A.22)

A mentor is like a coach; he or she encourages while giving advice for improving the skills teachers need to reach their full potential. Georgia’s Teacher Alternative Preparation Program includes a three-person support team as part of the induction plan with one member of this team being a school-based mentor (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2000). The new teacher candidate is required to meet with and be assessed by this support team periodically during the two-year induction program. New teachers are nearly twice as likely to leave teaching after their first three years if they have not participated in some type of mentoring program (Olson, 2000).

Low pay is another issue in teacher retention. Olson (2000) and Wilson (2000) reported the gap between the average annual salary of a young teacher and a non-teacher, both with only a bachelor’s degree, was $8,192 in 1998. “Overall, teachers salaries are about 20 percent below the salaries of other professionals with comparable education and training” (Darling-Hammond, 2003, p. 9). Although the salary gap between the teaching profession and other occupations is often significant, especially in rural and urban school, it is not new (Wilson, 2000). What is new are the options available to college graduates, especially women. Graduates are “choosing to enter high-tech jobs, instead” and “bypassing educational opportunities and moving into careers that promise them stronger salaries and more opportunities to travel” (Reising & Denlinger, 2002, p. 116). The gap between the average salary of a teacher and a non-teacher with the same level of education grows even larger as the two individuals age and acquire higher levels of education (Wilson). According to Wilson, “graduate studies yield only half the payoff for teachers as for individuals in other occupations” (p. 36). Reising and Denlinger argued that
higher salaries for teachers across America and a competitive job market will cause the teacher shortage to disappear and the quality of education to improve. Traditional motivational theories do not support this argument. Public Agenda (2000) addressed the issue of low salaries keeping people away. Although teachers do believe they are underpaid, raising teacher salaries by itself will not drastically change who enters the field of teaching. Olson stated, “Higher salaries might broaden the pool of potential teachers. But pay alone won’t keep them in the classroom” (2000, p. 10). Salaries become less of an issue the longer a person is in the teaching profession.

There is a large body of literature concerned with retaining new teachers; less attention has been given to retaining veteran teachers. Reductions in turnover would allow for relief from staffing issues as well as improve school performance due to teachers remaining in the classroom for longer periods of time. A task force established by the Professional Association of Georgia Educators (PAGE) Foundation issued suggestions for “keeping our best teachers” (Christmas, 2001, p. 17). The task force suggested limiting assignments to their area of concentration; developing smaller classes; providing a two-year induction program for beginning teachers; providing adequate resources including planning time, technology access, and support of local school administration, district staff, and the community; providing professional development that is focused on the teacher needs in order to improve student achievement; and providing opportunities for advancement without leaving the classroom (Christmas). Noble (2001) implored: “give us the tools and resources we need to get the job done for our children” (p. 5). Among those items listed by Noble are phones in the classroom, updated technology, more money budgeted for training, clerical help, a clean, safe environment to work in, and improved discipline both on the school grounds and on the buses. According to Public Agenda’s report, A Sense of Calling: Who Teaches and Why (2000), “What teachers most want is what they believe
will make them more effective in their work: smaller classes and much stronger support from administrators and parents” (p. 3).

Teachers who have left the profession expressed a lack of participation in the decision-making process for school environment as a reason they left. Ingersoll (2002) included enhanced faculty input into school decision making as a factor that would contribute to lower rates of turnover. “Working conditions, including influence over professional decisions, play an important role in determining who stays in teaching” (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 21). Creating a culture of learning and involving teachers in strategic decision making is crucial to increasing teacher job satisfaction (Martin & Kragler, 1999). Woods and Weasmer (2002) stated, “Teachers who claim a voice in moving toward organizational goals, increase their commitment to the district and enhance their job satisfaction” (p. 187).

Quality staff development is also an issue in retaining veteran teachers. Staff development needs to be an ongoing collaborative effort between teachers, administrators, and colleges of education (Clement, 2000). Workshops and in-service programs must be of value to the teacher. The district needs to look at the whole teacher and tailor learning opportunities to teachers’ needs at the various stages of their career. Clement suggested that veteran teachers need to be asked “how can the administration and board help you succeed at your job” and “what can we [administration and board] do to keep you working at our schools with our students” (p. 137). Asking these questions also allows the teacher to feel a part of the decision making process and contributes to improved working conditions.

Ruhland (2001) studied the factors influencing the retention of secondary business education teachers on the national level. The study identifies five factors important to retention of business education teachers: a pleasant working condition, a positive teaching experience, a
sense they are doing a good job, a positive interaction with students, and adequate time to complete job responsibilities. These five factors were significantly different for those who did not enter or chose to leave and those who remained in the teaching profession. Chapman’s retention model was supported by the results of the study conducted by Ruhland. Business education teachers who remained in teaching confirmed “teacher retention is a function of the first year teaching experience and professional and social integration into teaching” (Ruhland, p.11).

Feminization of the Career of Teaching

The feminization of teaching dates back to the development of the common school during revolutionary times. Sugg (1978) stated:

The changing estimate of human nature and its rights and capacities, the ambivalence toward authority whether institutional or intellectual, the emphasis on moral rather than intellectual training as the primary function of education, and the tendency to limit public education to the elementary level were all factors which incidentally predisposed Americans to accept the idea of woman as teacher. (p. 16)

The elementary school that was supported by both the elite in society and the common workingman was viewed as “an extension of the home rather than the first precinct of civil life” (p. 18). Thus it was appropriate for women to teach since this fit with the traditionally defined female role. Clifford (1991) described teaching as “within woman’s sphere’ –an extension of the maternal role as a child’s first and most important educator” (p. 117). The mother was seen as the primary instructor in the home because she spent so much time with the child during the
early years of development. The idea that elementary education was to focus on moral education instead of intellectual education paved the way for Americans to see women as teachers.

Society viewed teaching as an appropriate occupation for a young woman to occupy her time until she married and began a family (Clifford, 1991). This coming and going of young women caused a high turnover rate that normally would be seen as a negative in the world of work, but was seen as a positive where women and careers were concerned. When a woman married and vacated a teaching position, an opportunity opened for another young woman. Powerful ideologies tying together women with marriage and children while a man’s role was seen as the breadwinner helped this discriminatory system to continue (Acker, 1989). All levels of society began to allow their daughters to be trained as teachers. This provided the more elite of society’s young ladies with an income should the young lady not marry or become widowed. A high turnover rate for male teachers was an unfortunate, but acceptable, fact of life. In the late 1800s a young man might teach as an interim position between occupations or while he searched or prepared for his true occupation or in the event that he was unable to farm due to a handicap (Hoffman, 1981). The widespread acceptance of the high turnover rate of both male and female teachers was representative of the lack of commitment and importance nineteenth century society placed on education.

The first attempts at creating a state-supported system of common schools and a redefinition of the mission of schooling dates back to the mid 1800s (Hoffman, 1981). Hoffman credited three intertwined social changes for giving woman her new profession and education new respect: industrialization, immigration, and urbanization. The feminization of teaching can be explained somewhat by the theory of supply and demand. At a time when industrialization provided new opportunities for the sons of farmers, teachers were needed in newly developed
schools and school systems. “Educators seized the moment—mid-nineteenth century—to declare that women, the ‘natural’ teachers, should staff the graded schools” (Hoffman, p. 10). The growth in the numbers of immigrants coming to the United States made for increased population and increased demand for more teachers. The combination of industrialization and immigration increased urbanization as new immigrants and the sons of farmers moved closer to the cities to find better work in industry. Concern existed for the moral development of the immigrant child and the new industrialist child. Early school administrators decided that the untrained, temporary male teacher was unable to help develop student character. The new teachers would be “young women who loved books, were self-sacrificing, had an instinct for mothering, and sought dignified work” (p. 12). The first normal school or teacher’s college, Lexington Academy, opened in 1839 in Massachusetts. The normal school is where teaching as a profession for women was born (Hoffman).

Teaching became a career that required special training. Before the establishment of the normal schools, teaching only required that the teacher, male or female, have completed education only slightly beyond the level being taught. It was 1907 before the first state, Indiana, required that teachers be high-school graduates (Clifford, 1991). As the educational requirements leading toward teaching grew, the opportunity costs for men became more than they were willing to expend.

The mass entry of women into the profession in the middle nineteenth century caused teaching to be labeled “women’s work” and, thus, a second-rate profession (Hoffman, 1981). Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) developed a category called semi-professions that consisted of all the major women’s professions including teaching. Simpson and Simpson (1969) also identified teaching as a semi-profession.
Over the span of 100 years, 1870 to 1970, teaching remained in the top five on the list of the ten leading occupations of all women in the labor force (Clifford, 1991; Chavetz, 1997). “In the United States, 50% of all employed women are concentrated in four relatively poorly paid female occupations: registered nurse, clerk, retail-sales worker, and teacher” (Bookman, 2000, p. 93). Addressing the reasons for an early desire to become a teacher, Chavetz suggested a variety of sources having influenced a woman’s career choice. Television shows, books, and staffing patterns in schools all seemed to send the message: “teaching is for women” (p. 15). The woman teacher was one of the few models of the working woman with whom school girls had direct, prolonged experience (Clifford).

Clifford (1991) noted three demographic profiles of the American population in the nineteenth century that affected women’s educational and employment histories: the falling birth rate in the United States, the rising age of first marriage, and the growing population of permanently single American women. With the decline in the birth rate, women lived longer, healthier lives, and their daughters spent less time as mother’s helper and therefore had more time for education. As young women chose to postpone or avoid marriage, those equipped to teach could be self-supporting and decently occupied. “Teaching, with its missionary ideology and its image as an extension of mothering, could be accepted as a chosen alternative to marriage for a woman of the educated classes” (Hoffman, p. 11).

Teacher Shortage

There is an increasing teacher shortage in our nation. “By 2011, the shortfall nationwide is expected to reach 2 million teachers” (Trapps, 2001, p. A.22). This situation resulted from a combination of retiring teachers, increasing student enrollment, and switching professions (Riley, 1999). This shortage has been in the making for a long time and is only worsened by
legislation, although much needed, to reduce class size (Shure, 2001). Societal views of teaching, opportunities outside of teaching, and changing opportunities for women are also reasons for teacher shortages (Billingsley, 1993). According to Ingersoll (2002), “Problems of teacher quality and quantity are, indeed, among the most important issues in schools, but they are among the least understood” (p. 42).

Approximately 26% of secondary teachers are expected to retire in the next 12 to 15 years (Bandeira de Mello & Broughman, 1996). In recent years the teaching profession has experienced a low retention rate.). One-third to one-half of all new teachers leave the profession within the first five years (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Dawson, 2001; Hope, 1999; Ingersoll, 2002; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003). In its report, No Dream Denied, a Pledge to America’s Children, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTFA) reported that staffing shortages are most common in inner cities and in rapidly growing areas of the country such as the South and West.

Since new teachers improve dramatically during their first few years on the job, “it is critical to retain teachers for at least five or six years so that they can reach their full potential” (Olson, 2000, p. 10). If new teachers are leaving the profession before reaching their potential, students continue to experience less than the best quality educational practices. High attrition rates among career and technology teachers results in negative impacts on programs. Those impacts include programs that may be inconsistent, students who are less than prepared to compete in a global marketplace, and teachers who are less than qualified (Self, 2001). “The most serious consequence of high teacher turnover is that it erodes teaching quality and student achievement” (NCTAF, p. 33).
Shure (2001) stated, “this teacher shortage knows no boundaries as it is affecting public and private schools, urban and rural schools alike, specifically in areas of special education, mathematics, science, foreign language study, bilingual education and, even career and technical education” (p. 19). U. S. teacher education institutions graduated approximately 2,800 licensed technology teachers between 1995 and 1998 (Ritz, 1999). Weston (1997) found that the technology education profession would need an estimated 13,000 technology education teachers by 2001. This leaves a shortage of over 10,000 technology teachers. Supply and demand is a critical issue in career and technical education. The current slump in the economy seems to be easing the teacher shortage (Blair, 2003; Sausner, 2003; Stripling, 2003). Sausner, as well as Blair, stated that the demand had decreased due to budget issues. Stripling pointed out, “the soft economy means more people are willing to work for teacher’s pay” (p. 20). As the economy improves, the risk of the return of teacher shortages increases.

Until recently, Georgia was also experiencing a shortage of teachers. While metro Atlanta counties are experiencing an ease in the number of teacher vacancies, “vacancies persist elsewhere in Georgia” (Blair, 2003, p. 10). A shortage of teachers is a threat not only due to large percentages of teachers becoming eligible for retirement, “but also from private industry that is heavily recruiting teachers with expertise in science, math, and other technical fields” (Badertscher, 2001). Due to the teacher shortage, the Georgia Student Finance Commission (2000) expanded the HOPE Scholarship Program to include the HOPE Teacher Scholarship. The HOPE Teacher Scholarship allows teachers to participate in a loan forgiveness program based on critical shortage need areas. The loan is repaid by a year of service for every $2,500 of funds received from the program toward an advanced degree in a critical shortage area (Georgia Student Finance Commission, 2000). Georgia’s business education teacher shortage prompted

The national teacher shortage extends to business education. The fact that as many as 50% of business education teachers are close to retirement and the drop in the number of graduates from business teacher preparation programs over the past 10 years are two reasons for this shortage of business teachers (Okula, 1999). The demand for secondary business education teachers exceeded the supply by 64% in 1997-1998, up from 8% in 1991-1992 (LaBonty, 1999). Many young graduates are choosing to enter the business world where they can obtain a higher-paying job instead of choosing to teach. Graduates have more options now than 20 or 30 years ago, “becoming an engineer or computer business person is more lucrative than teaching about it” (Pascopella, 2001, p. 38). Older, mid-life individuals who are interested in a career change are faced with difficult, time-consuming, and costly certification requirements imposed by many states.

Summary

Hopefully, by studying the job satisfaction of secondary business education teachers and their intent to remain in the classroom, administrators and business teacher educators can provide those satisfying experiences for more secondary business education teachers and help keep them committed to remain in the classroom. When individuals become motivated, they exert energy toward a goal and enjoy satisfaction once the goal is attained and the anticipated reward is received. As stated before, individuals tend to approach activities they feel will be beneficial to them. “Teachers who are satisfied with their careers tend to remain in the profession longer” (Ruhland, p. 215).
CHAPTER 3
METODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) was used to measure job satisfaction levels. A personal data questionnaire surveyed attributes including gender, age, years employed at present school, total years teaching, highest degree attained, salary level, route to certification (traditional college teacher preparatory program or an alternate route), location of school currently teaching in (rural, urban, suburban), and level of intent to remain in the classroom. Huberty and Petoskey (1999) stated, “Such information, as much as is obtainable, should be reported in any survey study” (p. 16). Table 2 lists each variable and the corresponding measurement.

This chapter addresses the research methods that were used to conduct this study. Population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis of the data are also addressed.

Survey Research

Survey research is a method of using questionnaires or conducting interviews to collect data from participants in a sample about their characteristics, experiences, and opinions. The purpose of survey research is to use data collected by questionnaire or interview to generalize the
Table 2

Variables and Their Response Codes/Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Response Codes/Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction (DV)</td>
<td>General satisfaction raw scores from the MSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (IV)</td>
<td>Actual number of participant’s age at last birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (IV)</td>
<td>0=Male; 1=Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years @ present institution (IV)</td>
<td>Actual number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years teaching (IV)</td>
<td>Actual number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years employed outside teaching (IV)</td>
<td>Actual number of years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree held (IV)</td>
<td>1=Bachelor’s; 2=Master’s; 3=Specialist; 4=Doctor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary level (IV)</td>
<td>1=25,000-29,999; 2=30,000-34,999; 3=35,000-39,999; 4=40,000-44,999; 5=45,000-49,999; 6=50,000-54,999; 7=55,000-59,999; 8=over 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (IV)</td>
<td>0=Single; 1=Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification route (IV)</td>
<td>0=Traditional; 1=Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Location (IV)</td>
<td>1=Rural; 2=Urban; 3=Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to remain (IV)</td>
<td>1=Leave at end of current school year; 2=Teach for several years before leaving teaching; 3=Retire as soon as I have 30 years in; 4=Teach as long as I can beyond 30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable = DV; Independent Variable = IV

findings to a population represented by the sample group of participants (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Due to the cost involved in conducting interviews and the nature of this research study, questionnaires were used to collect data from the participants. Questionnaires are used to collect descriptive data or data that reveals a participant’s opinions, values, attitudes, and intentions, or
both descriptive and attitudinal data (True, 1989). The questionnaires used for this study
collected both descriptive data and attitudinal data.

An advantage of survey research is that it allows the researcher to collect a large amount
of information from a large group of people at a relatively inexpensive cost (Salant & Dillman,
1994). Other advantages include the fact that all the participants are asked the same questions,
large geographical areas can be covered easily, participants can fill out at their convenience, and
“private” information that is usually difficult to collect can be reported. One disadvantage of the
research method is limited questionnaire length (Salant & Dillman). Dillman (2000) suggested
questionnaires be made to appear short and easy. Including a statement in the cover letter that
indicates, “responding should only take a few minutes” (Dillman, p. 18) can enhance the
appearance of ease of completion. Another disadvantage is that the researcher cannot control
participation and therefore runs the risk of possible low response rates.

Dillman (1978) developed the Total Design Method (TDM) for mail and telephone
surveys in 1978. The TDM for mail surveys looked at each aspect of the survey process and the
organization of the survey efforts in order to attempt to maximize the response rate obtained.
Since 1978, Dillman (2000) updated his methods, reevaluating each aspect of the TDM and
developing the Tailored Design Method. Dillman (2000) describes the Tailored Design as
follows:

the development of survey procedures that create respondent trust and perceptions of
increased rewards and reduced costs for being a respondent, which take into account
features of the survey situation and have as their goal the overall reduction of survey
error. (p. 27)
The TDM used one basic method for all survey situations. Dillman’s Tailored Design allows the researcher to account for survey sponsorship, population, and content.

In the description of the Tailored Design, Dillman stated survey procedures should have reduction of survey error as a goal. There are five types of errors that a researcher using survey methods must attempt to control in planning the research project: sampling error, selection error, frame error, non-response error, and measurement errors (Salant & Dillman, 1994). Rojewski (2001) suggested use of an up-to-date list as a control for frame errors. Using a random sampling method can control sampling error, or the chance of having a sample that is not representative of the population. Purging the list of duplicates controls the chance of some sampling units having a greater chance of being selected for participation than others, or selection error. Comparing early responders to late responders can control non-response error. Using suitable, reliable, and valid instruments controls measurement errors. Dillman’s (2000) Tailored Design was used as a guide for this study.

**Population and Sample Selection**

Participants in this study consisted of secondary business education teachers in the state of Georgia. A list of business educators and their addresses was obtained from the Georgia State Department of Education in January 2004. Rojewski (2001) suggested use of an up-to-date list as a control for frame errors, thus the list was obtained at the latest possible date in order to have the most up-to-date information. This list contained 1,601 names and addresses. The names of those identified as teaching in elementary schools (n=6), middle school (n=283), post-secondary (n=25), state level FBLA coordinator (n=1), and duplicated names (n=2) were removed from the list before the sampling process began. Duplicate names were removed to control selection error.
The remaining 1,284 names and addresses constituted the population from which the sample was drawn.

Using a random sampling method can control sampling error, or the chance of having a sample that is not representative of the population (Rojewski, 2001). A systematic random sample was used to determine the sample for this study. The researcher using a systematic sample goes through an ordered list of members of the population and selects every \( n \)th person on the list where the number of entries on the list skipped is determined by the combination of the size of the desired sample and the actual population size (Gall et al., 1996; Huck, 2000; Moore, 2000). A table of random digits was used to select the first participant (3) and every fourth (1284/297) person on the list was selected to receive the survey packet. According to Huck (2000), “so long as the starting position on the list is determined randomly, each entry on the full list has an equal chance of ending up in the sample” (p.120).

It was estimated that 297 participants were needed to be able to generalize to the population of Georgia secondary business education teachers (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Although Dillman (2000) suggested rates of return in the 70-77 % range, a more conservative estimated rate of return of 50 % was used for this research. Using an anticipated rate of return of 50 %, 594 surveys were sent to the sample population. A total of 293 surveys were returned completed for a response rate of 49.33 %.

This sample of Georgia’s secondary business education teachers was predominately female (80%). Participants ranged in age from 23 to 67 with an average age of 43 years and a standard deviation of 10.43. Almost one third (32%) of the sample was over 50 years of age. Age distributions for the sample included 35 (13%) in the 20-29 age bracket, 62 (23%) in the 30-39
age bracket, 89 (32%) in the 40-49 age bracket, 75 (27%) in the 50-59 age bracket, and 13 (5%) in the over 60 age bracket.

The majority of teachers were married (78.6%). Most of the teachers received their certification via the traditional route (73%) of certification, upon completion of a bachelor’s degree, as opposed to receiving their certification through an alternate route (27%), post-bachelor master’s degree. Of the 283 participants who indicated their level of education 27.9% (n = 79) held at least a bachelor’s degree, 46% (n = 132) held a master’s degree, 22.5% (n = 66) held a specialist degree, and 2.1% (n = 6) held a doctorate degree.

School location as identified by the participant was 42.8% rural, 14.5% urban, and 42.8% suburban. The salary levels were evenly distributed among the ranges with the exception of the lowest salary level, which had the least participant responses. Point seven percent (n=2) of the participants indicated making in the $25,000-29,000 range, 9.3% (n=26) indicated making in the $30,000-34,999 range, 15.7% (n=44) indicated making in the $35,000-39,999 range, 15.3% (n=43) indicated making in the $40,000-44,999 range, 15.3% (n=43) indicated making in the $45,000-49,000 range, 18.5% (n=52) indicated making in the $50,000-54,999 range, 7.8% (n=22) indicated making in the $55,000-59,999 range, and 17.4% (n=49) indicated making in the over $60,000 range.

Participants had an average of 14.53 total years teaching with as few as 1 year or as many as 49 years reported. The average for years at the present institution was 8.65 years with the minimum number reported as .5 and the maximum number reported as 32 years. Years employed outside teaching ranged from 0 years to 40 years with an average of 6.57 years. Table 3 shows the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation for these variables.
Table 3

*Years Teaching Total, Present Institution, and Years Outside Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Years Teaching</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Present Institution</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Employed Outside Teaching</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 285 participants responding to the total years teaching survey item, 42.5% (n = 121) reported having nine years or less of teaching experience, 25% (n = 71) reported having 10 to 19 years, 22.5% (n = 64) reported having 20 to 29 years, and 10% reported having taught 30 years or more. Sixty-eight percent (n = 191) of the respondents reported nine years or less at their present institution, 19% (n = 55) reported 10 to 19 years, 12% (n = 34) reported 20 to 29 years, and 1% (n = 3) reported more than 30 years at their present institution. A total of 266 responses to the years employed outside teaching survey item revealed that 25% (n = 66) of those responding had not worked outside of the teaching profession, 48% (n = 128) reported having worked outside the classroom from 1 to 9 years, 16% (n = 43) reported 10 to 19 years, 9% (n = 25) reported 20 to 29 years, and 2% (n = 4) reported working 30 years or more outside the teaching profession.

The area employed outside teaching survey item produced a variety of responses. A list of responses to this item was provided to five individuals knowledgeable in both business and business education to cluster related items in order to reduce the data to a more reasonable form. Once the data were reduced, seven cluster groups emerged: accounting (14%), business (19%), secretarial (17%), marketing/sales (6%), military/government (4%), education/daycare (4%) and
other (36%). It should be noted that some gave multiple responses to this item and are included in more than one of the cluster groups. The other cluster included a wide variety among responses such areas as construction, legal, real estate, insurance, consulting, restaurants, librarian, service, landscaping, publishing, ministry, airlines, technology, and factories.

**Instrumentation**

The instruments used in this study were the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) and a researcher-developed personal data questionnaire. The MSQ was used to measure job satisfaction of the participants. The personal data questionnaire was used to gather descriptive data on the participants and for use in conjunction with the second and third research questions.

Selection of the MSQ as the instrument to measure job satisfaction was based primarily on two factors: it was designed to measure job satisfaction and it has been used previously to measure job satisfaction of teachers. It is a well-known, often-used instrument and is recognized as one of the best indicators of job satisfaction. Studies of job satisfaction of which used the MSQ include Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967), the study for which the MSQ was developed; Hadaway (1978), Stitt (1980), Collins (1998), Goetze (2000), Alexeeff (2001), and Hancer (2001). Hadaway (1978), Stitt (1980), and Collins (1998) used the MSQ to measure the job satisfaction of teacher educators or career and technical education teachers. The MSQ was developed at the University of Minnesota for use in the Work Adjustment Project that started in 1957. The major objectives of this project included the development of diagnostic tools for assessing the work adjustment (job satisfaction) potential of applicants for vocational rehabilitation and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes. Weiss et al. theorized that job satisfaction is dependent upon how closely a person’s abilities match the requirements of the job.
and the degree to which the person’s needs are met by the reinforcers in the work environment. According to Herzberg, “factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy the individual’s need for self-actualization in his work” (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 114).

The MSQ was published in 1967 and revised in 1977. Normative scores for various occupational groups are included in the manual for the MSQ. Scores from each MSQ scale are converted to percentile scores to rate each individual’s level of satisfaction using the normative charts in the MSQ manual. Percentile scores of 75 or higher represent a high degree of satisfaction, scores of 26 to 74 represent average satisfaction, and scores of 25 or less represent low satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967). Percentile conversions were be used for comparison to the normative data in the MSQ manual for teachers as a part of the analysis for research question one which describes the job satisfaction of the sample and to establish which raw scores indicate high, average, and low levels of satisfaction.

The MSQ is written on a fifth-grade level, takes an average of 15-20 minutes to complete, and is self-administering (Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ long form was used for this study. Weiss et al. strongly recommended that the long form be used unless the researcher finds that “the 15-20 minutes required by the long form to be absolutely impractical” (p. vii). The long form consists of 100 items that measure 21 scales, the level of general job satisfaction and the levels of satisfaction on 20 scales. Each scale of the 20 satisfaction scales is measured by 5 items on the MSQ instrument. Huberty and Petoskey (1999) suggested the use of composite groups of items to measure a single item stating that the, “use of a single item measure may be questionable in terms of validity and reliability” (p. 17). Twenty items including one from each of the 20 scales measure the general satisfaction scale. Responses to each item are on a five-point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied (a response of 1) to very satisfied (a response of 5).
The total score for any individual scale may range from 5 to 25, with five indicating very dissatisfied and 25 indicating very satisfied. The 20 individual scales of the MSQ are ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social services, social status, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), variety, and working conditions. Table 4 describes each intrinsic and extrinsic scale using the satisfaction item that correlated highest with scale score for a group of 1,793 employed individuals (Weiss et al., 1967). The general satisfaction scale is comprised of one item from each of the 20 scales of the MSQ.

Table 4

MSQ Scales and Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Title</th>
<th>Satisfaction Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability utilization</td>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get form the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company policies and practices</td>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Title</td>
<td>Satisfaction Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-human relations</td>
<td>The way my boss handles his men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-technical</td>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>The working conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Comprised of 1 item from each of the 20 scales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiss et al., 1967, p. 1-2)

The MSQ scales that correlated with those intrinsic and extrinsic factors identified by Herzberg were used in this study. Those intrinsic factors included Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Recognition, and Responsibility. Those extrinsic factors included Company/School Policies and Practices, Compensation, Co-Workers, Supervision-Technical, Supervision-Human Relations, and Working Conditions.

Permission was requested to use the MSQ for this study and to modify certain individual MSQ items to be more appropriate for this population (see Appendix A). The wording was changed on 18 of the 100 MSQ items. Two examples of these changes follow:

Question 10: Change from “The way my supervisor and I understand each other.” To read “The way my department chairperson and I understand each other.”

Question 29: Change from “Company policies and the way in which they are administered.” To read “School policies and the way they are administered.”

Hadaway (1978), Stitt (1980), and Collins (1998) made similar changes when they used the MSQ.
Research of various occupational groups including teachers was used to determine the content validity of the MSQ. According to Weiss et al. (1967), factor analysis results:

indicated that about half of the common MSQ scale score variance can be represented by an extrinsic satisfaction factor, defined by the two supervision scales, company policies and practices, working conditions, advancement, compensation and security. The remaining scales define one or more intrinsic satisfaction factors, accounting for the other half of the common variance. (p. 23)

Norms for teachers as an occupational group have been established and this served as evidence of reliability of the MSQ and its appropriateness as the instrument used in this study. Factor analysis for teachers indicated, “the first factor was intrinsic satisfaction” and “accounted for about two-thirds of the common variance” (Weiss et al., 1967, p.23). The two Supervision scales and Co-workers and Recognition, giving the appearance of being related to people as a source of satisfaction, defined the second factor for teachers.

Internal consistency of the MSQ was established using Hoyt’s analysis of variance method for 27 occupational groups (Weiss et al., 1967). Hoyt reliability coefficients for teachers ranged from the high 70’s to the low 90’s for the 20 scales and the standard error of measurement was less than 2 points on each of the 20 scales. Appendix B presents the normative data and summary statistics for teachers. A test-retest correlation of the scores on the 20 MSQ scales, excluding the general satisfaction scale, range from .66 to .91 for the one-week interval and .35 to .71 for the one-year interval. The test-retest correlation for general satisfaction scale scores resulted in a .89 coefficient for the one-week interval and a .70 coefficient for the one-year interval. These high reliability indexes indicated minimal error variance. The MSQ has shown a reasonable level of reliability over time and was thus considered a reliable instrument.
for use in this study. Reliability for this study was determined using Cronbach’s Alpha.

Reliability for the 20 scales and the general satisfaction scale was .941. Reliability for the five intrinsic scales, six extrinsic scales, and the general job satisfaction scale analyzed in this study was .898.

Personal Data Questionnaire

The researcher-designed personal data questionnaire (see Appendix C) was used to collect basic demographic data on the sample of Georgia secondary business education teachers: data on specific variables identified in the literature as having an effect on job satisfaction and data on the individuals’ intent to remain in the teaching profession. Collins (1998), Stitt (1980), and Hadaway (1978) collected similar demographic data. The personal data questionnaire included the following items: gender, age, highest degree attained, route taken to certification, total years teaching, years at present institution, location of school where currently teaching, years employed outside teaching, area of that employment, marital status, salary range, and intent to remain in the teaching profession.

Intent to remain in teaching was measured by a choice of four responses: leave at the end of the current school year, teach several years before leaving teaching; retire as soon as I have 30 years in; or teach as long as I can beyond 30 years. These stems were adapted from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Schools and Staffing Survey (Bobbitt, Leich, Whitener, & Lynch, 1994). The NCES Schools and Staffing Survey asked the question, “How long do you plan to remain in this job” (p. 82), with the response choices as: As long as I am able; Until I am eligible for retirement; Will probably continue unless something better comes along; Definitely plan to leave as soon as I can; Undecided at this time. The state of Georgia allows teachers to retire after completion of 30 years of service. In order to distinguish between those whose intent
to remain only until they are eligible for retirement and those who intend to teach as long as possible, the response stems were adjusted to reflect the 30 year marker. By including this benchmark in the stem, it allowed years remaining to be calculated for each participant in those response categories by subtracting the total number of years teaching from 30 years for those indicating that they plan to leave teaching as soon as they have 30 years in and are eligible for retirement. By doing this calculation, an indication of how many of the respondents would be leaving within several years as a result of retirement was provided. The number of years remaining for those who indicated that they plan to teach as long as possible beyond the 30 years was calculated by subtracting the total number of years teaching from 50, the maximum number of total years teaching reported plus one.

Data Collection Procedures

Before data collection began, permission was sought from the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research Involving Human Subjects. The application was submitted on December 20, 2003. The IRB approved all aspects of the research process that involved human subjects. The approval form can be found in Appendix D.

Each participant was sent a packet that includes a cover letter (see Appendix E), the Personal Data Questionnaire (see Appendix C), and the MSQ. Instructions for completing the instruments were contained both in the cover letter and on the individual questionnaires. A well-constructed, easy-to-complete questionnaire is only part of the plan and is not the main determinant of response to mail surveys. Implementation procedures that influence response rates include: “multiple contacts, the contents of letters, appearance of envelopes, incentives, personalization, and sponsorship and how it is explained” (Dillman, 2000, p. 149). Participants were contacted three times over the course of this research study. The cover letters were
performed, stressed the importance of each participant’s response, and explained that the research was being conducted through the University of Georgia.

The questionnaires were sent via the U.S. postal service on February 5, 2004, and included a stamped, pre-addressed return envelope. A deadline of February 26, 2004, was included in the cover letter in an effort to increase the speed of questionnaire return (Whipple & Muffo, 1982). A follow-up mailing was sent on February 26, 2004, to any participant who had not responded. Successive follow-up reminders have been shown to increase response rates (Dillman, 2000; Whipple & Muffo). A follow-up cover letter (see Appendix F) requested that participants return the survey packet by March 18, 2004. A postcard follow-up (see Appendix G) was mailed on March 18, 2004, to any participant who had still not responded. Two weeks from the date of the postcard follow-up mailing, March 30, 2004, were allowed for any responses to be returned. In order to account for non-responders, all responses received from the initial mailing were considered early responders and any responses received after the February 26 follow-up mailing were coded as late responders. Intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction scales as identified by Herzberg for early and late responders were analyzed to determine if there was a difference in their responses that might affect research outcomes. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level in early and late responders on any of the eleven tests conducted.

Data Analysis Procedures

Several methods of statistical analysis were utilized in this study. The analysis of data began with descriptive statistics. These statistics created a description of business education teachers currently teaching in Georgia’s secondary public schools, their levels of satisfaction,
and their intent to remain in the teaching profession. The statistical procedures calculated for each variable were means, standard deviations, and frequencies.

A Pearson correlation matrix was created to determine the strength of the relationships between the individual MSQ scales that correlate with Herzberg’s intrinsic and extrinsic factors and general job satisfaction. Those factors included intrinsic factors of ability utilization, achievement, advancement, recognition, and responsibility and extrinsic factors of company/school policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, and working conditions. Pearson correlation coefficients were also calculated for specific variables identified in the literature (age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree attained, salary level) that may affect job satisfaction to determine the strength of their relationship to the overall satisfaction of the participants.

Individual ANOVA’s were calculated for each of the intrinsic and extrinsic scale scores and the intent to remain in the classroom. A familywise analysis was calculated for the intrinsic and extrinsic scales identified by Herzberg for comparison with the intent to remain in the classroom of Georgia secondary business education teachers in public schools. A Bonferoni adjustment (Huck, 2000) was calculated in order to hold the overall alpha for the familywise comparison to .05.
The purpose of this study was to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. This chapter will address the data analysis performed for each of the three research questions.

Job Satisfaction

Research Question one asked, “What is the level of satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools based on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)?” Job satisfaction was measured using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Georgia secondary business education teachers are generally satisfied with their job. The general satisfaction scale of the MSQ indicated an average score of 78.63 for this sample population. Norms for teachers provided in the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire indicated an average satisfaction score of 82.14 (Weiss et al., 1967). According to the manual a score of “75 or higher is ordinarily taken to represent a high degree of satisfaction” (Weiss et al., p. 5). General satisfaction scale scores ranged from 20 to 100 with a standard deviation of 10.81. Each MSQ scale was comprised of five items on the instrument. Scale scores on the MSQ ranged from 5 to 25 with responses to each item ranging from a 1 for very dissatisfied to a 5 for very satisfied. The responses were totaled for each item to get the composite raw scores (Weiss et al., 1967; Huberty & Petoskey, 1999). Scale scores for this study included those scales identified by Herzberg as intrinsic or extrinsic. Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics for those intrinsic and
extrinsic scales. Scales with the highest mean score included ability utilization (21.26), achievement (21.00), and responsibility (20.50), all identified by Herzberg as intrinsic in nature.

Table 5

*Intrinsic and Extrinsic Descriptive Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization (au)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement (ach)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement (adv)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (rec)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (res)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company (school) Policies And Practices (cpp)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (com)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers (cw)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Human Resources (shr)</td>
<td>285*</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-Technical (st)</td>
<td>285*</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions (wc)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Min and Max for all scales were 5 and 25.) *Six MSQ instruments returned indicated that they were the department head or marked these items with n/a.
Scales with the lowest mean score included company (school) policies and practices (16.62) and compensation (16.43), both identified by Herzberg as extrinsic in nature.

Authors of the MSQ instrument suggested that scales with scores over 75% (18.75 points) represent a high degree of satisfaction, while scores below 25% (6.25 points) represent a low level of job satisfaction (Weiss et al., 1967). None of the scales considered in this study indicated a low level of job satisfaction. All of the scale scores fell within the average (6.26-18.74 points) satisfaction range or the high (18.75-25 points) satisfaction range indicating that overall Georgia’s secondary business education teachers are experiencing a high degree of job satisfaction. Intrinsic scales that fell into the high degree of satisfaction range included ability utilization, achievement, and responsibility. Extrinsic scales that fell into the high degree of satisfaction range included co-workers, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, and working conditions. Intrinsic scales that fell into the average satisfaction range included advancement and recognition. Extrinsic scales that fell into the average satisfaction range included company (school) policies and practices and compensation scales.

**Personal and Professional Variables**

Research question two asked, “What is the relationship between general job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools and personal and professional variables identified in the literature that may have an effect on the job satisfaction of teachers?” Those variables include: age, gender, years in present institution (yearsipi), total years teaching (yearstch), years employed outside teaching (outyrs), highest degree attained (hdgr), and salary level (salary).

A Pearson correlation matrix was constructed to determine the strength of relationship between each of these variables and job satisfaction using the general satisfaction scale score
from the MSQ as the measure for job satisfaction. The correlation coefficient of determination for the relationship between general job satisfaction and salary was statistically significant ($r^2 = .02$) at the .05 level. None of the other variables showed a statistically significant relationship with general job satisfaction.

Since salary showed a statistically significant relationship with general job satisfaction, it is worth noting the other variables that indicated a statistically significant relationship with salary even though they did not indicate a statistically significant relationship with general job satisfaction. The variable salary showed statistically significant positive relationships at the .01 level with age ($r^2 = .20$), years at present institution ($r^2 = .19$), total years teaching ($r^2 = .45$), and highest degree attained ($r^2 = .44$). This was expected since Georgia’s pay scale is based on years of experience and level of degree held. Years of teaching ($r^2 = .47$), years at present institution ($r^2 = .19$), and highest degree obtained ($r^2 = .03$) also had a statistically significant positive correlation with age at the .01 level. Years employed outside teaching ($r^2 = -.27$) indicated a statistically significant negative relationship at the .01 level with age. Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients ($r$), the adjusted Pearson correlation coefficients ($r^2$), significance levels, and the number of respondents (N) to each of the variables identified in the literature.

**Intent to Remain**

Research question three asked, “What is the comparison between the intent to remain in the classroom of Georgia secondary business education teachers in public schools and the selected intrinsic and extrinsic scales of job satisfaction as identified by Herzberg?” The variable intent to remain indicated that the highest percentages of participants (43.3%, n=123) intend to retire with 30 years. Six point seven percent (n=19) indicated intent to leave at the end of the
Table 6

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Yearsspi</th>
<th>Yearstch</th>
<th>Outyrs</th>
<th>Hdgr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearsspi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25(**)</td>
<td>.44(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearstch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24(**)</td>
<td>.68(**)</td>
<td>.65(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outyrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14(*)</td>
<td>-.27(**)</td>
<td>-.27(**)</td>
<td>-.40(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdgr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.17(**)</td>
<td>.23(**)</td>
<td>.30(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13(*)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.45(**)</td>
<td>.43(**)</td>
<td>.67(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. General job satisfaction is represented by the variable “Gen.”
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
current year, 32.7% (n=93) indicated intent to teach for several more years before leaving teaching, and 17.3% (n=49) indicated intent to teach as long as they can beyond 30 years. Using these responses, a new variable, ESTLONG, was created to better express the intent in a numerical figure. This variable converted the responses to the intent to remain variable for those who responded either “retire as soon as I have 30 years in” or “teach as long as I can beyond 30 years” into an estimated number of years left to teach. The response “retire as soon as I have 30 years in” was converted by subtracting the item response for the total years of teaching from 30. The “teach as long as I can beyond 30 years” was converted by subtracting the response for the total years teaching from 50. Fifty years was used based on the longest response (49) to the number of years teaching item. Frequencies were then run for the ESTLONG variable. Over half (51.4%) of the participants intend to teach less than 10 more years. Less than 10% of the participants intend on teaching beyond 30 years from now.

A series of one-way ANOVA’s were run pairing each intrinsic and extrinsic scale score to the intent to remain variable with an alpha of .05. The results of the one-way ANOVAs comparing each intrinsic variable to the intent to remain variable indicated a significant effect for ability utilization, achievement, advancement, and responsibility. The recognition variable was not found to have a statistically significant effect on the intent to remain variable. The results of the one-way ANOVAs comparing each extrinsic variable to the intent to remain variable indicted a statistically significant effect for only two of the six variables: company/school policies and practices and working conditions. No statistically significant effect was indicated for compensation, supervision-human resources, supervision-technical, or co-workers. Table 7 and Table 8 show the means, standard deviations and analysis of variance for intent to remain in teaching and those intrinsic and extrinsic variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>End of Current M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Several Years M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>30 Years M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>As long Possible M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AVOVA F(2,279)</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>10.88***</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.84**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>5.60**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.36*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\eta^2$ = effect size.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Several Years M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>End of Current M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>As long Possible M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AVOYA F(2,279)</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company/school policies</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.46**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-human resources</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision-technical</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>20.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. η² = effect size. *p < .05, **p < .01.
A familywise analysis of the group of intrinsic scales and the group of extrinsic scales was performed. A Bonferoni adjustment was made to the alpha level in order to keep the familywise alpha at .05. The Bonferoni adjustment procedure (Huck, 2000) divides the alpha by the number of variables in the family or group so that the total of all the alpha’s does not exceed the .05 level. The Bonferoni correction for the intrinsic family of variables was .01 (.05/5). The familywise analysis of the intrinsic variables indicated the intrinsic variable ability utilization showed a statistically significant difference at the .01 level for each of the four groups with every other group, those intending to leave at the end of this year (p=.000), teach for several more years (p=.000), with 30 years (p=.000), and teach as long as possible (p=.000). Those intending to leave teaching at the end of this year showed a statistically significant difference at the .01 level with those who intended to retire as soon as the have 30 years (p=.008) and those intending to remain in teaching as long as possible (p=.001) on the achievement variable. The variable advancement indicated a statistically significant difference at the .01 level between those intending to leave teaching at the end of this year and those intending to teach as long as possible (p=.001). The Bonferoni correction for the extrinsic family of variables was .0083 (.05/6). The familywise analysis of the extrinsic variables indicated a statistically significant difference at the .0083 level in those who expressed their intent to remain as leaving at the end of this year and those who plan to teach as long as possible on the variable company/school policies and procedures (p=.003). None of the other extrinsic variables indicted a statistically significant difference among any of the intent groups.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the conclusions drawn from the data and recommendations for further research or program development.

A shortage of teachers has existed over the past several years both nationally and in the state of Georgia. Trapps (2001) indicated “By 2011, the shortfall nationwide is expected to reach 2 million teachers” (p. A.22). Blair (2003) indicated that vacancies persist in Georgia. Secondary business education has not been exempt from this shortage. Business education has experienced a reprieve in the teacher shortage due to the declining economy which has created a situation where people formerly employed in the business sector are now earning teaching certification. The shortage, however, may reemerge as the economy picks back up. Business education continues to remain on the 2004-2005 critical shortage list for the Georgia HOPE teacher scholarship program. While it may appear fewer individuals are choosing teaching as a career, it is also worth noting that approximately 50% of new teachers are leaving the profession within their first three to five years to pursue other careers (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Dawson, 2001; Ingersol, 2002). Ruhland (2001) stated, “Teachers who are satisfied with their careers tend to remain in the profession longer” (p. 215). Olson (2000) indicated that new teachers improve dramatically during their first few years of teaching; and therefore, it is critical to retain those teachers long enough for them to reach their full potential. Determining what factors satisfy secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools may help retain teachers in
the profession longer and help alleviate the current shortage situation. As a business education department chairperson charged with hiring and retaining quality business education teachers, determining what influences a teacher’s intent to remain in the classroom was the major impetus behind this study.

Demographic variables found in the literature as commonly considered in studies of job satisfaction in general and job satisfaction of teachers included age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree held, salary level, marital status, certification route, and school location. Variables that were considered in this research included age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree held, salary level, marital status, certification route, and school location. Pearson correlations were calculated to determine the relationship of the variables to general job satisfaction. The intent to remain variable was compared with those intrinsic and extrinsic scale factors to determine which affected the level of intent to remain. The scales used for this study were ability utilization, achievement, advancement, company/school policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, recognition, responsibility, supervision (human relations), supervision (technical), and working conditions. These scales were used because of their correlation with the intrinsic and extrinsic factors identified by Herzberg’s (1966) Two-Factor theory.

The purpose of this study was to describe the level of job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. The specific research questions that were addressed were:
1. What is the level of job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools?

2. What is the relationship between job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools and personal and professional variables identified in the literature that may have an affect on the job satisfaction of teachers? Those variables include: age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree attained, and salary level.

3. What is the comparison between the intent to remain in the classroom of Georgia secondary business education teachers in public schools and select intrinsic and extrinsic scales of job satisfaction as identified by Herzberg?

**Conclusions**

The following conclusions are based on the data presented in Chapter IV:

1. Georgia’s secondary business education teachers are generally satisfied with their job.

   The general satisfaction scale score of the MSQ indicated an average score of 78.63, which represents a high degree of satisfaction according to the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967). This is also in alignment with the norms for teachers provided by the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, which indicated an average scale score on the general satisfaction scale of 82.14. Those job satisfaction scales identified by Herzberg as intrinsic in nature satisfy Georgia’s secondary business education teachers more than those scales identified by Herzberg as extrinsic in nature. Scales with the highest mean scores were ability utilization (m=21.26), achievement (m=21.00), and responsibility (m=20.50). Scales with the lowest mean scores were company (school) policies and practices (m=16.62) and compensation
(m=16.43). None of the individual scale scores fell into the low level of job satisfaction. All of the intrinsic and extrinsic scales indicated either average or high levels of job satisfaction in those areas.

2. The personal and professional variables identified in the literature as having an effect on the general job satisfaction of teachers did not indicate a significant effect for this sample. Secondary business education teachers in Georgia are predominately female (80%), married (78.6%), and received their certification through the traditional route (73%). Pearson correlations indicated a statistically significant relationship between the general job satisfaction scale and salary ($r^2=.02$). However, this only explains 2% of the variance in the level of general job satisfaction and therefore is not very practically significant.

Gender, total years teaching, years at present institution, years outside teaching and highest degree obtained indicated no significant effect on the general job satisfaction of Georgia’s secondary business education teachers. Collins (1998) also found that age and years of experience were not significantly correlated to the teacher’s degree of general job satisfaction.

3. Over half of the secondary business education teachers in Georgia intend to leave the profession within the next 10 years. Thirty-three percent intend to teach for a few more years before leaving teaching, and 43% intend to retire as soon as they have 30 years in. With the decline in the economy, the shortage of teachers experienced in recent years is experiencing a reprieve (Blair, 2003; Sausner, 2003; Stripling, 2003). When the “retire as soon as I have 30 years in” response was converted into an estimated years to remain in teaching, a total of 51.4% intended to teach less than 10 more years. Couple this with the
fact that up to 50% of new teachers leave the profession within their first three years and
a shortage could very easily reemerge.

Discussion

The results of this study are likely to reflect the population of Georgia secondary business
education teachers; however, it is not clear whether they would reflect beyond that group to
Georgia teachers or teachers in general. The reason for this caution is that for a population size of
1294, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) indicated an estimated sample size of 297 was needed to
generalize to the population the sample represents. Responses to the various items/scales in this
study ranged from n=266 to n=293, just short of the recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan. An
estimated 50% rate of return was used and the actual rate of return was 49.33%.

Business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools are generally satisfied with their
job. The higher scale scores were those associated with factors identified as intrinsic in nature.
Secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools are most satisfied by the
opportunity to utilize their abilities and a sense of achievement and responsibility. The lower
scale scores were those associated with factors identified as extrinsic in nature. They are least
satisfied with company/school policies and procedures and their working conditions. None of the
scale scores indicated a low level of satisfaction. It appears that their level of satisfaction is not
affected by their age, gender, education level, or number of years spent in or out of the
classroom. The personal and professional variables indicated some statistical significance in the
relationship between general job satisfaction and salary level. It is not practical to think that an
adjustment in the salary of secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools
would greatly increase their job satisfaction since this only accounted for 2% of the variance in
the job satisfaction variable. It still holds true that teacher satisfaction “does not come from
money” (Thompson, 1979, p. 43). The fact that the salary variable indicated a statistically significant result does, however, support the idea that salary levels must be adequate to satisfy hygiene needs (Frase, 1989; Maslow, 1970). Other factors interacted with each other as expected based on the structure of Georgia’s salary schedule. Since the salary scale in Georgia is based on level of education and years of teaching experience, it was no surprise that salary was highly correlated with those two variables and the age variable. With salary accounting for only 2% of the variance in the job satisfaction variable, it leaves the question of what accounts for the other 98%.

Although secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools indicated that they are experiencing a high level of overall job satisfaction, many are still leaving the profession. Over half of the secondary business education teachers participating in this study indicated they plan to leave teaching within the next 10 years. With the exception of the recognition variable, all of the intrinsic variables indicated a significant effect on the teachers’ intent to remain in the classroom. The only extrinsic variables indicated as having an effect on the intent to remain variable were the company/school policies and procedures variable and the working conditions variable. The intrinsic and extrinsic variables indicating an effect on the intent to remain variable accounted for 34% of the variance in the teacher’s intent to remain in the classroom.

Recommendations

These recommendations for research and practice were based on the finding and conclusions of this study.

1. Since there appears to be a possibility of the shortage of secondary business education teachers in Georgia returning, it is recommended that further study be conducted to
determine those areas of satisfaction for secondary business education teachers in Georgia. By nature, the design of this study allowed for the collection of much information about this sample. It allowed for breadth rather than depth of information. The design of such further study should be one of a qualitative nature in order to get more in-depth information regarding those factors influencing both teacher job satisfaction and intent to remaining the profession.

2. It is also recommended that the personal and professional variables analyzed in this study be included in future studies more for descriptive purposes than for any effect they may or may not have on job satisfaction. Age, marital status, certification route, highest degree, salary range, years at present institution, and years outside teaching provide demographic information on the sample. The variable years teaching also provided demographic information about the sample. The variable years teaching also provided a basis for quantifying the intent to remain variable allowing for the conversion into a numerical value.

3. Further investigation should be conducted on the variable ability utilization. The four groups of intent responses varied significantly on this variable. A qualitative study should be conducted to further investigate and elaborate on those differences. This study should include the achievement, advancement, and company (school) policies and procedures variables since they also indicated differences among the levels of intent to remain.

4. Company/school policies and practices indicated a statistically significant relationship with the intent to remain variable. School principals and career and technical education administrators and supervisors should attempt to determine the company/school policies and procedures that concern secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public
schools in order to evaluate those practices and procedures and determine if there is a better way of handling them.

5. Working conditions indicated a statistically significant relationship with the intent to remain variable. School principals and career and technical education administrators and supervisors should attempt to determine the working conditions that concern secondary business education teachers in Georgia’s public schools in order to determine if improvements on those conditions could be made.

Attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers in the business education classroom is becoming more urgent due to the shortage and the No Child Left Behind education legislation promise that every child will have a highly qualified teacher in the classroom. (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 2003). It is important for school principals and career and technical education administrators and supervisors to acknowledge the connection between job satisfaction and intent to remain in teaching and aggressively seek opportunities to support that connection. Since the company/school policies and practices and working conditions factor scales varied for those who indicated intent to remain until the end of the current school year and those who indicated intent to teach as long as possible, school principals and career and technical supervisors should include as part of their induction programs an overview of the company/school policies and a discussion of the general working conditions that the new teacher will face. This overview/discussion should allow for ample question and answer time to allow the new teacher to have any questions clarified. This process should be repeated periodically over the life of the induction program since the new teacher may not know what questions to ask at the beginning of his/her career. Hopefully, by helping new teachers have a better
understanding of the working environment, they will be more inclined to remain in the classroom.

Business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools are generally satisfied with their jobs. School principals and career and technical supervisors should continue to provide those opportunities for ability utilization, achievement, advancement, and responsibility since these are the intrinsic factors that indicated having an effect on teacher’s intent to remain in the classroom. These are all factors of job satisfaction and as Ruhl (2001) indicated, “Teachers who are satisfied with their careers tend to remain in the profession longer” (p. 215). The goal is to retain quality teachers in the business education classroom, and thus job satisfaction should be an area of interest to all those charged with hiring and retaining teachers.
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APPENDICIES
APPENDIX A

REQUEST TO USE THE MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
January 5, 2004

Dr. D. J. Weiss
Vocational Psychology Research
N620 Elliot Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344

Dear Dr. Weiss:

Enclosed please find:

1. My initial letter requesting permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, with certain changes, in my doctoral research
2. MSQ Order form
3. A Check in the amount of $208.92 (royalties on 600 copies of the MSQ + a sample set of documents)
4. Qualifications form including research description

I will send out approximately 600 surveys in the initial mailing of my study. Additional royalties will be forwarded to you once I know the number of surveys I will need to send out with the follow-up mailing. Please let me know if you prefer to handle this by another method.

Your response to this request can be mailed to me at the following address: 1287 Everwood Drive S.W., Marietta, Georgia 30008. I have determined that approximately 600 surveys will be used. I plan to collect data during January and March 2004. Your help and cooperation with this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dianna Day Johnson
Graduate Student
The University of Georgia
December 9, 2003

Dr. D. J. Weiss  
Vocational Psychology Research  
N620 Elliot Hall  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344

Dear Dr. Weiss:

Please let this letter serve as my request to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire in my doctoral research. My dissertation title is “Job Satisfaction and Teacher Retention of Business Education Teachers in Georgia”. This is also a request to use the MSQ as amended for teacher survey use by Wanda L. Stitt, Ed.D., University of Georgia, 1980.

My doctoral work is directed by Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes, Occupational Studies, and a committee comprised of four other faculty members from within our department. This committee has met and agreed that I should use the MSQ with the following minor changes in the original questions:

a. Question 10: Change from “The way my supervisor and I understand each other.” to read “The way my department chairperson and I understand each other.”

b. Question 15: Change from “The technical ‘know-how’ of my supervisor.” to read “The educational knowledge of my department chairperson.”

c. Question 26: Change from “The chance to tell other workers how to do things.” to read “The chance to tell other teachers how to do things.”

d. Question 29: Change from “Company policies and the way in which they are administered.” to read “School policies and the way they are administered.”

e. Question 30: Change from “The way my boss handles his men.” to read “The way my department chairperson handles faculty members.”

f. Question 35: Change from “The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.” to read “The competence of my department chairperson in making decisions.”

g. Question 49: Change from “The way employees are informed about company policies.” to read “The way teachers are informed about school policies.”

h. Question 50: Change from “The way my boss backs his men up (with top management).” to read “The way my department chairperson backs the faculty (with the administration).”
i. Question 52: Change from “How my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other companies.” to read “How my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other schools.”

j. Question 54: Change from “The way promotions are given out on this job.” to read “The availability of promotions.”

k. Question 55: Change from “The way my boss delegates work to others.” to read “The way my department chairperson delegates work to others.”

l. Question 69: Change from “The way my company policies are put into practice.” to read “The way school policies are put into practice.”

m. Question 70: Change from “The way my boss takes care of complaints brought to him by his men.” to read “The way my department chairperson handles complaints brought by the faculty.”

n. Question 75: Change from “The way my boss provides help on hard problems.” to read “The way my department chairperson provides help on hard problems.”

o. Question 89: Change from “The way the company treats its employees.” to read “The way the school treats its faculty.”

p. Question 90: Change from “The personal relationship between my boss and his men.” to read “The personal relationship between my department chairperson and the faculty.”

q. Question 91: Change from “The way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job.” to read “The way transfers are handled in my job.”

r. Question 95: Change from “The way my boss trains his men.” to read “The way my department chairperson helps faculty members.”

Your response to this request may be mailed to me at the following address: 1287 Everwood Drive S.W., Marietta, Georgia 30008. I have determined that approximately 600 surveys will be used. I plan to collect data during January and February 2004. I am enclosing the Qualifications and Registration Form and a copy of the Research Approval Application submitted to the University of Georgia. Your help and cooperation with this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dianna Day Johnson
To establish a new account, please complete this form.

QUALIFICATIONS and REGISTRATION FORM
(Not Necessary for Sample Set)
Please type or print

1. QUALIFICATIONS

The instruments distributed by Vocational Psychology Research are available only to persons qualified by training and experience to use these instruments in accordance with the American Psychological Association's ethical standards for test use and interpretation.

The MJDQ, MSQ, and MSS may be used only by persons who have, as a minimum, satisfactorily completed a course in the interpretation of psychological tests and measurement at an accredited college or university, or the equivalent qualifications.

Use of the MIQ is restricted to persons who have both (1) an advanced degree in an appropriate profession, or membership in an appropriate professional association, or state licensure, or national or state certification; and (2) satisfactorily completed a course in the interpretation of psychological tests and measurement at an accredited college or university, or the equivalent qualifications.

Graduate students must include a description of their proposed research with this registration form.

2. INSTRUCTIONS

If you are a graduate or undergraduate student, or do not meet the above qualifications:

- Complete Section 3, and
- Have your adviser or supervisor complete Sections 4, 5, and 6.

If you are a qualified professional:

- Complete Sections 4, 5, and 6.

Return this form with your initial order.

3. STUDENTS AND OTHERS WITHOUT PROPER QUALIFICATIONS

Name ______ Dianna Day Johnson
Department/Institution: Occupational Studies/University of Georgia
Phone Number ______ 770-437-0000

Your level of training:

- Bachelor's Degree: Field Business Ed. Institution State Univ. of W. Georgia Year 1986
- Master's Degree: Field Business Ed. Institution State Univ. of W. Georgia Year 1998
- Doctorate: Field__________ Institution ____________ Year____

Additional experience:
- In-service training
- Supervised experience
- Continuing education
- Reading test manuals
4. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Your level of training:

___ Bachelor's Degree: Field_________ Institution_________ Year________

___ Master's Degree: Field_________ Institution_________ Year________

___ Doctorate: Field_________ Institution_________ Year________

Additional experience:

___ In-service training
___ Supervised experience
___ Continuing education
___ Reading test manuals

Your professional credentials:

___ Licensure: Area_________________________ State_____ License Number________

___ Professional organization memberships

___ Formally recognized professional competence: ___Fellow ___Diplomate ___Other____

Organization__________________________________________________________

Your educational background: (mark all applicable levels of training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Other Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychometrics and Measurement Theory</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Test Interpretation</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Personality Testing</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Interest Testing</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ Practicum in test administration and interpretation

___ Internship: type____________________________________________________

___ Other___________________________________________________________

5. PURPOSE FOR USING THESE INSTRUMENTS

___ X ___ Research: all information specific to the individual will be kept confidential; information will be used only as a group aggregate. Please attach a description of your intended study.

___ Assessment of the examinee: to obtain and use information specific to the individual for:

(check all that apply) ___Counseling ___Selection ___Placement ___Other:__________

6. CERTIFICATION

I certify that I have personal knowledge of the relevant professional testing standards (such as the APA-AERA-NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests, 1985), that I and/or other persons who may use the instruments being ordered by me possess the appropriate training and competencies to use the materials being ordered, and that my/our use of such materials will adhere to applicable State and Federal laws and regulations, and the ethical principles of my profession.

___ X ___ I agree to supervise the individual indicated in Section 3 in the use of items ordered.

Name: Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes
Department/Institution: Occupational Studies/The University of Georgia
Description of intended study:

Our nation is faced with an increasing shortage of teachers. In recent years the teaching profession has experienced a low retention rate, with new teachers dropping out of the profession at a rate of 50% by the end of their first five years. Teachers are leaving the classroom to pursue other careers within three to five years of entering the education field. This revolving door effect has led to an increased need to not only recruit new teachers, but retain those new teachers and veteran teachers as well. The shortage of teachers in general and business education teachers in particular is expected to continue over the next decade. Georgia’s HOPE Teachers’ Scholarship placed business education on their critical shortage list in spring 1999 and business education remains on the 2003 list. The purpose of this study will be to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia’s secondary public schools and determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to remain in the profession. In accordance with the purpose of this study, answers to the following questions are sought:

1. What satisfies business education teachers in Georgia secondary public schools?
2. What is the relationship between job satisfaction of business education teachers in Georgia secondary public and personal and professional variables identified in the literature that may have an affect on the job satisfaction of teachers? Those variables include: age, gender, years at present institution, total years teaching, years employed outside teaching, highest degree attained, salary level, marital status, route to certification (traditional or alternative), and location of school currently teaching in (rural, urban, suburban).
3. What is the relationship between the level of job satisfaction and intent to remain in the classroom of Georgia secondary business education teachers in public schools?

A survey method of research will be used. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) will be used to measure job satisfaction levels. A personal data questionnaire will survey attributes including gender, age, years employed at present school, total years teaching, highest degree attained, salary level, route to certification (traditional college teacher preparatory program or an alternate route), location of school currently teaching in (rural, urban, suburban), and level of intent to remain in the classroom.

Several methods of statistical analysis will be used during this study. The analysis of data will begin with descriptive statistics. These statistics will be used to create a description of business education teachers currently teaching in Georgia’s secondary public schools, their levels of satisfaction, and their intent to remain in the teaching profession. The statistical procedures calculated for each variable will be means, standard deviations, and frequencies. Multiple
correlation analysis will be used to analyze the data on the relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction levels and on the relationship between job satisfaction and the intent to remain in the profession.

Participants in this study will consist of secondary business education teachers currently teaching in public schools in the state of Georgia. A list of secondary business educators and their addresses will be obtained from the Georgia State Department of Education. A systematic random sampling method will be used to select participants from the list. Each participant will be sent a packet that includes a cover letter, the Personal Data Questionnaire, and the MSQ. Instructions for completing the instruments will be contained both in the cover letter and on the individual questionnaires. The questionnaires will be distributed to the participants the third week in January 2004. The questionnaire will be sent via the U.S. postal service on January 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2004, and will include a stamped, pre-addressed return envelope. A deadline of February 10, 2004 will be included in the cover letter in an effort to increase the speed of questionnaire return. A second follow-up mailing will be mailed on February 10, 2004, to any participant who has not responded. A postcard follow-up mailing will be on March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2004 to any participant who has still not responded. Ten days from the date of the postcard follow-up mailing, March 12, 2004, will be allowed for any responses to be returned.
APPENDIX B

MSQ NORMATIVE DATA FOR TEACHERS
### Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than bachelors degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelors degree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masters degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten through 3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 through 6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in present occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 9 years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years and over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSQ Manual, 1967, p. 58
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Hoyt Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability utilization</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company policies &amp; practices</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral values</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision—human relations</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision—technical</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General satisfaction</td>
<td>82.14</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSQ Manual, 1967, p. 58
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE
Personal Data Questionnaire

Instructions: Please supply the information requested. This information will be used for statistical purposes only in analyzing the data collected. Do not write your name on this information sheet.

1. Gender
   _____ Female   _____ Male

2. Age _____ (as of last birthday)

3. Highest Degree attained
   _____ Bachelor’s   _____ Specialist
   _____ Master’s   _____ Doctorate

4. Route taken to obtain certification:
   _____ Traditional (Certification at the Baccalaureate level)
   _____ Alternative (Post Baccalaureate Masters)

5. Years teaching at present institution _____

6. Location of school currently teaching at:
   _____ Rural   _____ Suburban   _____ Urban

7. Total years teaching _____

8. Years employed outside teaching _____; area of employment ________________

9. Are you married?   _____ Yes   _____ No

10. Present Salary Range
    _____ 25,000 – 29,999   _____ 40,000 – 44,999   _____ 55,000 – 59,999
    _____ 30,000 – 34,999   _____ 45,000 – 49,999   _____ Over 60,000
    _____ 35,000 – 39,999   _____ 50,000 – 54,999

11. How long do you plan to remain in the teaching profession?
    _____ Leave teaching at the end of the current school year
    _____ Teach for several years before leaving teaching
    _____ Retire as soon as I have 30 years in
    _____ Teach as long as I can beyond 30 years
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IRB APPROVAL FORM
APPROVAL FORM

Date Proposal Received: 2003-12-23  Project Number: H2004-10441-0
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Number Assigned by Sponsored Programs:  Funding Agency:

Form 310 Provided: No

Your human subjects study has been approved as indicated under IRB action above.

Please be aware that it is your responsibility to inform the IRB...
...of any adverse events or unanticipated risks to the subjects or others within 24 to 72 hours;...
...of any significant changes or additions to your study and obtain approval of them before they are put into effect;...
...that you need to extend the approval period beyond the expiration date shown above;...
...that you have completed your data collection as approved, within the approval period shown above, so that your file may be closed.
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For your convenience in obtaining approval of changes, extending the approval period, or closing your file, we are providing you with a blue Researcher Request form. Detach this blue form, complete it as appropriate, sign and date it, then return it to the IRB office. Keep this original approval form for your records.
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APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER
February 5, 2004

Dear Colleague,

My name is Dianna Day Johnson and I am a doctoral student in the Occupational Studies (Business Education) Department at the University of Georgia conducting research in the area of teacher retention. I am writing to request your participation in a study of Job Satisfaction and Intent to Remain in Teaching of Georgia Business Education Teachers. Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes, my graduate advisor at the University of Georgia, is overseeing the study.

This research will attempt to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers currently teaching in Georgia’s secondary public schools and to identify factors that may influence teachers to remain in the teaching profession. The data collected may be used to improve teacher preservice and inservice programs.

The enclosed questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please insert your completed questionnaire into the enclosed postage paid return envelope, and place in the U.S. Mail by February 23, 2004. Your decision to participate is completely voluntary. Your completed questionnaire will indicate your consent to participate. You may skip any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. Your responses will be kept confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form unless required by law. All data will be reported aggregated, not individually. The aggregated results of this research will be made available to the University of Georgia. The survey does not ask you to identify yourself. Identification numbers located on the surveys will be used to identify non-responders only to be sent two follow-up mailings.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to ask now or at a later date. You may contact me at 770-437-0000 or by e-mail at ddjohnson@juno.com. Dr. Stitt-Gohdes may be reached at 706-542-4078.

Sincerely,

Dianna Day Johnson
Graduate Student
Occupational Studies

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER
Dianna Day Johnson  
University of Georgia Graduate Student  
1287 Everwood Drive  
Marietta, Georgia 30008  
770-437-0000

February 26, 2004

Dear Colleague,

Within the last few weeks, a letter was mailed to you requesting your participation in a study of Job Satisfaction and Intent to Remain in Teaching of Georgia Business Education Teachers. My name is Dianna Day Johnson and I am a doctoral student in the Occupational Studies (Business Education) Department at the University of Georgia conducting research in the area of teacher retention. Dr. Wanda Stitt-Gohdes, my graduate advisor at the University of Georgia, is overseeing the study. If you have returned the questionnaire already, thank you for your participation. If you have not returned the questionnaire, I ask that you take a few moments to complete it now and return it. Your participation as a representative of the secondary business education teachers in Georgia is important. I am including the questionnaire with this mailing in case the original was lost or misplaced.

This research will attempt to describe the job satisfaction of business education teachers currently teaching in Georgia’s secondary public schools and to identify factors that may influence teachers to remain in the teaching profession. The data collected may be used to improve teacher preservice and inservice programs.

The enclosed questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please insert your completed questionnaire into the enclosed postage paid return envelope, and place in the U.S. Mail by February 23, 2004. Your decision to participate is completely voluntary. Your completed questionnaire will indicate your consent to participate. You may skip any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. Your responses will be kept confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form unless required by law. All data will be reported aggregate, not individually. The aggregated results of this research will be made available to the University of Georgia. The survey does not ask you to identify yourself. Identification numbers located on the surveys will be used to identify non-responders only. You will receive one additional reminder requesting your participation. Failure to respond will indicate your decision not to participate.

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to ask now or at a later date. You may contact me at 770-437-0000 or by e-mail at djohnson@juno.com. Dr. Stitt-Gohdes may be reached at 706-542-4078.

Sincerely,

Dianna Day Johnson  
Graduate Student  
Occupational Studies

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
APPENDIX G

POSTCARD FOLLOW-UP
Message of Postcard

Dear Colleague:

Recently you were sent a letter requesting participation in a research study of Job Satisfaction and Intent to Remain in Teaching of Georgia Secondary Business Education Teachers. Your name was drawn randomly for a list of all secondary business education teachers in Georgia.

If you have returned the questionnaire, thank you for your participation. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please take a few moments to complete it.

If you did not receive a questionnaire, or if it was misplaced, contact me at 770-437-0000 or ddjohnson@juno.com and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Dianna Day Johnson
Graduate Student, Occupational Studies
University of Georgia