

1999

# A Study to Determine the Level of Job Satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association Members Teaching Middle School Technology Courses

M. Reid Rawls  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots\\_masters\\_projects](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects)

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Rawls, M. Reid, "A Study to Determine the Level of Job Satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association Members Teaching Middle School Technology Courses" (1999). *OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers*. 272.  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots\\_masters\\_projects/272](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/ots_masters_projects/272)

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the STEM Education & Professional Studies at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in OTS Master's Level Projects & Papers by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

**A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION  
AMONG VIRGINIA TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION MEMBERS  
TEACHING MIDDLE SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY COURSES**

**A Research Paper**

**Presented to the Graduate Faculty  
of the Department of Occupational and Technical Studies  
at Old Dominion University**

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for  
the Master of Science in Education Degree**

**By  
M. Reid Rawls  
August, 1999**

**SIGNATURE PAGE**

This research paper was prepared by M. Reid Rawls under the direction of Dr. John M. Ritz in OTED 636, Problems in Occupational and Technical Studies. It was submitted to the Graduate Program Director as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education.

Approval by: John M. Ritz 8-10-99  
Dr. John M. Ritz Date  
Advisor and Graduate  
Program Director

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend most loving thanks to my dear wife, **Louise**, who despite her serious illness, was unwavering in her love, encouragement, and support throughout my graduate program. Without her inspiration and unselfish devotion to my academic pursuits, my success and accomplishments would be greatly diminished. Thank you so much, sweetheart.

Also I want to extend my thanks to **Dr. Walter Deal** for your tireless efforts to teach me both the content of the courses and the skills of a talented educator. Thank you for being a great professor.

I wish to extend very special thanks to my academic and research advisor, **Dr. John M. Ritz**, Professor and Chair, Occupational and Technical Studies, Old Dominion University, for all your help and guidance. Your influence and professionalism has left a lasting impression that will serve me well through out my teaching career and beyond. Many heartfelt thanks.

M. Reid Rawls

## Table of Contents

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Signature Page</b>                                       | <b>i</b>    |
| <b>Acknowledgements</b>                                     | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>Table of Tables</b>                                      | <b>v</b>    |
| <br><b>CHAPTER</b>  |             |
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>                                      | <b>1</b>    |
| Statement of the Problem                                    | 2           |
| Research Goals  | 2           |
| Background and Significance                                 | 2           |
| Limitations   | 3           |
| Assumptions   | 3           |
| Procedures  | 4           |
| Definitions of Terms  | 4           |
| Overview of Chapters  | 4           |
| <b>II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>                             | <b>6</b>    |
| Job Satisfaction - An Historical Perspective                | 6           |
| Modern Theory   | 7           |
| Job Satisfaction and Teaching Professionals                 | 8           |
| Summary   | 10          |
| <b>III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES</b>                          | <b>11</b>   |
| Population  | 11          |
| Instrument Design   | 11          |
| Data Gathering Procedures                                   | 12          |
| Statistical Analysis  | 12          |
| Summary   | 13          |
| <b>IV. FINDINGS</b>   | <b>14</b>   |
| Report of Findings  | 14          |
| Summary   | 25          |
| <b>V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND<br/>    RECOMMENDATIONS</b> | <b>26</b>   |
| Summary   | 26          |
| Conclusions   | 27          |
| Recommendations   | 29          |
| Additional Research   | 30          |

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> | 31 |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   | 33 |
| Appendix A          | 34 |
| Appendix B          | 37 |
| Appendix C          | 39 |

## Table of Tables

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| TABLE 1 Response Data                       | 15          |
| TABLE 2 Response to Question One            | 15          |
| TABLE 3 Response to Question Two            | 16          |
| TABLE 4 Response to Question Three          | 16          |
| TABLE 5 Response to Question Four           | 17          |
| TABLE 6 Response to Question Five           | 17          |
| TABLE 7 Response to Question Six            | 18          |
| TABLE 8 Response to Question Seven          | 18          |
| TABLE 9 Response to Question Eight          | 19          |
| TABLE 10 Response to Question Nine          | 19          |
| TABLE 11 Response to Question Ten           | 20          |
| TABLE 12 Response to Question Eleven        | 20          |
| TABLE 13 Response to Question Twelve        | 21          |
| TABLE 14 Response to Question Thirteen      | 21          |
| TABLE 15 Response to Question Fourteen      | 22          |
| TABLE 16 Response to Question Fifteen       | 22          |
| TABLE 17 Response to Question Sixteen       | 23          |
| TABLE 18 Response to Question Seventeen     | 23          |
| TABLE 19 Summary of Responses by Percentage | 24          |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

By gross calculation, workers in the United States devote forty-five to fifty years preparing for and performing their chosen occupations. Other researchers have stated that nearly half of our waking hours are spent on the job (Hopkins, 1983, p. 1). With this much time consumed by one activity, it is easy to understand that job satisfaction has a tremendous effect on our everyday lives.

Our careers greatly influence many key aspects of our lives including income level, amount of leisure time, community standing, and even attracting a spouse. Since these factors impact us greatly in our personal lives, our level of job satisfaction directly relates to our willingness and ability to be successful and productive workers.

Professional educators have the same desire to enjoy what they do for a living as other employees. Even more important is the quality of the learning experience for the students who will be our future doctors, scientists, lawyers, and other professional and non-professional workers. Consequently, as a future middle school technology education teacher, this researcher investigated the level of job satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association members teaching middle school technology courses.

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The problem of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association members teaching middle school technology courses.

## **RESEARCH GOALS**

The goals of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. What factors affect job satisfaction levels among middle school technology teachers?
2. What steps should be taken to enhance job satisfaction for middle school technology teachers?

## **BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Teaching is a difficult and demanding vocation. To be effective, a teacher must be able to present new ideas and concepts in a systematic and understandable way that will interest and motivate the student. For this reason, there is an inherent need for teachers to be dedicated professionals committed to their careers. Job satisfaction is especially important in light of the relatively low salaries for teachers as compared to many other

professionals with equal years of higher education, training, and experience. To balance this factor, a concerted effort must be made to assess and enhance non-monetary rewards and to remediate problem areas in order to keep motivated teachers in our classrooms.

There is a projected national shortage of up to 310,000 teachers by the year 2001 (Tetzeli, 1993, p. 10). Some states are dealing with this crisis by offering bonuses, tuition reimbursement, reduced rate mortgages, and other perks (Pipho, 1998, p. 181) underscoring the importance of job satisfaction in retaining experienced teachers and attracting new college graduates to our classrooms.

## **LIMITATIONS**

This study used data collected through the results of a survey and is subject to the following limitations:

1. Only middle school technology instructors teaching in Virginia were surveyed.
2. This study was limited to 1998-99 Virginia Technology Education Association members.

## **ASSUMPTIONS**

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Teacher job satisfaction levels affects their job performance and career longevity.
2. There are ways to enhance job satisfaction among teaching professionals.

## **PROCEDURES**

This study was accomplished by e mailing a survey to Virginia Technology Education Association members currently teaching middle school technology courses. Responses were returned by electronic message transmission via the Internet. The results were tabulated to assess the overall level of job satisfaction among the respondents and suggest practical ways these levels may be raised.

## **DEFINITION OF TERMS**

The following terms are defined for the benefit of those reading this study:

1. **Middle School** - Sixth, seventh, and eighth grades.
2. **Technology Education** - The study of the history, application, and potential of technology related advancements and their social, political, economic, and cultural effects.
3. **Technology Education Teacher** - A current full time instructor teaching approved technology based courses at the middle school level.
4. **Level of Job Satisfaction** - The degree to which a worker has positive feelings related to the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their job.

## **OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS**

Chapter I serves to introduce the topic of this study which deals with the issues of

job satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association members and how it may be enhanced. Chapter II reviews the literature the researcher consulted for this study. Chapter III details the procedures and methods used to collect, organize, tabulate, and analyze the responses to the survey instrument. Chapter IV is comprised of the findings based on the study criteria. Chapter V offers a summary, conclusions, and recommendations based on the knowledge gained through this research.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

This chapter will begin with an overview of the subject of job satisfaction as a subset of industrial psychology from an historical perspective. A look at the pioneering work in this field will help to illustrate the evolution of a theoretical framework. Also, the development of modern theory will be discussed in terms of a more sophisticated model of worker attitudes and behavior. Lastly, contemporary studies regarding job satisfaction among teaching professionals is reviewed.

#### **JOB SATISFACTION -AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

The origin of studies relating to job satisfaction can be traced to Frederick W. Taylor, known as the "father of scientific management." His study of tasks performed by steel mill workers in the 1880's led him to experiment with variables such as work station design, pay plans, and working conditions and their effect on productivity.

In 1927, Elton Mayo conducted a series of studies at Western Electric's Hawthorne plant. Better known as the Hawthorne studies (Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc., 1992), his research found that relationships among co-workers and between workers and their supervisors contributed more to productivity than working conditions or pay.

Job satisfaction as a separate field of study did not come of age until the work of Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959). Up to this point, the focus was on the task itself and the working conditions on the job site. In "The Motivation to Work," these authors introduced the hypothesis that the basic determinants of job satisfaction fell into two distinct categories, intrinsic or task related and extrinsic or work environment related factors.

In a later individual book, Herzberg (1966) modified the original hypothesis and presented his own theory as motivators vs. hygiene factors for which he is best known. He defined motivators as: recognition, advancement, levels of responsibility, and personal growth/development. Hygiene factors included such components as: salary, working condition, supervision, organizational policies, status, interpersonal relationships, and job security.

The key to Herzberg's refined doctrine was that motivation (satisfaction) flowed exclusively from intrinsic elements, while dissatisfaction is caused by the absence of hygiene factors. He still perceived these factors as independent and bipolar determinants.

## **MODERN THEORY**

Later theory regarding job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, though rooted in the works of Taylor, Mayo, Herzberg, and others, is far more diverse and complex. Smith (1992) theorizes that job satisfaction is part of a general satisfaction one feels with their life. In her model, variables such as temperament, trust in management, and attitude toward

change had the greatest impact on job satisfaction.

Another theory is social information processing developed by Salancik and Pfeffer (1978). Their approach emphasizes the relationship between job characteristics or design and worker attitudes. Still other models stress need satisfaction (Stone and Gueutal, 1984), the importance of opportunity (Miller and Monge, 1986), and the complex relationships between such variables as job challenge and autonomy (James and James, 1989).

## **JOB SATISFACTION AND TEACHING PROFESSIONALS**

Teachers in today's classrooms experience both the rewards of their vocation as well as endure the negative aspects of their chosen profession. They are not immune from the stresses, frustrations, and disenchantments that drive other workers to change careers. This coupled with normal attrition, rising enrollments, school violence, and higher academic standards for both students and teachers, signals an alarming trend. The latest figures available show that 6% of public school teachers and 10% of private school teachers left teaching between the 1993-94 and 1994-95 school years (U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Many school systems and institutions of higher learning are taking a closer look at job satisfaction in order to retain experienced teachers and attract new college graduates

to hopefully prevent a serious shortage of qualified educators. One example is a recent climate study conducted at Patrick Henry Community College in Martinsville, Virginia. This seventy-three question survey sought to determine faculty and staff attitudes in the three areas of job satisfaction, communications, and management (Mohammadi, et al, 1995). Results were quantified along two lines, work environment and working conditions. The general perception of all employees was positive and stratified. Hourly staff had the most positive feelings regarding their job environment, followed by classified staff, faculty, and administrators. Attitudes toward working conditions were similar and rated most favorably by hourly staff, then administration, classified staff, and finally faculty.

Another study focused on the engineering/industrial technology faculty at Delgado Community College in New Orleans, Louisiana. All twenty-six faculty members completed a questionnaire designed to assess satisfaction levels with their use of skills and abilities, immediate supervision, autonomy and control, and self-fulfillment (Satterlee, 1988). The findings in this case were separated into satisfying versus dissatisfying aspects of the job and ranked. Participants were most satisfied with aspects of their job that allowed them to use their individual skills and abilities. This was followed by feelings of accomplishment, amount of autonomy and control, immediate supervision, and professional relationships. Dissatisfying aspects were identified as opportunities for promotion, followed by top management policies, pay, and job security.

A third study investigated teacher attitudes concerning the quality of their schools. The interesting thing about this particular survey was its interest in Total Quality

Management (TQM) principles. The belief that quality positively affects productivity and productivity leads to job satisfaction was supported by this study (Davis, 1994).

## **SUMMARY**

The development of job satisfaction theory has spanned over 100 years. One researcher estimated that by 1976 some 3,350 articles and dissertations have been written on the subject (Locke, 1976). Given the evolution of modern theory and the increasing interest in this topic, the body of knowledge in this field will continue to grow. The information age will undoubtedly facilitate a broader appreciation and necessity for the benefits of a satisfied, motivated, and productive work force. Factors such as downsizing, higher training costs, and the need for more specialized skills for workers both inside and outside the classroom will put a premium on worker retention. Without question this will be true in both the private and public sectors as business concepts such as Total Quality Management expand into our schools and universities and other government and quasi-government settings.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

The third chapter of this study serves to designate the methods and procedures followed to gather pertinent data for this research. In this descriptive study, Virginia Technology Education Association members were surveyed to determine their level of job satisfaction. Information detailing the population, data collection methods, research design, statistical analysis procedures, and a summary are included.

### **POPULATION**

The population for this study was defined as current members of the Virginia Technology Education Association teaching middle school courses. Present membership of this organization consisted of approximately 41 teachers employed at the middle school level for whom the Association had e mail addresses.

### **INSTRUMENT DESIGN**

A questionnaire was constructed with a series of statements relating to various aspects of job satisfaction. This single mode survey was designed to be simple, brief, and relevant. Some of the survey questions were patterned after those used in previous studies. Notably, a study conducted at Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, Virginia, in 1995 by John Mohammadi, and others, as well as a study conducted at

Delgado Community College, New Orleans, Louisiana in 1988 by Brian Satterlee were especially helpful.

A five point Likert scale was used to offer possible responses. The choices were VS (very satisfied), S (satisfied), N (not sure), D (dissatisfied), and VD (very dissatisfied). A copy of the instrument used is included in Appendix A.

## **DATA GATHERING PROCEDURES**

A list of Virginia Technology Education Association members was acquired through the efforts of the research adviser, Dr. John M. Ritz. A 17 question survey accompanied by a cover letter explaining the importance of VETA input was e mailed to 41 teachers identified as middle technology instructors. The directions asked the recipients to complete the survey and respond by return e mail. The cover letter and survey were sent electronically on June 6, 1999. A copy of the cover letter is included in Appendix B. A follow-up letter and second copy of the survey was transmitted on June 17, 1999. A copy of the follow-up letter is included in Appendix C.

## **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

The data collected from the results of the survey were tabulated by standard statistical methods. A range of values from 5 to 1 were assigned to each possible response with 5 being most positive (very satisfied) and descending to 1 or most negative (very

dissatisfied). An simple mean was calculated for each survey question to quantify the findings in the next chapter.

## **SUMMARY**

Chapter III stated the methods and procedures employed in this research study. The population, methods of data collection, specifics of the instrument design, and statistical procedures used were also outlined. Chapter IV will present the study's findings accompanied by a complete data analysis.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDINGS**

The findings shown in this chapter were taken from the results of a survey entitled "Virginia Technology Education Association Members Job Satisfaction Survey."

The questionnaire addressed the problem of this study which was to determine the level of job satisfaction among Virginia middle school technology teachers. The survey instrument contained questions dealing with various factors affecting the subjects' feelings about their current teaching position.

### **REPORT OF FINDINGS**

The sample population of 41 middle school technology teachers was selected from a recent e mail address list of Virginia Technology Education Association members. A 17 question survey was sent via the Internet to all 41 teachers. The initial message was delivered to 34 active e mail accounts. Subsequent e mail, postal, and telephone communications produced a total of 25 completed responses. This equaled a response rate of 61% of the sample population. Table 1 shows the response rate data in tabular form.

**Table 1**  
**Response Data**

|                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>TOTAL SURVEYS SENT BY E MAIL</b> | <b>41</b>  |
| <b>SURVEYS RECEIVED BY SUBJECTS</b> | <b>34</b>  |
| <b>COMPLETED RESPONSES RETURNED</b> | <b>25</b>  |
| <b>EFFECTIVE RESPONSE RATE</b>      | <b>61%</b> |

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY QUESTION**

Question 1 asked subjects how satisfied they were with their duties as a classroom teacher. Table 2 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 4.28.

**TABLE 2**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 1**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>9</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>4.28</b> |

Question 2 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the sense of accomplishment they got from their jobs. Table 3 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 4.04.

**TABLE 3**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 2**

---

---

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>7</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>4.04</b> |

---

Question 3 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the maintenance of the technology equipment in their classrooms. Table 4 shows that respondents were not sure, indicated by a mean of 3.44.

**TABLE 4**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 3**

---

---

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>4</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>3.44</b> |

---

Question 4 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with their schedule of classes and planning periods. Table 5 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.92.

**TABLE 5**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 4**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>10</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>3.92</b> |

Question 5 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the recognition they got for doing a good job. Table 6 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.56.

**TABLE 6**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 5**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>7</b>  | <b>9</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.56</b> |

Question 6 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the level of responsibility in their current position. Table 7 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 4.16.

**TABLE 7**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 6**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>6</b>  | <b>13</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>4.16</b> |

Question 7 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the social status of being a public school technology teacher. Table 8 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.88.

**TABLE 8**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 7**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>6</b>  | <b>13</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>3.88</b> |

Question 8 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with their opportunities for professional growth. Table 9 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.88.

**TABLE 9**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 8**

| VS | S | N | D | VD | MEAN |
|----|---|---|---|----|------|
| 9  | 9 | 3 | 3 | 1  | 3.88 |

Question 9 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the way school policies were implemented. Table 10 shows that respondents were not sure, indicated by a mean of 3.44.

**TABLE 10**  
**QUESTION 9**

| VS | S  | N | D | VD | MEAN |
|----|----|---|---|----|------|
| 1  | 17 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.44 |

Question 10 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with their school systems pay plan. Table 11 shows that respondents were not sure, indicated by a mean of 3.40.

**TABLE 11**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 10**

---

---

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>3.40</b> |

---

---

Question number 11 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the overall working conditions in their school. Table 12 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.92.

**TABLE 12**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 11**

---

---

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>6</b>  | <b>15</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.92</b> |

---

---

Question 12 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the level of cooperation among faculty members in their department. Table 13 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 4.16.

**TABLE 13**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 12**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>10</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>-</b>  | <b>4.16</b> |

Question 13 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the way their principal performed his/her job. Table 14 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.76.

**TABLE 14**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 13**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>7</b>  | <b>12</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>3.76</b> |

Question 14 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the amount of job security they had. Table 15 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 4.20.

**TABLE 15**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 14**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>8</b>  | <b>16</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>4.20</b> |

Question 15 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the amount of after hours time needed to do their jobs well. Table 16 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.60.

**TABLE 16**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 15**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>4</b>  | <b>14</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.60</b> |

Question 16 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the budget for their classroom supplies. Table 17 shows that respondents were satisfied, indicated by a mean of 3.80.

**TABLE 17**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 16**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>9</b>  | <b>9</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.80</b> |

Question 17 asked the subjects how satisfied they were with the discipline policies enforced by their principals. Table 18 shows that respondents were not sure indicated by a mean of 3.12.

**TABLE 18**  
**QUESTION NUMBER 17**

| <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> | <b>MEAN</b> |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| <b>3</b>  | <b>10</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>2</b>  | <b>3.12</b> |

The means for the 17 questionnaire items ranged from a high of 4.28 for question number 1, to a low of 3.12 for question number 17. Therefore, no item reached the threshold mean of 4.50 or "very satisfied." Conversely, no item mean fell to the 2.50 threshold for "dissatisfied." The majority of the survey items (13) registered means in the "satisfied" range between 3.50 and 4.50, while the balance (4) rested in the "not sure" category between 2.50 and 3.50.

The results by percentage however, revealed several areas of dissatisfaction not clearly evident by reviewing the means alone. Item 17 had a total of 44% of responses in the dissatisfied and very dissatisfied column. In addition, items 3, 5, and 10 scored negatively with 36%, 28%, and 28% of responses in this category respectively. Table 19 expresses the participants responses to each question by percentages.

**TABLE 19**  
**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGE**

| <b>ITEM</b> | <b>VS</b> | <b>S</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>VD</b> |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1.          | 36        | 60       | -        | 4        | -         |
| 2.          | 28        | 60       | 4        | 4        | 4         |
| 3.          | 16        | 48       | -        | 36       | -         |
| 4.          | 40        | 40       | -        | 12       | 8         |
| 5.          | 28        | 36       | 4        | 28       | -         |
| 6.          | 44        | 40       | 4        | 12       | -         |
| 7.          | 24        | 52       | 12       | 12       | -         |
| 8.          | 36        | 36       | 12       | 12       | 4         |
| 9.          | 4         | 68       | 4        | 16       | 8         |
| 10.         | 4         | 60       | 8        | 28       | -         |
| 11.         | 24        | 60       | 4        | 8        | 4         |
| *12.        | 41.6      | 37.5     | 16.7     | 4.2      | -         |
| 13.         | 28        | 48       | 4        | 12       | 8         |
| 14.         | 32        | 64       | -        | -        | 4         |
| 15.         | 16        | 56       | 4        | 20       | 4         |
| 16.         | 36        | 36       | 4        | 20       | 4         |
| 17.         | 12        | 40       | 4        | 36       | 8         |

**\*One respondent was an itinerant teacher working at two separate schools. He gave two answers to item 12 to reflect both situations. To maintain the integrity of the study results, his response(s) to that question was excluded.**

## **SUMMARY**

Chapter IV contained the findings of this study to determine the level of job satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association members teaching middle school technology courses. The results of the data collected were presented in both tabular and narrative formats. Chapter V of this study will present the Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations consistent with these findings.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **SUMMARY**

The problem of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction among Virginia Technology Education Association members teaching middle school technology courses. The following pages will summarize this research project, offer conclusions, and make recommendations based on the parameters of the study and the results of the survey conducted.

The review of literature portion of this research project supported the widely recognized importance of job satisfaction in attracting, motivating, and retaining qualified and dedicated teaching professionals. The knowledge gained was also used to structure this study to answer the two questions that represented the specific research goals of this project. First, what factors affect job satisfactions levels among middle school technology teachers? Second, what steps should be taken to enhance job satisfaction for middle technology teachers?

For the purpose of this study, two basic assumptions were made with respect to the research goals mentioned above. One, teacher job satisfaction levels affect their job performance and career longevity. Two, there are ways to enhance job satisfaction among teaching professionals.

The limitations of this investigation dealt with the selection of the sample population. Only middle school technology instructors teaching in Virginia were surveyed. Also, the list of survey recipients was drawn from 1998-99 Virginia Technology Education Association members.

All research data was collected by means of an e mail survey sent to 41 middle technology teachers. The 17 item forced choice questionnaire asked the participants to indicate their level of job satisfaction with certain intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their current position. The survey instrument was scored on a five point Likert scale. Of the 41 surveys transmitted, 34 were successfully delivered. A total of 25 completed responses were subsequently generated for a total response rate of 61%.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The analysis of data produced by the survey confirmed that in general, the teachers questioned were satisfied with their current job situations. The overall mean for the percentage of very satisfied and satisfied responses for the questionnaire was 79.24%.

The first research goal of the study was to assess what factors affect job satisfaction levels among middle school technology teachers. The results of the survey indicated that all 17 of the job aspects included in the survey were significant determinants of job satisfaction levels. This conclusion is based on the review of "not sure" responses for all questions. Only one question, item 12, had four responses in that column. Two other questions received three "not sure" responses (item 7 and 8), while one question

(item 10) had two such responses. The balance of the questions had either one or zero "not sure" responses. This indicated that the respondents were able to clearly express their perceived level of job satisfaction, either positive or negative, on a per question basis.

The second research goal was to determine what steps should be taken to enhance job satisfaction for middle technology teachers. By analyzing "dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied" responses, a definite pattern emerged that pointed out problem areas that needed to be addressed.

Question 17, that dealt with principals enforcement of discipline policies received the highest number of "dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied" answers with a rate of 44%. Item 3, concerning maintenance of classroom equipment had the next highest negative assessment at 36%, while question 5 having to do with adequate recognition for doing a good job followed closely with 33% unsatisfactory responses. Question 10 which dealt pay plans, question 15 which referred to after hours work time and question 16 that concerned classroom supply budgets averaged one out of four "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" responses.

In addition, only one question (number 10) of the top six with unsatisfactory ratings had more than one "not sure" answer. This again illustrated that the respondents were able to concretely define their feelings on the issues raised in the survey.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, this researcher respectfully submits the following recommendations:

1. The Virginia Department of Education and the Division of Adult and Vocational Education should conduct a joint study on the discipline policies and their administration by middle school principals.
2. The Division of Adult and Vocational Education should more closely monitor and recommend the maintenance, repair and/or replacement of technology education classroom equipment.
3. The Virginia Department of Education and the Division of Adult and Vocational Education should work together with local school administrations to increase awareness of the importance of technology education in our changing society and the valuable contributions made by technology education teachers.
4. The Virginia Department of Education and the Division of Adult and Vocational Education should renew efforts to recommend the needed funds to the local school districts to provide an adequate budget for technology classroom supplies.
5. The Virginia Department of Education should design and conduct a series of time management seminars to assist all teaching professionals in developing techniques to minimize the amount of after hours time spent on school related matters without sacrificing job performance.

## **ADDITIONAL RESEARCH**

The following suggestions for additional research are offered to further explore the issues raised in the course of this study:

1. A repeat of this survey or an expanded version to determine how the results relate to all technology teachers in the state, including high school teachers.
2. A similar study to compare opinions of technology teachers vs. those in other disciplines.
3. Stratify future studies to determine the influence of factors such as years of teaching experience, educational level, income level, age, sex, etc.
4. A survey of district and school administrators concerning their attitudes regarding the importance of technology education in the overall educational experience of students.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cranny, C. J., Smith, Patricia Cain, Stone, Eugene F. Job Satisfaction. New York: Lexington Books, 1992.
- Davis, Voyia (1994). Teacher's Assessment of the Quality of Their Schools. (ERIC) Educational Research Information Center, Document No. 377141.
- Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc. (1992). "Hawthorne Studies."
- Herzberg, F. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Hopkins, Anne H. Work and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld, 1983.
- James, L. R. and James, L. A. "International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology." Chichester, England: Wiley, 1989.
- Locke, E. A. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction" in The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, pp.1297-1349. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Miller, K. I. and Monge, P. R. "Participation, Satisfaction, and Productivity: A meta-analytic review." Academy of Management Journal, (Vol. 29), pp. 727-753.
- Mohammadi, John and others (1995). "Climate Study." Presented at Patrick Henry Community College, Martinsville, Virginia.
- Pipho, Chris "A 'real' Teacher Shortage." Phi Delta Kappan (Nov. 1998),pp.181.
- Salancik, G. R. and Pfeffer, J. "An Examination of Need-Satisfaction Models of Job Attitudes." Administrative Science Quarterly, (Vol 22), pp.427-456.
- Satterlee, Brian (1988). "A Study to Determine the Job Satisfaction of the Engineering/Industrial Technology Faculty at Delgado Community College." Presented to Nova University.
- Stone, E. F. and Gueutal, H. G. "On the Premature Death of Need Satisfaction Models: An Investigation of Salancik and Pfeffer's Views on Priming and Consistency Artifacts." Journal of Management., (Vol. 10), pp. 237-258.

Tetzeli, Rick "Whose Afraid of a Teacher Shortage?" Fortune (March 8, 1993, Vol 127, n5), pp. 10-11.

Wint, John, et al The Condition of Education, 1998. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1998, p. 124.

**APPENDIX A**  
**SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

## Virginia Technology Education Association Members Job Satisfaction Survey

Please complete the following questions and respond by e mail to DadeePhil@AOL.com.

**Directions :** For each of the following questions, please highlight and enter your desired response.

VS = Very satisfied S = Satisfied N = Not sure

D = Dissatisfied VD = Very dissatisfied

1. I am ----- with my duties as a classroom teacher.

VS S N D VD

2. I am ----- with the sense of accomplishment I get from my job.

VS S N D VD

3. I am ----- with the maintenance of the technology equipment that I use.

VS S N D VD

4. I am ----- with my schedule of classes and planning periods.

VS S N D VD

5. I am ----- with the recognition I get for doing a good job.

VS S N D VD

6. I am ----- with the level of responsibility in my current position.

VS S N D VD

7. I am ----- with the social status of being a public school technology teacher.

VS S N D VD

8. I am ----- with my opportunities for professional growth.

VS S N D VD

9. I am ----- with the way school policies are implemented.

VS S N D VD

10. I am ----- with my school system's pay plan.

VS S N D VD

11. I am ----- with the overall working conditions in my school.

VS S N D VD

12. I am ----- with level of cooperation among faculty member in my department.

VS S N D VD

13. I am ----- with the way my principal performs his/her job.

VS S N D VD

14. I am ----- with the amount of job security I have.

VS S N D VD

15. I am ----- with the amount of after hours time needed to do my job well.

VS S N D VD

16. I am ----- with the budget for my classroom supplies.

VS S N D VD

17. I am ----- with the discipline policies enforced by my principal.

VS S N D VD

**APPENDIX B**  
**COVER LETTER**

June 6, 1999

Dear Virginia Technology Education Association Member:

As a practicing technology education teacher, you have the unique combination of knowledge and experiences that provide the ideal population for a current research study I have undertaken. This project is part of my preparation to become a middle school technology teacher through a Master's Degree program at Old Dominion University.

My goal is to determine the level of job satisfaction that you, as my future peers, enjoy in your profession. In addition, I hope to make the findings available in an effort to contribute in some way to the appreciation and advancement of teaching professionals for the valuable contributions you have made. It is for this reason that I ask for your help in completing this study.

Please complete the attached questionnaire and return to my e mail address which is DadeePhil@aol.com by June 16th in order that the results may be tabulated promptly. These seventeen questions are similar to those used in other documented studies, thus providing valid and reliable measures of job satisfaction.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in furthering my research objectives.

Sincerely yours,

M. Reid Rawls

MRR/lcr

enclosure

**APPENDIX C**  
**FOLLOW UP LETTER**

June 17, 1999

Dear Virginia Technology Education Association Member:

On June 6, 1999 an e mail letter with an enclosed survey was sent to all 41 Virginia Technology Education Association members who are currently teaching technology courses at the middle school level. This research project is part of my graduate program requirement.

My objective was to determine the level of job satisfaction among middle school technology teachers since I will soon be joining their ranks.

With a sample population of only 41 participants, each response is critical to the successful completion of this study. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed brief questionnaire and return it by return e mail. Your help in this regard would be very much appreciated. Your individual response will be strictly confidential. If you have any questions concerning this survey or its purpose and results, please feel free to contact me at the number listed below.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

M. Reid Rawls  
613 Hassell Drive  
Chesapeake, Virginia 23322  
757-482-6768

MRR/lcr

enclosure

