DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 494 CE 073 443

AUTHOR Funderburg, Dinnah L.; Kapes, Jerome T.
TITLE Work Values and Job Satisfaction of Arkansas Business Educators in Secondary Systems and Community/Technical Colleges.
PUB DATE 24 Jan 97
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, January 24, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Education Teachers; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Job Satisfaction; Secondary Education; Sex Differences; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; Work Attitudes; *Work Ethic
IDENTIFIERS *Arkansas

ABSTRACT

The work values and job satisfaction of Arkansas business educators in secondary school systems and community/technical colleges were examined through a survey of a random sample of 129 of Arkansas' 926 secondary and community/technical college business educators. Of those teachers sent surveys (67 secondary and 62 community/technical college business educators), 64.5% responded. Respondents completed a demographic information, the Values Scale (a measure of work values), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (a measure of job satisfaction). Data were analyzed by multivariate analysis of variance, t-tests, and effect sizes. The secondary business educators valued cultural identity, economic rewards, and economic security more than the community/technical college business educators did. No differences were found between the job satisfaction of the secondary and community/technical college business educators as measured by the MSQ; however, a self-report form that was also used indicated that the community/technical college educators were more satisfied with their jobs than were the secondary-level educators. Among the secondary-level educators, males valued achievement, advancement, authority, autonomy, cultural identity, physical prowess, prestige, and risk more than females did. No gender differences regarding work values or job satisfaction were discovered among the community/technical college subsample. (Contains 21 references.) (MN)

Work Values and Job Satisfaction of Arkansas Business Educators in Secondary Systems and Community/Technical Colleges

Dinnah L. Funderburg
Owner
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Stamps, AR 71860
(501) 533-2298
Fax (501) 533-2298

Jerome T. Kapes
Professor of Educational Psychology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4225
(409) 845-5479
jkapes@tamu.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX, January 24, 1997.

Abstract

The problem addressed in this research was the need for more information on work values and job satisfaction of business educators at the secondary and community/technical college level. The sample of 129 subjects were randomly chosen from the population of Arkansas secondary and community/technical college business educators. Characteristics of the educators were determined using biographical data, the Values Scale (VS) to measure work values, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to measure job satisfaction. Data were analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance, t-tests, and effect sizes. The findings indicate that secondary business educators valued Cultural Identity, Economic Rewards, and Economic Security more than the community/technical college educators. No differences were found between the secondary and community/technical college subsamples in job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ; however, the community/technical college subsample were more satisfied with their jobs as measured by a self-report question, Global Satisfaction. Males at the secondary level valued Achievement, Advancement, Authority, Autonomy, Cultural Identity, Physical Prowess, Prestige, and Risk more than their female co-workers. Females at the secondary level were more satisfied with their jobs as measured by Global Satisfaction. No differences were between males and females in community/technical colleges on work values or job satisfaction. (Contains 21 references.)

Background

Research relating to job satisfaction within the field of education has continued to indicate the act of teaching to be intrinsically self-rewarding with little importance placed on extrinsic values or factors (Akroyd, O'Brien, and Richards, 1993; Bruening and Hoover, 1991; Chapman, 1983; Drummond and Stoddard, 1990; Handley and Shill, 1973). Values rated highly in contribution to personal fulfillment and job satisfaction for educators include ability, autonomy, social interaction, and utilization (Drummond and Stoddard, 1990). Yet, in spite of the fact that intrinsic rewards providing self-fulfillment are still present in the work environment of educators, more and more are leaving the field of education due to dissatisfaction. According to the Texas Education Agency, nearly 50% of Texas' beginning teachers in the 1988-89 school year had left the classroom within five years ("Study," 1995).

There is good reason to believe that extrinsic factors are influencing job satisfaction in the field of education. Salary, lack of parental and administrative support, student behavior, general working conditions, and little or no student motivation are some of the factors mentioned in recent studies. Even though educators have long recognized the prospect of low salary and have chosen to teach knowing the lack of monetary rewards (Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986), they are becoming more concerned with salary as inflation erodes the purchasing power of monetary compensation (Akroyd, O'Brien, and Richards, 1993). In a survey by Louis Harris and Associates (1992), approximately 20% of teachers completing their second year in the field of education have chosen to leave indicating lack of parental and administrative support as major factors in their decision. Several studies have pointed

to student behavior and lack of student motivation as factors negatively affecting job satisfaction (Akroyd, O'Brien, and Richards, 1993; Camp, 1987, Lortie, 1986).

Business educators at the secondary and community/technical college level work in a complex environment that requires continual upgrading of technical skills and expertise. They must be able to offer occupationally-specific courses as well as continuing education courses and comprehensive transfer courses ("This We Believe," 1994). Both secondary and postsecondary business educators have large course enrollments with business as the most popular occupational program at both levels ("Status of Postsecondary," 1995; "Status of Secondary," 1995). In addition to essential classroom activities and course content preparation expected by the system or institution, business educators are encouraged to invest hours outside the classroom in activities related to business/education linkages, curricula validation, practical work experience programs for students, and increased technological expertise ("This We Believe," 1994). In view of the above conditions and needs, the problem addressed in this study is the need for more information on the nature of work values and degree of job satisfaction of Arkansas business educators at both the secondary and community/technical college level.

The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions:

1. Are there differences in work values and job satisfaction of business educators who are employed in (a) secondary schools and (b) community/technical colleges?
2. Are there differences in work values and job satisfaction based on gender for business educators who are employed in (a) secondary schools and (b)

community/technical colleges?

Method

Sample

This study was undertaken using the pool of 926 secondary vocational and community/technical college business educators in Arkansas. Two hundred potential participants, 100 from each subsample, were selected based on a table of random numbers. The study had a total return rate of 64.5% with complete data received on 67 secondary and 62 community/technical college business educators.

Instrumentation

Descriptive information on each subject was collected through a demographic information sheet, one instrument to measure work values, and one instrument to measure job satisfaction. A Demographic Information Sheet was used to obtain biographical information including teaching environment (secondary or community/technical college), gender, and subject's perception of his or her current degree of overall job satisfaction. This global question of the subject's perception of his or her current degree of job satisfaction was obtained through use of a line with each point on the line being assigned a number ranging from 0 (Low) to 10 (High). Subjects were asked to place an "X" on the line at the point reflecting their degree of job satisfaction.

The Values Scale (VS) (Nevill and Super, 1989) was utilized to measure work values, and the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967) was used to measure job satisfaction.

The Values Scale (Neville and Super, 1989) evolved from the internationally-

based Work Importance Study by Super and is used to assess objectives desired in order to satisfy needs. The VS includes 21 scales with five items each for a total of 105 items. Item 106, used for cross-national studies, was not included in this study. Raw scores for each item were obtained by totaling the weight (1 to 4) given by each subject for the item.

This assessment instrument is appropriate for use with subjects of varying ages and with different cultural groups. The standard norms were based on a sample of adults (N = 323) in the United States. Alpha coefficients for internal consistency are generally above .65 for United States Adult sample with a median alpha of .77. Factor analyses, conducted across varying age groups, supports the conclusion of valid data. Due to the recent introduction of the VS as an assessment instrument, no information is available for predictive validity although some of the norming data was treated to allow for longitudinal tracking and criterion-data collection.

Internal consistency reliability using Cronbach's Alpha was computed for this study and reported in the form of alpha coefficients. The alphas for this sample ranged from .47 for the scale of Physical Prowess to .88 for the scale of Prestige. The median alpha for this sample was .79.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Short Form, (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967) was used to measure job satisfaction. This assessment instrument is appropriate for use with adults in the area of employment counseling. The condensed form was developed for the purpose of efficient and cost-effective administration and data collection, and items chosen were those that correlated the highest with their respective scales. The MSQ measures job satisfaction using 20

items, one for each of the 20 scales. Each item is answered using a five-point Likert scale with a scoring weight of 1 to 5. The weights for these 20 items are summed for a total general satisfaction score.

Based on normative data for six occupation groups, the short-form reliability coefficients for total general satisfaction ranged from .87 for assemblers to .92 for engineers. Evidence to support construct validity is based on construct validation studies conducted during the development of the Theory of Work Adjustment. Concurrent validity was determined from the analysis of group differences in satisfaction, particularly occupational differences in satisfaction.

Internal consistency reliability for this study was computed using Cronbach's alpha. The alpha coefficient for total general satisfaction was .88 as compared to a Hoyt reliability coefficient of .92 for engineers, the one group among the six with characteristics most similar to educators.

Procedure

The data for this study were collected during the fall of 1995 through January of 1996. Support for this study was obtained from the state agency that administers secondary vocational business programs and the professional organization whose membership includes business educators at both the secondary and postsecondary level. Pre-survey letters explaining the purpose of the study were mailed to each of the 200 individuals selected to participate. One week later packets containing a cover letter reiterating purpose, three instruments, postage-paid response envelope, and packet of tea were mailed. Postcards were mailed to nonrespondents two weeks later, followed by phone calls to nonrespondents over the next four weeks.

A total of 133 packets were received; of the 133, 129 were usable. Between days 5 and 11 following the initial packet mailing, 57.4% of the usable packets were returned. Fourteen percent were received after the postcard follow-up. The phone calls produced 7.8% of the usable packets.

Analysis

Data were calculated using SPSS for Windows statistical package (Graduate Pack, Advanced Version). Statistical procedures for this study included multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), t-tests, and effect sizes (ES). Question Two is posed as a simple effects analysis since it was predetermined that gender differences were of interest in each teaching environment studied. The procedure of effect size was used because statistical significance testing is highly influenced by sample size and does not provide information about the magnitude of differences found (Thompson, 1994). Effect sizes were calculated for this study in order to (1) determine a computed, nonsubjective magnitude of difference for comparison of scale scores (Borg and Gall, 1989, Thompson, 1994) and (2) study practical group differences (Borg and Gall, 1989; Thompson, 1995).

When calculating effect size for two groups, i.e., secondary and community/ technical college, the average of the standard deviations for that scale was used as the denominator. The magnitude descriptions for effect size (ES) follow the conventions recommended by Cohen (1977) of .2, .5, and .8 as guides for small, moderate, and large effect sizes respectively.

Results

Of the total sample of 129 respondents, 93% were Caucasian and 77%,

female. The mean age was 43.7 years. Independent t-tests revealed a statistically significant difference [$t(124) = 2.69$; $p < .01$] in the mean years as an educator; 18 for secondary educators and 13.5 for community/technical college educators. The same is true for number of years as a business educator. Independent t-tests indicated a statistically significant difference between the means of the two subsamples [$t(120) = 2.08$; $p = .04$] with the mean years for secondary business educators 16.7 and for community/technical college business educators, 13.3.

Question 1. This question examined the differences between the work values and job satisfaction of business educators who are employed in (a) secondary schools and (b) community/technical colleges. The multivariate analysis of variance revealed a nonsignificant multivariate effect for overall mean scale difference for the two groups, Wilks' lambda = .83, Exact $F(21, 107) = 1.00$, $p = .47$. Table 1 presents the findings for the comparison of secondary and community/technical college educators for the Values Scale. Only three scales yielded differences that are statistically significant. These included Economic Rewards (ES = .40), Cultural Identity, (ES = .36), and Economic Security (ES = .36). All three effect sizes were moderate with secondary educators indicating a higher mean score than postsecondary educators for each of these scales. Although not statistically significant, secondary educators valued Prestige and Working Conditions more than community/technical college educators. The reverse was true for Risk with the community/technical college subsample valuing this scale more. Each of these three scale mean differences yielded a moderate effect size of .31.

Insert Table 1 about here.

The MSQ scales for the two subsamples were first analyzed through MANOVA. This analysis failed to reveal a significant difference between the two groups, Wilks' lambda .79, Exact $F(20, 107) = 1.43$, $p = .12$. Table 2 provides the data for the comparison of the two subsamples on the MSQ scales. Working Conditions (ES = .42) was the only scale with a statistically significant mean difference. The ES for MSQ Total Satisfaction was .09; however, the score for the self-perceived satisfaction from the demographic information sheet, Global Satisfaction, indicated a statistically significant difference in satisfaction with the community/technical college business educators expressing greater satisfaction (ES = .37). Even though not statistically significant, the postsecondary subsample indicated a higher degree of satisfaction with the scale of Authority, Co-Workers, Creativity, and Supervision--Human Relations. Each of these scales yielded a moderate effect size.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Question 2. This question sought to determine differences in work values and jobs satisfaction based on gender for business educators who are employed in (a) secondary systems and (b) community/technical colleges. The MANOVA analysis for the secondary subsample on the VS was statistically significant, Wilks' lambda = .54, Exact $F(21, 44) = .88$; $p = .05$, indicating a difference between the two groups on the scales of this instrument. Table 3 indicates males and females in this subsample

yielded statistically significant differences on the scales of Achievement, Advancement, Authority, Autonomy, Cultural Identity, Physical Prowess, Prestige, and Risk with males scoring higher on all eight scales. The effect sizes for these scales were moderate to large, ranging from .70 to 1.08. Although not statistically significant, males valued the scales of Ability Utilization, Economic Rewards, Personal Development, and Working Conditions more highly than females with effect sizes on these scales ranging from .28 to .69.

Insert Table 3 about here.

The MANOVA analysis of gender for community/technical college business educators on the VS was not statistically significant, Wilks' lambda = .66, Exact $F(21,39) = .94$; $p = .14$. Table 4 presents the data related to gender and the VS for this subsample. No scale mean differences were found to be statistically significant. Creativity had the largest ES (.54) with females in this subsample valuing Creativity more highly than males. The scales of Ability Utilization (ES = .53) and Achievement (ES = .40) yielded moderate effect sizes with females valuing these scales more highly than their male counterparts. However, males in this subsample had a higher mean score on Cultural Identity (ES = .46), a finding similar to that of males in the secondary subsample on this scale.

Insert Table 4 about here.

The analysis of the effect of gender on MSQ scales for the secondary subsample again indicated no statistically significant difference, Wilks' lambda = .72,

Exact $F(20, 45) = .88$; $p = .1$. No statistically significant mean differences were found in the data presented in Table 5; however, five scales have moderate effect sizes due to the spread of scores for that scale as seen in the standard deviations. These five were: Security (ES = .65), Working Conditions (ES = .61), Activity (ES = .59), Independence (ES = .56), and Social Service (ES = .50). Females had higher mean scores on all five scales. No statistically significant difference was found between males and females on MSQ Total Satisfaction (ES = .39); however, females expressed greater satisfaction as measured by Global Satisfaction (ES = .91), a large effect size. Global Satisfaction mean scores for the female subsample (n = 59) was 7.50 with a standard deviation of 1.53 while the mean score for the male subsample (n = 8) was 5.63 with a standard deviation of 2.56, indicating a wider spread in scores.

Insert Table 5 about here.

The MANOVA for community/technical college educators indicated no statistical significant difference between the two subsamples on the scales of the MSQ, Wilks' lambda of .58, Exact $F(21, 38) = 1.26$; $p = .26$. The information needed to explore the effect of gender on the MSQ scales for the community/technical college subsample can be found on Table 6. Three scales, Moral Values (ES = .61), Advancement (ES = .53), and Social Status (ES = .54) were statistically significant, with females expressing greater satisfaction on Advancement and Social Status than males. Other scales not statistically significant but indicating moderate effect sizes included Compensation (.44), Social Service (.47) and Variety (.43) with females indicating greater satisfaction. The analysis of MSQ Total Satisfaction and Global

Satisfaction indicated no difference in job satisfaction between males and females. Both measures of total satisfaction had small effect sizes. Global Satisfaction mean scores for the female subsample were similar with females (n = 42) scoring 7.88 and males (n = 20) scoring 7.85.

Insert Table 6 about here.

Discussion and Conclusions

While there have been studies related to values and degree of job satisfaction of educators in general and vocational educators specifically, little is known about the values or degree of satisfaction of business educators at the secondary or community/ technical college. No information is available related to values and degree of job satisfaction for Arkansas business educators. What are the values and current degree of job satisfaction for Arkansas business educators? Considering the workload of vocational educators and, more to the point, business educators, can values be identified and utilized by school systems and institutions to retain outstanding business educators?

Based on work values as measured by the VS, secondary business educators valued Cultural Identity, Economic Rewards, and Economic Security more than their counterparts at the postsecondary level. These findings follow the growing trend of interest in extrinsic factors and point to the educators' propensity toward monetary needs with secondary educators placing more emphasis on this than postsecondary educators. As postsecondary compensation is generally higher, these educators may feel that their salary is more sufficient in meeting their financial needs. These findings

also point to the greater desire of secondary business educators to work with people of similar interests and beliefs. Because secondary business educators have less autonomy than is available to postsecondary educators in the planning of course content, curricula, and program objectives due to state-mandated course competencies, these educators may feel greater unity and work more productively with people of similar interests and beliefs.

In an examination of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ Total Satisfaction and the self-perceived question of Global Satisfaction, two findings are noteworthy. Community/technical college educators were more satisfied with their jobs based on Global Satisfaction. Yet, no difference was found in job satisfaction as measured by MSQ Total Satisfaction. This may be an indication that a broad question related to overall satisfaction may be answered without much thought regarding the facets inherent in defining personal satisfaction within the framework of their employment. Yet, when individual aspects of the job are carefully considered and weighed, a different answer may be obtained. Postsecondary educators were also more satisfied with their work environment than were secondary educators. Again, the growing trend of interest in ancillary factors such as working conditions to be reflected in these findings.

Based on the relationship between gender with work values, males in the secondary subsample tended to value more highly characteristics previously ascribed in literature to males: advancement, authority, prestige, and risk (Beutell and Brenner, 1986). However, there is little difference between males and females in community/technical colleges. This follows current findings of value similarities in

studies related to gender due to comparable education and socialization experiences (Lefkowitz, 1994).

Gender and its relationship to job satisfaction indicated the greater degree of self-perceived job satisfaction by females in secondary systems. Possibly, females perceive their work as an environment where a large number of people of the same gender having similar interests and educational background can interact. The reverse may tend, in part, to be true for males. Even though males have similar interests and educational background as their female cohorts, they may perceive problems due to their small numbers in the secondary systems.

Females in the postsecondary institutions were more satisfied than their male counterparts with their opportunities for advancement and their social status. This tends to suggest that women perceive opportunity for advancement to be greater in postsecondary education settings as compared to the corporate world with "glass ceilings." This may also reflect social recognition given by the community to females employed in postsecondary institutions.

Based on findings in this research, school systems and postsecondary institutions in Arkansas, as much as it is possible given current fiscal constraints, need to attend to the growing importance of extrinsic facets such as compensation and working conditions in order to retain outstanding business educators.

References

Akroyd, D., O'Brien, T., & Richards, B. (1993). The ability of selected intrinsic and extrinsic work rewards to predict vocational teachers' work satisfaction. Occupational Education Forum, 21(2), 3-17.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989) Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Bruening, T. H., & Hoover, T. S. (1991). Personal life factors as related to effectiveness and satisfaction of secondary agricultural teachers. Journal of Agricultural Education, 32(4), 37-43.

Beutell, N. J., & Brenner, O. C. (1986). Sex differences in work values. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28(1), 29-41.

Camp, W. G. (1987). Student misbehavior and job satisfaction of vocational agriculture teachers: A path analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. 279 791)

Chapman, D. W. (1983). Career satisfaction of teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 7(3), 40-50.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (rev. ed.). New York: Academic Press.

Drummond, R. J., & Stoddard, A. H. (1990). Work values of preservice and inservice teachers and educators. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 319 721)

Handley, H. M., & Shill, J. F. (1973). Work values and job attitudes held by new teachers in vocational education in Mississippi. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 696 451)

Harris, L., & Associates. (1992). The America teacher, 1992, the second year: new teachers' expectations and ideals, A survey of new teachers who completed their second year of teaching in public schools in 1992, The metropolitan life survey. New York: Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 354 226)

Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, Jr., E. F., & Cohn M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(8), 559-567.

Lefkowitz, J. (1994). Sex-related differences in job attitudes and dispositional variables: Now you see them,.... Academy of Management Journal, 37(2), 323-349.

Lortie, D. C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? Phi Delta Kappan, 67(8), 568-575.

Nevill, D. D., & Super, D. (1989). The values scale: Theory, application, and research: Manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Status of postsecondary vocational education. (1995). Vocational Educational Journal, 70(5), 30-31.

Status of secondary vocational education. (1995). Vocational Education Journal, 70(5), 28-29.

Study: Nearly half of new teachers left in five years. (1995, July 8). Texarkana Gazette, p. 5A.

This we believe about business programs in community colleges (Statement No. 55). (1994). Business Education Forum, 49(1), 19-20.

Thompson, B. (1994). The concept of statistical significance testing. Washington, DC: ERIC/AE Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 366 654)

Thompson, B. (1995). Editorial policies regarding statistical significance testing: Three suggested reforms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 392 819)

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: xxii). Minneapolis, MN: Vocational Psychology Research, University of Minnesota.

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for the Values Scale for Secondary and Community/Technical College Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Secondary Subsample n=67		Community/ Technical C. Subsample n=62		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	16.73	2.23	16.56	2.26	-.17	.07
Achievement	16.91	2.70	16.72	1.70	-.19	.08
Advancement	13.60	3.52	13.02	2.82	-.58	.18
Aesthetics	13.57	3.73	13.18	3.19	-.39	.11
Altruism	15.63	2.61	15.34	2.82	-.29	.10
Authority	12.85	2.93	12.13	2.65	-.72	.26
Autonomy	14.72	2.73	14.82	2.73	.11	.04
Creativity	14.60	2.93	14.40	2.83	-.19	.07
Cultural Identity	13.94	3.41	12.71	3.43	-1.23*	.36
Economic Rewards	16.15	2.87	15.08	2.50	-1.07*	.40
Economic Security	17.94	2.63	16.98	2.65	-.96*	.36
Life Style	15.27	2.25	14.89	2.34	-.38	.17
Personal Development	16.15	2.12	16.00	2.09	-.15	.07
Physical Activity	10.39	3.07	10.17	2.99	-.21	.07
Physical Prowess	8.31	2.56	7.68	1.91	-.64	.28
Prestige	14.27	3.60	13.18	3.42	-1.09	.31
Risk	7.31	2.38	8.08	2.65	.77	.31
Social Interaction	12.27	3.00	12.16	2.96	-.11	.04
Social Relations	13.72	2.94	13.31	2.67	-.41	.15
Variety	14.16	2.88	13.53	3.01	-.63	.22
Working Conditions	16.73	2.60	15.91	2.72	-.81	.31

*$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

TABLE 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and Global Satisfaction for Secondary and Community/Technical College Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Secondary Subsample n=67		Community/ Technical C. Subsample n=62		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	4.24	.68	4.34	.81	.10	.14
Achievement	4.05	.82	4.07	.92	.02	.02
Activity	4.30	.63	4.29	.52	-.01	.01
Advancement	2.97	1.02	3.10	.97	.13	.13
Authority	3.58	.61	3.71	.64	.13	.21
Comp Pol & Practices	3.03	1.09	3.18	.98	.15	.14
Compensation	3.00	1.24	2.91	1.21	-.08	.07
Co-Workers	3.69	1.02	3.87	.84	.18	.20
Creativity	4.09	.83	4.34	.68	.25	.33
Independence	4.09	.69	4.00	.68	-.09	.13
Moral Values	4.19	.70	4.16	.79	-.03	.04
Recognition	3.31	1.02	3.37	1.12	.06	.05
Responsibility	4.08	.86	4.05	.76	-.03	.03
Security	4.33	.93	4.24	.80	-.09	.10
Social Service	4.48	.53	4.39	.71	-.09	.15
Social Status	3.96	.81	3.92	.71	-.04	.05
Sup--Human Relations	3.49	1.06	3.77	1.02	.28	.27
Sup--Technical	3.67	1.04	3.58	1.05	-.09	.09
Variety	4.34	.75	4.19	.81	-.15	.19
Working Conditions	3.66	.98	4.03	.83	.38*	.42
MSQ Total Satisfaction	76.58	10.04	77.47	9.29	.89	.09
Global Satisfaction	7.28	1.76	7.87	1.45	.59*	.37

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

TABLE 3
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for Male and Female Comparisons on the Values Scale for Secondary Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Females n=58		Males n=8		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	16.64	2.28	17.25	2.05	.61	.28
Achievement	16.69	2.75	18.25	1.91	1.56*	.70
Advancement	13.17	3.43	16.50	3.12	3.33*	1.02
Aesthetics	13.22	3.53	15.35	4.40	2.03	.51
Altruism	15.45	2.52	16.38	2.97	.93	.34
Authority	12.48	2.88	15.25	2.25	2.77**	1.08
Autonomy	14.40	2.68	16.75	2.38	2.35*	.93
Creativity	14.41	2.85	15.50	3.46	1.09	.34
Cultural Identity	13.62	3.39	16.00	3.12	2.38*	.73
Economic Rewards	16.00	2.85	17.00	3.16	1.00	.33
Economic Security	17.90	2.60	18.00	3.07	.10	.04
Life Style	15.10	2.19	16.13	2.53	1.02	.95
Personal Development	15.91	2.02	17.37	2.20	1.46	.69
Physical Activity	10.17	3.00	11.88	3.60	1.71	.52
Physical Prowess	7.95	2.14	10.38	3.93	2.43**	.80
Prestige	13.85	3.58	17.13	2.59	3.28**	1.06
Risk	6.95	1.87	9.75	4.06	2.80**	.95
Social Interaction	12.07	2.74	13.63	4.60	1.56	.42
Social Relations	13.41	2.85	15.50	3.02	2.09	.71
Variety	13.91	2.82	15.63	3.07	1.71	.58
Working Conditions	16.57	2.62	17.88	2.48	1.31	.51

*$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

TABLE 4
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for Male and Female Comparisons on the Values Scale for Community/Technical College Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Females n=41		Males n=20		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	16.90	2.44	15.80	1.70	-1.10	.53
Achievement	16.93	1.69	16.25	1.68	-.68	.40
Advancement	13.17	2.72	12.50	2.97	-.67	.24
Aesthetics	13.24	3.43	12.90	2.71	-.34	.11
Altruism	15.56	3.00	14.85	2.50	-.71	.26
Authority	12.12	2.74	12.00	2.51	-.12	.05
Autonomy	14.71	3.00	15.15	2.21	.34	.13
Creativity	14.88	3.01	13.45	2.26	-1.43	.54
Cultural Identity	12.20	3.71	13.65	2.64	1.45	.46
Economic Rewards	15.05	2.47	15.05	2.65	.01	.01
Economic Security	16.90	2.51	17.00	2.97	.10	.04
Life Style	14.78	2.40	15.10	2.32	.32	.14
Personal Development	16.15	2.41	15.85	1.60	-.30	.15
Physical Activity	9.93	2.88	10.70	3.29	.77	.25
Physical Prowess	7.84	1.60	8.00	2.49	.46	.23
Prestige	13.15	3.70	13.15	2.94	.01	.01
Risk	8.02	2.71	8.20	2.67	.18	.07
Social Interaction	12.27	3.18	11.85	2.56	-.42	.15
Social Relations	13.44	2.84	12.95	2.37	-.49	.19
Variety	13.61	3.26	13.30	2.54	-.31	.11
Working Conditions	16.00	2.96	15.75	2.29	-.25	.10

*$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

TABLE 5
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for the Male and Female Comparisons on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and Global Satisfaction for Secondary Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Female Subsample n=59		Male Subsample n=8		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	4.26	.69	4.13	.64	-.13	.20
Achievement	4.07	.77	3.88	1.25	-.19	.19
Activity	4.35	.64	4.00	.54	-.35	.59
Advancement	3.02	1.05	2.63	.92	-.39	.41
Authority	3.57	.62	3.63	.52	.06	.10
Comp Pol & Practices	3.07	1.09	2.63	1.06	-.44	.41
Compensation	3.02	1.24	3.00	1.41	-.02	.01
Co-Workers	3.72	.99	3.38	1.30	-.35	.31
Creativity	4.09	.88	4.13	.35	.04	.06
Independence	4.14	.69	3.75	.71	-.39	.56
Moral Values	4.21	.70	4.13	.84	-.08	.11
Recognition	3.36	.99	2.88	1.25	-.49	.44
Responsibility	4.08	.90	4.00	.54	-.09	.12
Security	4.41	.88	3.75	1.17	-.66	.65
Social Service	4.50	.54	4.25	.46	-.25	.50
Social Status	3.95	.80	4.13	.84	.18	.22
Sup--Human Relations	3.47	1.10	3.63	.92	.16	.16
Sup--Technical	3.66	1.05	3.75	1.04	.09	.09
Variety	4.38	.64	4.13	1.36	-.25	.25
Working Conditions	3.72	.97	3.13	.99	-.60	.61
MSQ Total Satisfaction	77.09	9.92	72.88	11.48	4.21	.39
Global Satisfaction	7.50	1.53	5.63	2.56	1.87**	.91

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

TABLE 6
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Differences, and Effect Sizes for the Male and Female Comparisons on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and Global Satisfaction for Community/Technical College Business Educators, Arkansas, 1995

	Female Subsample n=42		Male Subsample n=20		Mean Difference	Effect Size
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Ability Utilization	4.37	.66	4.30	1.08	-.07	.08
Achievement	4.07	.96	4.00	.86	-.07	.08
Activity	4.29	.51	4.25	.55	-.04	.08
Advancement	3.29	.90	2.80	.95	-.49*	.53
Authority	3.73	.59	3.60	.75	-.08	.12
Comp Pol & Practices	3.29	.90	3.00	1.12	-.29	.29
Compensation	3.12	1.14	2.60	1.23	-.52	.44
Co-Workers	3.88	.78	3.85	.99	-.03	.03
Creativity	4.32	.69	4.40	.68	.08	.12
Independence	4.05	.59	3.84	.83	-.21	.29
Moral Values	4.02	.88	4.45	.51	.43*	.61
Recognition	3.37	1.11	3.45	1.15	.08	.07
Responsibility	4.00	.67	4.15	.93	.15	.19
Security	4.29	.64	4.10	1.07	-.19	.23
Social Service	4.49	.64	4.15	.81	-.34	.47
Social Status	4.05	.59	3.65	.88	-.40*	.54
Sup--Human Relations	3.71	.90	3.90	1.25	.19	.18
Sup--Technical	3.56	.92	3.70	1.26	.14	.13
Variety	4.32	.61	3.95	1.10	-.37	.43
Working Conditions	4.02	.82	4.05	.89	.03	.03
MSQ Total Satisfaction	78.27	8.55	76.05	10.88	2.22	.23
Global Satisfaction	7.88	1.31	7.85	1.79	.03	.02

*$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$.

SERA

CE 073443

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Work Values and Job Satisfaction of Arkansas Business Educators in Secondary Systems and Community/Technical Colleges

Author(s): Dinnah L. Funderburg & Jerome T. Kapes

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: January 24, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

[X]

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

[ ]

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Dinnah L. Funderburg

Printed Name/Position/Title: Dinnah L. Funderburg

Organization/Address:
Route 2, Box 271
Stamps, AR 71860

Telephone: (501) 533-2298

FAX:

E-Mail Address:

Date: 02/18/97

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse ~~on Assessment and Evaluation~~
210 O'Boyle Hall
The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

Adult, Career, & Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com