

PERSISTENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING AS
RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING AND
TEACHING EXPERIENCES

By

RACHEL ANN ANDERSON
//

Bachelor of Science
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas
1972

Master of Science
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1979

Thesis
1979D
A549p
cop. 2



PERSISTENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING AS
RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING AND
TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Thesis Approved:

Anna M. Gorman

Thesis Adviser

Elaine Jorgensen

Lara Casey

Bill J. Elsom

K. Kay Stewart

Norman D. Ruckman

Dean of the Graduate College

1041481

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The foundations of home economics are based upon the family unit. Without the support of my family and the professionals in the home economics and education fields, this study could not have been accomplished. To these individuals a very special note of acknowledgment is extended:

To Dr. Anna M. Gorman, thesis adviser, whose patience, guidance, expertise, and critique led to the completion of this study; to Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, for her encouragement, advice, and expertise; and to Dr. Lora Cacy, Dr. K. Kay Stewart, and Dr. Bill Elsom, for their expertise and critique of the study. To fellow graduate students Evelyn Hearn and Margaret Crouse, whose support, patience, understanding, and encouragement was always forthcoming.

A supporting family is an irreplaceable gift. To my parents, Billie and Lorine Anderson, whose philosophy of living has been an inspiration and has given me the direction and encouragement to pursue self-fulfilling goals. Also, to my sister and her husband, Marynell and Harold Bryant; to my brother and his wife, Neal and Ritaann Anderson; and to two young nieces, Melissa Bryant and Aisha Anderson, who I hope will receive the same encouragement from the family in pursuing their educational goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose and Objectives	5
Hypotheses	5
Assumptions and Limitations.	6
Definitions.	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	10
Law of Diminishing Return.	10
Factors Relating to Beginning Teacher Dropout. . .	13
Major Problems of Teachers	14
Administration	16
Supervision.	19
Attitude	19
Discipline	20
Health and Facilities.	21
Marriage and Sex Role.	24
Morale and Mental Health	25
Testing.	27
<u>Purdue Teacher Opionnaire.</u>	27
<u>Purdue Student-Teacher Opionnaire.</u>	29
Suggested Changes in Teacher Education	39
Summary.	41
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	42
Type of Research Design.	42
Sample Plan.	43
Procedure for Obtaining Sample and Data	
Collection Procedure.	44
Instrumentation Procedure.	47
<u>Background Information Sheet.</u>	48
<u>Purdue Student-Teacher Opionnaire.</u>	51
<u>Purdue Teacher Opionnaire.</u>	53
Data Analysis.	55
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA.	60
Accepting Sample	60
Characteristics of the Respondents	62
Personal Characteristics.	63

Chapter	Page
Findings of the Study.	76
<u>Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire.</u>	76
<u>Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.</u>	91
<u>Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Supplement</u>	114
Statistical Analysis	122
 V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 134
Summary.	134
Statement of the Problem.	134
Objectives.	134
Hypotheses.	135
Survey Sample	135
Instrument Design	136
Data Collection	137
Statistical Treatment	137
Conclusions.	137
Recommendations.	140
Related Studies	140
 REFERENCES	 143
 APPENDIXES	 148
APPENDIX A - <u>PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE</u> <u>EXPLANATION.</u>	149
APPENDIX B - <u>PURDUE STUDENT-TEACHER OPINIONAIRE</u> <u>FACTOR EXPLANATION</u>	151
APPENDIX C - CORRESPONDENCE	153
APPENDIX D - INSTRUMENTS.	183
APPENDIX E - DATA FOR BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET RESPONSES.	188
APPENDIX F - DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR JOB SATISFACTION	195
APPENDIX G - DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE.	200
APPENDIX H - DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOL VARIABLES	211

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Research Participants of the Five States	61
II. Total Teachers Who Left the Teaching Field	62
III. Personal Characteristics of Respondents.	64
IV. Educational Level of Non-Returning and Returning Teachers	66
V. Academic Degree of Spouse of Returning and Non- Returning Teachers	67
VI. Years Teaching Experience and Membership in Profes- sional Organizations of Returning and Non-Returning Teachers	68
VII. Mother's and Father's Educational Attainment and Occu- pational Status of Returning and Non-Returning Teachers	70
VIII. Spouse's Attitude Toward Home Economics Teacher Being Employed as a Teacher.	72
IX. Future Teaching Plans of Returning and Non-Returning Teachers	74
X. Reasons Suggested by Home Economics Teachers for Re- maining in the Teaching Field.	75
XI. Reasons Suggested by Non-Returning Home Economics Teachers for Leaving the Teaching Field.	76
XII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 1 - "Rapport with Supervising Teacher"	78
XIII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 2 - "Rapport with Principal"	79
XIV. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 3 - "Rapport with University Supervisor"	81

Table	Page
XV. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 4 - "Teaching as a Profession"	82
XVI. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 5 - "School Facilities and Services"	84
XVII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 6 - "Professional Preparation"	86
XVIII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 7 - "Rapport with Students"	87
XIX. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 8 - "Rapport with Other Teachers"	89
XX. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PS-TO Factor 9 - "Student Teacher Load"	90
XXI. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal"	92
XXII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 2 - "Job Satisfaction"	96
XXIII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers"	100
XXIV. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary"	103
XXV. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 5 - "Teacher Load"	104
XXVI. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues"	108
XXVII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 7 - "Teacher Status"	109
XXVIII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education"	112
XXIX. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services"	113
XXX. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTO Factor 10 - "Community Pressures"	115
XXXI. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTOS "Teacher Rapport with School Board"	117

Table	Page
XXXII. Frequency Distribution by Groups for PTOS "Teacher Rapport with Superintendent".	120
XXXIII. Summary of t Tests Results of the Two Groups on Job Satisfaction.	124
XXXIV. Summary of t Tests Results of the Two Groups on Student Teaching Experience	125
XXXV. Summary of t Tests Results of the Two Groups on Selected Public School Variables.	129
XXXVI. Data for Student's t and Tabulated t' Test for Job Satisfaction.	196
XXXVII. Data for Student's t and Tabulated t' for Student Teaching Experience	201
XXXVIII. Data for Student's t and Tabulated t' for Selected Public School Variables	212

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teachers for the public school systems in the United States are required to be certified for teaching at institutions of higher education that have approved teacher preparation programs as a function. These teacher preparation programs are usually from four to five years in length. One measurement of the effectiveness of these teacher preparation programs is that the graduates obtain teaching positions and continue in the teaching profession.

There has been evidence of teachers electing to leave the teaching profession even before the decline in school enrollment began to occur. A National Education Survey of the 1972-73 school year reports that teacher turnover equaled about 8.7 percent of the secondary school teachers, while turnover in the elementary sector was estimated at 8.3 percent. Previous National Education Surveys (1971-72, 1970-71) show this statistic as being only eight percent, which indicated an increase in the public schools in regard to teacher turnover. Thus, at the time of the 1972-73 research survey, the teaching profession has been losing increasing numbers of teachers from the classroom.

Further, Wolf and Wolf (1964) write that only 60 out of 100 certified new teacher graduates enter the teaching profession each year. Of these 60 beginning teachers, 53 will return to teaching the

following year. Results show

. . . two years after the original 100 prospective teachers graduated, less than half are engaged in teaching, and, after 10 years, only 12-15 of the initial 100 prospective teachers may be teaching in elementary and secondary school classrooms (p. 193).

These statistics show that many qualified individuals are not in the teaching field.

Many factors contribute to the growing teacher dropout rate. Cruickshank, Kennedy, and Myers (1974) found that teacher failure is caused by non-exposure to typical classroom events during the pre-teaching experience. The teachers did not know, when faced with these occurrences, how to cope with or interpret the situation.

Selden (1969) reports that basic causes of teacher dropouts are poor salaries, lack of fringe benefits, frustration, and lack of status. Frustration, Selden (1969) reports, has been caused by teacher workload which restricted teachers from participating in professional related activities. He further states that

. . . the underground railroad out of the classroom, more often than not, terminates in a non-teaching job within education. . . . Many a capable teacher is pushed out of a classroom by intolerable working conditions (p. 61).

Bush (1969) has stated a reason for teacher dropout as the affect of socialization of the beginning teachers with their more experienced colleagues. If satisfaction is seen from these experienced teachers, then the beginning teacher may feel a desire for the same satisfaction. If, however, the experienced teacher reveals dissatisfaction, then the prospects of losing another professional to the dropout ranks appears inevitable. Edgerton (1977) reports a similar conclusion. Behavioral changes occur within teachers who are

discouraged by what they view as their role in education. First and second year teachers observe these changes and become convinced that they do not want to remain in the classroom because of what they see happening to experienced teachers.

Pratt (1977) cites the availability of careers offering more opportunities as a teacher dropout factor. The researcher mentions reasons given as a return to college, maternity leaves, and job transfers of husbands as being additional factors. The problems mentioned above (as revealed by research studies) show that the decision for teachers to drop out of the teaching profession is caused by many and varied factors.

The many problems encountered during the first and second years of teaching have been the deciding factors as to whether the teacher would remain in public school education. Graham (1968) acknowledges the inadequacy of teacher preparation. The beginning teacher is pictured as having run the gauntlet of university coursework. The student then proceeded to the eight week classroom experience under the supervision of one teacher with the experience taking place in a recommended "good school." Graham (1968, p. 51) reveals the consequences of these beginning teachers as then being "swallowed by the classrooms at the first of September, reappear shaken in June, and too often, disappear from the scene."

Further evidence of attitudinal change of teachers is reflected in the National Education Research Division, Teacher Opinion Poll (1972-73). When asked how they would compare teaching as a profession now and teaching as it was five years ago, the responses indicate that teaching is improving. Specific figures reveal 34 percent

viewed the profession as improving, 26 percent thought it is getting worse, and less than 10 percent revealed the opinion that no change has occurred. Sanoff (1978, p. 3) reports a survey which "shows a rise from nine to 19 percent from 1966 to 1976 in the proportion of teachers who would choose other careers if they could start again."

With a rise in statistics concerning selection of teaching as a career, the decision as to why individuals select the teaching field is questioned. Research by Cohen (1969) supports the idea that teaching is not chosen to provide individuals with an identity. This researcher (Cohen) also states that student teachers know what is expected of them when they enter the teaching profession. Hilton (1960) reveals three factors that have been identified by students pursuing professional training in education. These factors that help influence them in their decision to teach are: "a perception of the role in question, his conception of an ideal or optimum role for himself, and his perception of his present role" (p. 210).

Research regarding expressed reasons for selecting a teaching career reveals a unifying goal. The reason most commonly given according to Haubrich (1960) is the expressed desire to work with people. Other studies by Birkinshaw (1935) and Clark (1968) support the people oriented concept that characterizes teachers. Edgerton (1977, p. 120) states that those entering teaching do so with the desire "to help people learn, cope and create."

This expressed desire of teachers to work with students and to see achievement occur would be of utmost importance in their decision to remain in teaching. Teachers are able, through their teaching,

to achieve a feeling of personal and professional rewards and have a desire to continue in the teaching profession. Yet, the fact remains that many beginning teachers leave the profession after only one or two years of service. Therefore, there remains a need to gain insight regarding factors in the student teaching experience and actual teaching experience that supports a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the teaching profession during the first year of teaching.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to discover why beginning teachers in home economics were making the decision to continue or withdraw from teaching after one year of teaching experience. In order to accomplish the purpose of this study the following objectives were formulated:

1. To compare the difference in job satisfaction of first year home economics teachers who remain in teaching their second year with those first year teachers that leave the teaching profession.
2. To determine if specific variables in the student teaching experience influence the decision of first year teachers to remain in or to leave the teaching field.
3. To determine if specific variables in the public school system influence first year home economics teachers to remain in or to leave the teaching field.
4. To make recommendations for further research studies in the area of teacher persistence by home economics teachers.

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses formulated for this study were as follows:

- H₁: There will be no significant difference in job satisfaction of home economics teachers completing the first year of teaching in relation to their decision to remain or not to remain in the teaching field.
- H₂: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or to leave the teaching field in relation to the student teaching experience.
- H₃: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or not to remain in the teaching field in relation to public school teaching variables.

Assumptions and Limitations

The assumptions formulated for this study were as follows:

1. The student teaching experiences completed by the home economics teachers were similar in structure in the institutions of higher education certified in teacher education.
2. Home economics teachers' perceptions of the teaching profession were influenced by various factors in society.

The limitations of this study were the following:

1. The specific sample was limited to home economics teachers who had completed one year of teaching home economics in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, and Texas (Areas I, VI, VII). This was Region VI of the American Vocational Association, excluding New Mexico.
2. The Louisiana sample of first year home economics teachers was not complete because a comprehensive list of beginning teachers was not available.
3. The Arkansas sample of first year home economics teachers obtained from the State Department did not include addresses of those teachers who had left the teaching field after their first year of teaching.
4. The list of first year teachers obtained from the state departments in Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma and the state teacher education universities in Missouri

contained some names of teachers who had graduated from college at a time other than 1977-78, as specified in the study.

5. Addresses for teachers, who had not returned to the teaching field, were not always available, therefore, most of the invited sample were teachers who were presently employed in the teaching profession.
6. The first year home economics teachers in the study were both vocational and general teachers.

Definitions

In order that complete understanding of the research report be accomplished, the following definitions have been selected to give the same connotation of the words whenever they are used in the report:

First Year Home Economics Teacher (returning teacher) - A teacher who has completed the basic requirements for certification for the teaching certificate and has completed one year of teaching home economics.

First Year Home Economics Teacher Dropout (non-returning teacher) - A teacher who has completed the basic requirements for certification for the teaching certificate and has completed one year of teaching home economics, and has made the decision to not return for the second consecutive year of teaching.

Home Economics Education - A professional program offered at the senior college and graduate levels for prospective teachers and teachers in the service in the field of home economics (Good, 1973, p. 285).

Job Satisfaction - Pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with teaching (Bentley and Rempel, 1970, p. 4). This is Factor 2 of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO).

Public School Experience Variables - Factors of the PTO that explain the public school experience variable are:

Factor 1 - Teacher Rapport with Principal

Factor 3 - Rapport Among Teachers

Factor 4 - Teacher Salary

Factor 5 - Teacher Load

Factor 6 - Curriculum Issues

Factor 7 - Teacher Status

Factor 8 - Community Support of Education

Factor 9 - School Facilities and Services

Factor 10 - Community Pressures (Bentley and Remple, 1970, p. 4).

Factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement (PTOS) that explain the public school variable are "Teacher Rapport with School Board" and "Teacher Rapport with Superintendent" (Bentley and Remple, 1970, addendum). (See Appendix A for a description of each factor on these two instruments.)

Student Teaching Experience - The program of learning experiences specified by an institution, incorporating the nine factors identified by the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PSTO). Those factors are:

1. Rapport with Supervising Teacher
2. Rapport with Principal
3. Rapport with University Supervisor
4. Teaching as a Profession
5. School Facilities and Services

6. Professional Preparation
7. Rapport with Students
8. Rapport with other Teachers
9. Student Teacher Load (Bentley and Price, 1972, addendum).

Descriptions of each factor are located in Appendix B.

Homemaking Teacher - A teacher who has completed a degree in home economics and is instructing consumer and homemaking education classes that have as the main purpose to improve the quality of life.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gaede reported (1978, p. 405) that "beginning teachers find the first year to be one of severe disillusionment." Gaede further stated that the first year teacher faces the tasks of establishing a reputation, preparing for teaching new courses, and adapting to the role of adult, professional, and teacher. Unknown events and activities may also cause concern for the beginning teacher, especially events and activities that were not present during the student teaching experience. All of these factors may have an effect on the decision of the beginning teacher to remain or withdraw from the teaching profession. This chapter focused on studies that relate to identified problems of beginning teachers and on a theory that related to teacher turnover. The chapter explored research studies that specifically relate to improving the student teaching experience.

Law of Diminishing Return

The law of diminishing return was first given its description by Cournot, cited Moore (1925, p. 360). Mathematical form was used by Cournot to explain his theory. He used mathematical definitions of three laws of returns without identifying them by names as "the law of diminishing return, the law of constant return, and the law of increasing return" (p. 360).

The law of diminishing returns can also be traced to the year 1815 when some English economists, writing independently but approximately the same time, expressed the diminishing return idea as applied to agriculture (Patton, 1926). These economists, Edward West, Robert Torrens, David Ricardo, and Thomas Robert Malthus, expressed the idea as "every increase of produce is obtained by a more than proportional increase in the application of labor to the land" (Mill, 1965, p. 177). The idea of these economists was so accepted by other economists at that time "that the law of diminishing returns, as the proposition was called, was almost immediately admitted to the canon of accepted economic principles" (Patton, 1926, p. 10).

Davenport (1908) cited 11 different concepts of the law of diminishing returns. He stated that three were related to economics:

1. A dynamic and sociological generalization foretelling a diminution in the pre-capita command of consumable goods, by reason solely of the society coming to contain more members, these being assumed to be unmodified in all relevant aspects.
2. A law in the dynamics of competitive economics; a forecast of changes in the relative distributive shares accruing to different agents and instruments in production technologically viewed, changes due solely to changes in the relative supply of these concrete factors; thereby changes in their relative value through the capitalization of their income-earning power; and thereby, also upon the supply side.
3. A static, competitive, entrepreneur law expressing the disadvantages accruing to the entrepreneur from any relative excess or defect in the quantities employed of any productive agent or agents, in view of the existing levels of compensation for these different agents (p. 506).

Fetter (1918) expressed a different view to the law's most important aspects. He saw the law as being confused with the law of

proportionality. Furthermore, Fetter cited three problems:

1. technical proportion, the best mechanical or physical combination
2. profitable proportion, the enterpriser's best combination of factors at existing prices
3. diminishing returns, the social economic problem of the relation of population to resources (p. 440).

Fetter stated the law of increasing and decreasing returns as the following:

The amount attributable to the labor element of a whole population varies with the amount and efficiency of the material agents at the disposal of labor, increasing if they increase more rapidly than population and decreasing if the population increases more rapidly than they do. It is one aspect of the law of proportionality as applied, not to a private enterprise, but to the relation of the whole population to its resources (p. 435).

Patton (1926) described the law of diminishing returns as follows:

When on the application of two successive equal doses of productive power, the increment of product due to the first dose is less than the additional increment due to the second, the law of increasing returns is said to act; and conversely it is a case of decreasing returns when the increment due to the first dose is greater than the increment due to the second (p. 17).

That there is not just one law of diminishing returns was expressed by Patton (1926). The author stated, based on a study, that three groups of statements actually constitute diminishing returns. These statements relate to the "phenomena of physical, entrepreneurial and secular returns" (p. 92).

Canaan (1967) related the law of diminishing returns to agricultural production. He stated:

. . . the belief that the increase of population, in spite of all improvements, in the long run necessitates the employment of a larger and ever larger proportion of the labour of the world in the production of the prime necessities of life, practically implies that as population increases, mankind becomes poorer and poorer, unless the

diminishing productiveness of the labour of the agriculturists is overbalanced by increasing productiveness of the labour of the remainder of the community must be a diminishing proportion of the whole (p. 133).

Thus, researchers indicated that the law of diminishing returns is an economically based structure. The concept of personal satisfaction was not included; however, there may be a relationship between personal satisfaction and economics. The question of the degree of influence that personal satisfaction and economics relate to the law of diminishing return can be compared to beginning teacher dropout and the economic losses incurred in a public school system. The personal satisfaction of beginning teachers that is derived from a particular school system can be seen through the economic loss or gain of that system. The public school system is obligated to spend their funds on the adjustment periods needed by new faculty members. If increasing numbers of faculty are replaced year after year, then the school system is economically affected. If personal satisfaction is an influence, then the relationship to the law of diminishing returns can be identified. This study was designed to determine why teachers were making the decision to stay or withdraw from teaching and to determine if job satisfaction was an influence in the decision.

Factors Relating to Beginning

Teacher Dropout

The large numbers of beginning teachers who leave the profession after only one or two years of teaching do so for a variety of reasons. Nelson and Thompson (1963) compiled a list of 19 factors believed to be influential in this exodus of beginning teachers.

Those factors listed were as follows:

. . . salary, teaching loads, assignments beyond regular classroom teaching, inadequate supervision, poor assignments, discipline problems, pressure groups, poor mental hygiene, marriage, inadequate preparation of major or minor fields of study or knowledge of subject, inability to handle classes, unfair teacher evaluation, inadequate facilities, poor faculty relationships, lack of opportunity to develop new ideas, routine clerical duties, competition between schools and industry for trained personnel, poor school boards, and health (pp. 467-471).

The researchers emphasized "that although any one of the factors may be influential enough to cause the new teacher to resign, it usually is a multiplicity of these factors" (Nelson et al., 1965, p. 472).

Another study relating to specific causes for the high teacher turnover in Montgomery County, Maryland, was conducted by Browning (1963). The results of a mail survey of 241 teachers employed in the school system and teachers who had left the system voluntarily "showed that far more had quit out of necessity than out of unhappiness with the district" (p. 81). The home and family or the family situation was given as the main reason for women's departure from the system. Men cited reasons "associated with status improvement" (p. 81). Respondents revealed that the most unfavorable categories on the survey were "excessive pressures and work overload and dislike for administrative and supervisory practices" (Browning, 1963, p. 81). The data revealed that those areas of least importance were salary, quality of students, leave of absence, and military service.

Major Problems of Teachers

The National Education Association Research Division conducted a teacher opinion poll in 1971 to ascertain what problems were of utmost

importance to teachers in their work. Nineteen problem areas were listed with the teacher to respond by indicating if they considered the problem major, minor, or not a problem. The areas denoted as being major were large class size, insufficient time for rest or preparation, and lack of public support for schools. Each of these areas was seen as major problems by more than 30 percent of those in the study. Problems receiving 10 percent or less were the lack of opportunity for professional growth and negative attitude of colleagues toward teaching.

Daniels (1975) related some problems of the first year teacher in physical education that were considered problems to experienced teachers as well. Daniels stated

Though these problems do not apply exclusively to the first year teacher, they are compounded by the fact that he/she is operating independently for the first time, with full responsibility for his/her actions in dealing with these problems (p. 134).

Problems common to physical education teachers, according to Daniels, were:

1. discipline problems
2. the inability to teach a variety of activities
3. problems related to cultural and racial differences
4. communication problems with school personnel
5. large classes
6. limited equipment and limited facilities (p. 134).

Daniels stated that first year teaching experience was unique and it was virtually impossible to prepare a future teacher for all situations. Therefore, "it is necessary to make the professional preparation program such that physical education graduates can face and

resolve unforeseen problems" (Daniels, 1975, p. 135). Daniels further stated that an "inservice program should be an extension of professional preparation" (p. 135) and give more support and direction to the first year teacher.

Kennedy, Cruickshank, and Myers (1976) studied perceived problems of beginning secondary teachers on the basis of school location.

The purpose of the study was to attempt

. . . to describe and compare those areas of personal and professional goals, consciously or unconsciously held by beginning teachers, that are chronically being frustrated in inner-city, outer-city, suburban and rural classrooms (p. 170).

The participating sample consisted of 175 beginning teachers in secondary schools in Ohio. The stratified sample was based on areas of secondary specialization. Findings reported were that

Beginning inner-city teachers report a greater frequency of certain kinds of problems but, as a group, they are not as dissimilar as their rural, suburban, and outer-city colleagues when it comes to reporting the extent to which classroom problems personally bother or disturb them (p. 171).

The researcher further noted that "teachers hold a job-fulfilling prophecy. They expect certain kinds of problems to occur and when they do they expect to accommodate or live with them" (p. 171).

Administration

"Public employees are gaining the right to collective bargaining in increasing numbers," stated Sebring (1978, p. 37). As professional associations gained more power, the fact that administrators have developed an antagonistic attitude towards those associations became apparent. Sebring stated "nowhere has this been more apparent

than in public school education" (p. 37). The author further revealed that this shift in power was adversely affecting public attitudes toward the schools. Further, educators were finding themselves pitted against one another. Sebring related

Collective bargaining rights have caused educators to position themselves in opposing camps; administrators versus teachers; teachers versus school boards; community versus teachers (p. 37).

The teacher demanding more involvement in the decision-making process was the most overwhelming view expressed in the various groups. This continued to remain a contributing source of conflict because the extent of involvement of the teachers in decision-making was an important consideration and one that needed to be carefully evaluated.

Snow (1963, p. 318) reported that "today the teacher is being recognized as the key to school improvement, and commendable steps are being taken to help teachers operate more fully." Among some of the areas being improved in public school education were better instructional materials and equipment and the grouping of student ability. Yet, one condition not being improved and cited by Snow was

A teacher is, by the very nature of his work, denied clear-cut, indisputable proof of his effectiveness. He has no dependable means of tracing the consequences of his teaching, of discerning the precise extent to which his efforts have helped students learn (p. 318).

Evaluation of their teaching ability depended on supposition and inference. The teachers based their self-evaluation largely on the judgments of others. An observation of their classroom teaching by others had varying effects on their teaching. Snow stated the conclusion that

. . . if teaching is to improve, there must be a continuous channeling back to the teacher of reliable

information about the effectiveness of his efforts so that future teaching may be adjusted for better results (p. 320).

The increased bargaining power of teachers through their professional organizations has assumed negative proportions. Bruce (1964) saw a problem between teachers and school boards as neglecting the interest of the children, parents, and communities. He further stated that

Unless the interests of parents and communities are more clearly defined and placed in the forefront, the differences between the teachers and boards will continue to be seriously harmful to the schools and communities (p. 29).

Belasco and Alutto (1972) examined the relationship between satisfaction levels of teachers and their decisional participation which took place in two school districts. The researchers defined satisfaction as "the willingness to remain within the organization despite a variety of inducements to leave" (p. 54). Results of the study indicated

. . . that decisional climate is a major factor influencing teacher satisfaction levels. Those teachers with lower satisfaction levels also possess the highest level of decisional deprivation. . . . Furthermore, those teachers experiencing highest levels of satisfaction also reported less felt job tension and less militant attitudes (p. 54).

The respondents surveyed indicated the following:

. . . a certain substrata of teachers who desire more participation in organizational decision making than they currently enjoy and report low levels of satisfaction, while others concurrently desire less participation than they currently have and report high levels of satisfaction (p. 55).

With this variation in strata, the researchers suggested developing a participative management program that would meet the needs of those teachers who feel themselves deprived.

Supervision

Lovell and Phelps (1977) reported on a study conducted by the Tennessee Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (TASCD). The purpose of the study was "to collect data describing the practice of supervision in Tennessee during the 1974-75 school year" (p. 226). Random sampling of teachers and principals was used as well as the "population of instructional supervisors as listed by the State Department of Education" (p. 226). Conclusions drawn from the study as reported by Lovell and Phelps were that "principals were perceived by teachers to be the major source of instructional supervisory support" (p. 227). Furthermore, conferences held with teachers and principals were short and were not based on classroom observations. Teachers perceived these observations "to be uncontrolled, unplanned, and haphazard" (p. 270).

Attitude

Indiresan (1976, p. 277) reported that "the teacher is at the heart of the educational process and the success of an educational institution depends largely upon its faculty." The researcher conducted a study of background variables and attitude variables with expressed job satisfaction of engineering teachers. Respondents to the study were 158 engineering teachers in nine different institutions of higher education. Nine background variables were used in the study and results revealed:

. . . only involvement in research work and research output, showed a significant correlation with expressed job

satisfaction. The remaining variables, namely, age, education, occupational level, length of service, salary and consultation do not show any correlation with job satisfaction (p. 298).

Furthermore, stated Indiresan

. . . of the six general attitude variables studied, the variables overall job satisfaction, career plan, time satisfied and the factor financial position are correlated with job satisfaction (p. 298).

Results also showed that those teachers who revealed expressed satisfaction intended to remain in their jobs.

Discipline

Wells (1978) stated:

Few teachers are prepared by training or experience to cope with the problems facing them. The extent to which discipline problems have caused teachers to leave the profession as not been clearly established (p. 68).

The author further stated that teachers find themselves in a vulnerable position when attempting to discipline students.

Discipline is an important problem in the public schools for all concerned. Discipline was the number one problem in minds of the adult public as expressed in the Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public School. The percentage of adults that cited discipline as a leading problem in the most recent poll was higher than at any time within the past nine years that the poll was administered (Gallup, 1977).

The National Education Association publication, Today's Education (1972) reported on assaults of public school teachers. Specifically, the article stated "the increase in assaults on teachers in the past few years is a symptom of the times; an era of increasing violence

in America" (p. 71). The author further stated another cause of violence was the new permissiveness and racism. Besides these societal causes, there are several in-school causes of violence. These were inadequate facilities which actually promote disruption, disputes between students and educators; disputes that occur when there are large numbers of people from different backgrounds and "increasing politicalization of schools" (p. 69).

Cramer (1978) reported that parents state their desire for the public school to make students behave, even when the parents themselves lack this quality. Cramer (p. 29) further stated that it was those people who reveal their desire for effective discipline management that ". . . are the same ones who will slap a lawsuit on the school board and administration the moment disciplinary action is taken against their little Eloise or Reginald." He further stated:

A gaggle of laws and legal rulings seems to restrain, constrain and detain school officials from taking what they might consider effective disciplinary action. One U.S. Supreme Court ruling, for example, makes school board members and administrators personally liable for violating a student's civil rights--even unwittingly (p. 29).

Health and Facilities

Landsmann (1978), as editor of Instructor, conducted a study regarding teacher health. The study, conducted in 1976, included a questionnaire published in the September, 1976 issue of Instructor. Nine thousand teachers responded. Results revealed that 10 hours per day were spent on preparation and work. The average amount of sleep was seven and one-half hours. Average absence because of illness was four and a half days a school year. Of those days missed, 75 percent

of the respondents reported them to be stress or tension related. Regarding the physical environment and health, respondents indicated no negative effects. When asked if their view of teaching had changed since they began, 80 percent said yes. When asked if they believed there were health hazards in teaching, 84 percent said yes. To the question of whether their principal took an active role in helping teachers stay physically and mentally healthy, 61 percent said no (Landsmann, 1978, p. 49).

Landsmann (1978) cited 84 percent of the teachers believed there were health hazards in teaching. Open-ended questions revealed three major health hazard areas: "stress, weight, diet, and exercise, and physical environment" (p. 49).

Teachers believed that stress was the major force affecting their health. Stress, in the form of tension and pressure, arose from:

. . . large class sizes, lack of teaching materials, increase in discipline problems over the past few years, more public pressures on teachers, schedules that permit few breaks or none (Landsmann, 1978, p. 49).

Other areas of stress noted were the inability to leave problems at the school, lack of in-service education in general areas, lack of preparation for newly formulated programs and "the difficulty they have in accepting that there are limits to what schooling can achieve" (Landsmann, 1978, p. 49).

The second most important health concern was that of weight, diet, and exercise. Many teachers responded by stating that they did not get enough exercise, and lunch at school was unsatisfying. Suggestions for improving these concerns were for an exercise period to be set aside and a variety of food products to be made available

to them. More than one third of the respondents stated that the third major concern regarding teachers' health involved the physical environment. Aspects of the physical environment cited by Landsmann (1978) were:

. . . poor lighting, flickering fluorescent lights, or too much glare; poor acoustics or too much noise from the neighborhood; cold cement floors, dirty classrooms, and smoke-filled teacher lounges (p. 50).

One facet of the environmental area involved school injuries. Landsmann (1978) reported that

. . . children caused most of the injuries cited. Children have bitten and scratched teachers, belted them when they were breaking up fights, and caused them both deliberate and accidental playground injuries (p. 50).

To the question of what teachers could do to improve their own health, the respondents placed the burden on the principals. Landsmann (1978, p. 50) noted that "good health has to do with attitude and morale as well as disease." Teachers expressed belief that the principals influenced many causes of health problems. Landsmann further noted that

. . . principals can offer more positive reinforcement; help with curriculum decisions; act as buffers; and aid teachers in improving school/community relations. They can help reduce class size, foster more open communication among staff members, provide adequate in-service preparation, sign the work orders to fix drafty windows, and enforce policies that keep sick children home until they are well (p. 50).

Despite these numerous problems, Landsmann reported that teachers were taking their concerns into their own hands and trying to work out feasible solutions to each of the problems.

Marriage and Sex Role

Mason, Dressel, and Bain (1959) researched the sex role and career orientations of beginning teachers. The researchers stated that "an understanding of the career orientations of teachers must start with the relationship between sex role and occupational role" (Mason et al., 1959, p. 371). A national sample of 7,150 beginning teachers completed the questionnaire on career orientations of men and women. Results of the study revealed "few new teachers intended to stay in teaching until retirement" (p. 382). Women were reported to have chosen their sex role over the occupational role by stating their desire to leave teaching for homemaking responsibilities. Men reported the desire to move from classroom teaching to administrative positions. Mason, Dressel, and Bain (1959, p. 382) stated that "both the contingent career commitment of the women and the limited commitment of the men were seen to be impediments to the professionalization of teaching." The researchers hypothesized:

. . . that the career plans of men would be more closely tied to factors intrinsic to their own work and to their job satisfaction, while the career plans of women would depend more upon extrinsic factors and be more independent of job satisfaction (p. 382).

Results of this study showed both hypotheses to hold true. Additionally, women were more satisfied than the men were with teaching as a profession. The major conclusion drawn from the research was that school administrators wishing to maintain their staff "must seek in part different solutions for their men and women teachers" (p. 383), if they hope to retain them in the teaching field.

Morale and Mental Health

Edwards (1963, p. 17) reported that the teachers work was changing over the years and the teacher was not only more "responsible for a mastery of subject matter but also for the social-emotional development of each of his students." This added responsibility "calls for character and personality traits in the teacher that are different from those admired by previous generations" (p. 17). Edwards also related that

. . . the teacher affects his students by his personality and by his ability to observe and understand behavior situations which will affect the mental health atmosphere in the classroom (p. 17).

Because of these pressures within the classroom, the teacher needed the security of being in a school situation where integrity and harmony were maintained. Edwards further stated that our school systems fall short of this goal and as a result teacher morale is low as well as the fact that mental health of the teacher is also affected.

Coverdale (1973) researched some determinants of teacher morale in Australia. A random sample of 165 employed primary and secondary teachers completed the questionnaire. The six parts of the questionnaire were as follows:

- (i) the role and the self-image of the teacher
- (ii) a list of problems raised by teachers to be graded on a four-point scale ranging from the category of 'highly important' to that of 'little or no importance'
- (iii) social background of the teacher and his family
- (iv) retrospective assessment of teacher training
- (v) recommendations by the teachers themselves for improving the profession; and

(vi) some personal details of the respondent (p. 36).

The purpose of the research study was to "uncover factors to account for the high level of resignations and the general dissatisfactions with present conditions of teachers in New South Wales" (p. 34).

Results showed that teachers were concerned more with conditions of service. Coverdale stated

. . . the inspectorial and transfer system, promotion structure and status, class sizes and the demands on the teacher and scope of the curriculum were all ranked as highly important issues affecting morale by a majority of the teachers (p. 34).

Other factors that affect morale, according to Coverdale, were continuity of occupation, motives for entering teaching, and teacher training. Results relating to continuity of occupation showed only 30 reported parents that were in the education field as teachers. Thirty-five percent of those entering teaching gave as their main motive "a sense of vocation" (p. 38). Twenty-two percent stated "lack of alternative opportunities" (p. 38).

Other reasons for selecting teaching were for the initiative and creativity it would offer the individual as well as being a satisfying career. Security, salary, and working conditions were also important. In regard to teacher training, Coverdale reported two-thirds of the sample with the opinion that their training had been inadequate. Most (Coverdale, 1973) of the respondents stated that "too much emphasis had been placed on content and presentation and not enough on a sociological understanding of the child" (p. 38).

A study by Bloch (1977) revealed that the constant battle with students resulted in the following psychic and physical damage to teachers:

. . . psychological and somatic problems; anxiety; lack of preparedness to cope with discipline problems; difficulty in reporting incidents to administrators and lack of understanding on their behalf; overcrowded classrooms; poor leadership and ultimate breakdown in morale; difficulty in obtaining transfers from stressful situations (pp. 61-62).

Testing

One method developed to study morale or job satisfaction of teachers has involved the use of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire. In the present study, these two tests were used to determine the underlying factors which caused home economics teachers to become satisfied or dissatisfied with the teaching positions where currently employed. A brief discussion of the development of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) and the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PSTO) and research utilizing these tests follow so that the value of the tests in this particular study will be understood.

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) was designed to measure teacher morale by indicating a general level of morale as well as providing sub-sets which break up the concept of morale. Bentley and Rempel (1970) described the ten categories contained in the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire as follows:

- Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal"
- Factor 2 - "Satisfaction with Teaching"
- Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers"
- Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary"

- Factor 5 - "Teacher Load"
- Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues"
- Factor 7 - "Teacher Status"
- Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education"
- Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services"
- Factor 10 - "Community Pressures" (p. 4).

For a detailed description of the factors, see Appendix A.

The design of the instrument facilitates making comparisons among teachers' groups in various subject areas. Bentley and Rempel stated:

. . . the Opinionaire provides specific and valid information about crucial problems and tensions which concern the faculty and have an adverse effect on their morale. Very basic to improving the level of morale is an adequate understanding and diagnosis of how teachers feel about their particular school situation (p. 1).

The original form of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire contained 145 item statements which had been validated using "peer judgements made by fellow teachers" (p. 2), stated Bentley and Rempel. Three groups of teacher morale resulted from this process. "High," "middle," and "low" groups were differentiated. Mean scores were calculated and significance was established beyond the .05 level.

Bentley and Rempel (1970), in designing the statistical analysis, stated, ". . . the multidimensional nature of morale suggests the use of factor analysis methods in identifying and describing such dimensions" (p. 3). The researchers (1970) further stated that ". . . the procedure used was a principle components analysis of the image-covariance matrix followed by an oblique rotation of the extracted factors" (p. 3). An analyses was completed using a sample of 570

teachers and "factor analysis procedures were applied to 'high,' 'middle,' and 'low' teacher morale groups. These additional analyses made it possible to identify ten rather than eight factors" (pp. 3-4).

The 100 item revised instrument was "administered to the high school faculties with 20 or more teachers in Indiana and Oregon" (Bentley and Rempel, 1970, p. 5). Test and re-test data was obtained and analyzed for the 3023 teachers included. Factor correlations were above the .60 level. Inter-factor and inter-item correlations revealed that they "were sufficiently low to make factor scores meaningful in assessing the status of morale for an individual or for a group" (p. 6). Validity of the instrument was further evidence by using principals' reactions to the Opinionnaire. The principals were to respond as they perceived the faculty members' response. Bentley and Rempel stated, "differences between the median scores for teachers and the median scores for principals were not significant" (p. 7).

The researchers further revealed that

Although a quantitative study relating teacher turnover to scores on the instrument has not been made as yet, we have observed that when morale scores were low in a particular school, teacher turnover was frequently high the following year (p. 8).

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PSTO) was developed by using the 100 item statements of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) with an additional 56 items. Fourteen factors pertaining to student teaching made up the initial opinionnaire of 150 items (Price, 1971).

The final form of the instrument was derived by administering the experimental instrument to 299 student teachers. The student

teachers completed the questionnaire at the end of their student teaching experience. Price (1971) stated

. . . a factor analysis of item correlations as an item analysis of each item against each of the 14 hypothesized dimensions provided the basis for selection of items for the final form of the instrument (p. 47).

The reliability coefficient for the total scale was .96 using the Kuder-Richardson test. Factor analysis involved rotation to the varimax criterion. Price (1971) further noted

. . . fourteen principal components were extracted on the basis of the hypothesis that student teacher morale was composed of the ten (PTO) teacher morale factors plus the four factors which were written specifically for the instrument. The 14 principal components accounted for 56% of the total variance (p. 47).

Twelve factors involving 100 item statements were included in the final instrument. The title descriptions of the factors as stated by Price (1971) are as follows:

1. Rapport with Supervising Teacher
2. Rapport with Principal
3. Teaching as a Profession
4. Rapport with University Supervisor
5. Community Support of Education
6. Student Teaching Load
7. Rapport with Students
8. Rapport with other Teachers
9. Satisfaction with Housing
10. Professional Preparation
11. School facilities and services
12. Curriculum Issues (p. 481).

A shortened version of the PSTO, called Form B, was developed based on continuing evaluations of the instrument (Bentley and Price, 1972, addendum). The new Form B eliminated 41 of the original 100 items and three of the factors. Form B contained the 59 remaining items and one new item. Nine factors were retained for Form B. (See Appendix B for complete description of the factors.)

In a study to determine the morale of agriculture teachers in Virginia, Miller (1976) used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (1970, p. 1) in which the authors Bentley and Rempel defined morale as "the emotional and mental reaction of a person to his job." Further, Bentley and Rempel stated that morale

is then determined by the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied, and the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from the total job situation (p. 1).

Miller stated that "professionalism and morale should have a direct relationship" (p. 116).

The purpose of the Miller study was to determine if morale of first year teachers differed from morale of experienced teachers. Experienced teachers were defined as those with more than one year teaching experience. The two groups revealed no significant difference in differentiation of morale.

The study also selected variables relating to school activities and professional responsibilities to determine if morale was affected.

Variables used were

class size; periods taught per day; years of teaching experience; type of certificate held; length of contract; adult, young farmer or FFA work; home visitation or length of work week (p. 116).

Miller again reported no significant difference between the two groups when these variables were used.

A third part of the study by Miller compared three groups of teachers. These groups were the Agriculture Education teachers used in the other studies previously reported, a norm group of representative junior and senior high school teachers, and the third group consisted of all those who make up the total normative data for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Miller's (1976, p. 117) research revealed that first year and experienced agriculture teachers were rated above the 50th percentile on "teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, curriculum issues, teacher status and community support of education" when compared with the representative junior and senior high teachers. The group of experienced teachers was rated above the 50th percentile on community support of education.

The first year and experienced Virginia Agricultural Education teachers' morale, compared with tenth and 50th percentiles of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire norm group, revealed that "curriculum issues was the only factor that placed any group of Agricultural Education teachers above the 50th percentile, and that was for beginning teachers" (p. 117). Factors on which all the Agricultural Education teachers placed below the tenth percentile were satisfaction with teaching, teacher salary, and teacher load. Miller's (1976) conclusion from the study was that Agricultural Education teachers are "less satisfied with teaching, more adversely concerned with salary, load and community pressures than the typical teacher" (p. 117).

Ross and Swick (1969, p. 112) conducted a study "in the development of positive changes in student-teacher attitudes toward inner-city teaching." The study involved two hypotheses related to student teaching. The researchers stated the first hypothesis as

positive attitudes toward teaching in the inner-city can be developed by providing a positive or successful experience with the inner-city community, schools, and inner-city teaching (p. 113).

The second hypothesis proposed by Ross and Swick was "that changes in positive attitudes toward teaching in the inner-city differ between particular school systems" (p. 114).

The study (Ross and Swick, 1969) involved the use of 19 student teachers during the 1968-69 school year at the University of Connecticut. The student teachers were administered the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) as a pre-test and a post-test. The subjects were also asked to respond to the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire as a post-test.

Results of the pre-testing of the PTO showed that "this group of student teachers had a below average opinion of teaching" (p. 114). Other significant findings reported by Ross and Swick (1969, p. 114) were:

- (1) student teachers responded affirmatively to statements related to their teaching self-image and
- (2) in relation to statements that were oriented towards the educational establishment, student teachers responded in a negative manner.

Post-test results, using the PTO, showed an improvement in attitude over the pre-test. Specifically, the researchers (Ross and Swick, 1969) reported the following:

- (1) the group of student teachers responded even more affirmatively on the post-test to questions dealing with their teaching self-image than they did on the pre-test.
- (2) in relation to the statement that dealt with the educational establishment, the students showed a marked positive change in perceiving the educational establishment as effective and helpful (p. 11).

Two school systems were used in the study to determine "any significant impact on attitudes and opinions toward teaching" (p. 115). Results reported based on this aspect of the study by Ross and Swick (1969) were that

school system seems to indicate that the individual systems in which students teach may have significant attitudinal impact on how they perceive teaching in general and, more specifically, how they perceive themselves as teachers (p. 116).

The use of the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire produced the same conclusions. The researchers (p. 116) reported ". . . students who taught in System E consistently responded more negatively to statements dealing with teaching and the educational process." Ross and Swick (1969, p. 116).

Gubser (1969) investigated the relationship between authoritarianism of teachers and school principals to morale. The population for the sample consisted "of 273 elementary teachers and twenty principals" (p. 36) who were employed by an Oregon school district. Methodology consisted of using the California F-Scale, consisting of 30 items, and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. These instruments, as revealed by Gubser (p. 37), "were combined into a single instrument to which were added items seeking such personal information as age, sex, and preparation."

Results of the study showed that

means on total scores were comparable to those achieved in related research and in national norms. No correlations were found between total PTO scores and authoritarianism. Comparisons of F-Scale scores to certain morale factors did, however, reveal relationships significant at or above the .01 level of confidence (p. 37). The factor of age consistently showed influence on other variables significant at or above the .01 level of confidence (p. 38).

Results reported relating to principals showed

. . . in general, principals in this study did not demonstrate any significant ability to correctly anticipate the morale or authoritarian scores of their faculties. The authoritarian levels of principals apparently did not affect this lack of ability (p. 38).

Jones (1969) conducted a study of the morale of teachers involved with the mentally retarded. Regular elementary teachers and special education elementary teachers were compared regarding morale. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was selected for use as the measurement device. The respondents in the survey were 350 special education teachers and regular teachers. Respondents were from California and Michigan and were volunteers for the study. The participating sample "comprised 146 teachers of the educable or trainable retarded and 204 regular class teachers" (p. 5) reported Jones.

Results, as reported by Jones (1969, p. 6), revealed that the sample of female elementary teachers of educable mentally retarded compared to the female regular elementary teachers had "no reliable mean differences in responses to any of the 11 scales on the Purdue Opinionnaire." The same results were found for male respondents.

Secondary teachers of the educable mentally retarded as compared to regular secondary teachers revealed differences. Jones (1969)

reported

the regular teachers saw themselves as having greater rapport with their colleagues than did the special education teachers . . . the special teachers also tended to be less satisfied over salary issues . . . the greatest differences between the samples were found in the areas of curriculum issues and teacher status . . . the special education teacher expressed more dissatisfaction (p. 7).

The special teachers also "perceived greater community pressure but less community support" (p. 7).

Male teachers of regular classes and special education classes showed a reversal of the findings of the female teachers. The male teachers of the mentally retarded

. . . tended to perceive greater rapport with their colleagues. Also, there was a trend toward greater satisfaction with teaching, and higher overall morale on the part of the EMR teachers (p. 8).

Nineteen California female teachers of the trainable mentally retarded were compared to 93 regular elementary teachers. Results reported by Jones (1969) indicated

. . . for the teachers of trainables to perceive themselves as having lower status. Their responses also pointed to more dissatisfaction with salary, teaching load, and curriculum issues (p. 8).

Jones (1969, p. 9) hypothesized "that morale would be highest in the situation where the special teacher was joined by at least one colleague in her specialty." Results showed the following:

No reliable differences were found among opinionaire subscores for the California sample. However, teacher rapport with the principal and total morale were reliably higher in the isolated Michigan group (p. 9).

A second hypothesis and the results were stated by Jones. The researcher's hypothesis

that morale would be higher in the special school, received no support, as there were no statistically

significant differences between the responses of those teaching in the special schools and those integrated in regular schools (p. 9).

Bentley and Rempel (1967) conducted an experimental research study that was concerned with changing teacher morale. The study was developed around the following research questions as stated by the researchers:

- (1) Does feedback of teacher identified problems make a significant difference in changing teacher morale in particular school situations for (a) teachers generally, (b) vocational teachers, and (c) non-vocational teachers?
- (2) Do vocational teachers differ significantly from non-vocational teachers in the general level of morale and in terms of specific morale factors?
- (3) Is there a relationship between teacher morale and such factors as age, sex, teaching experience, level of education, salary, and major teaching assignments? (p. 8).

The two year study involved principals and teachers in Indiana and Oregon high schools. The experimental design used morale feedback to the experimental group and a control group which did not receive this treatment. Bentley and Rempel (1967, p. 8) stated that ". . . the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was used to measure changes and to make comparisons in the level of morale for these two groups over a period of time."

The population for the study "consisted of 3,070 teachers--223 vocational and 2,847 non-vocational" (p. 9). The pre-test and post-test experimental and control group design was selected for use.

Results of the comparison between vocational and non-vocational teachers revealed, according to Bentley and Rempel (1967), that

significance occurred

. . . with respect to teacher load with the vocational teachers reacting less favorably than the non-vocational teachers. Vocational teachers, however, were more favorable in their responses to items concerned with teacher-principal rapport (p. 19).

The population of Indiana vocational teachers enabled the researchers "to compare the morale scores of the vocational agriculture, home economics, and other vocational teachers" (p. 19). Differences were reported to be not significant with the exception of Factor I, which involved "rapport with principal." The vocational agriculture teachers were followed by the vocational home economics teachers in scoring the lowest.

The study (Bentley and Rempel, 1967) revealed that the Indiana and Oregon groups were different pertaining to certain factors. Oregon teachers were more favorable to "teacher salary, school facilities and services, community pressures, and community support of education" (p. 19). Indiana teachers were more favorable to the factor pertaining to satisfaction with teaching.

Results pertaining to teaching experience cited by Bentley and Rempel (1967, p. 29) were that "the teacher morale is significantly related to the total years of experience." The researchers (p. 29) stated further that ". . . it can be observed that in most instances the means either drop slightly or increase slightly when moving from the 1-3 years to the 4-9 years experience category."

The total morale scores for the subject area groups did not differ significantly. Bentley and Rempel (1967) noted

. . . that vocational teachers ranked high in teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, and

community support of education and low with respect to teacher load, school facilities and services, and community pressures (p. 37).

Conclusions from the study stated by Bentley and Rempel (1967)

revealed that:

- (1) comparisons of Indiana and Oregon teachers' scores revealed that there was little difference in mean total scores,
- (2) for four of the ten factors and for the total, the morale scores of the women were significantly higher than the morale scores for men,
- (3) differences were highly significant for salary and status factors,
- (4) marked differences were observed in the mean morale scores between teachers holding the master's degree and those holding the bachelor's degree,
- (5) age groups were found to differ significantly . . . there was a gradual upward progression in the level of morale with increasing age,
- (6) teacher morale was significantly related to total years of teaching experience,
- (7) there was a high correlation between salary level and the level of morale, and
- (8) it is difficult to establish any distinct or consistent pattern of mean scores for different major teaching areas (pp. 53-54).

Suggested Changes in Teacher Education

Research completed related to teacher training revealed many new concepts in the structure of the teacher education programs.

Bush (1978) revealed 10 lessons that educators learned from this mass of research. Those lessons are as follows:

1. Teacher preparation takes time, especially from the first day of practice until a beginner can step into a classroom with confidence and competence.

2. You cannot mass produce highly competent, professional teachers.
3. Frequent, varied, and criticized practice is very important.
4. Both the school and the university must participate in the training.
5. In-service and preservice have more in common than previously imagined.
6. Teacher training without parents and community members falls far short of excellence and responsiveness.
7. Fully professional teachers, who will continue their development over a lifetime career need to be well grounded in humanistic and behavioral sciences.
8. Teachers need a sound liberal or general education and a broad and deep training in the subject matter they teach.
9. The principle of individual differences applies to teachers and to teacher training as well as to pupils.
10. Excellent teacher training is not cheap (p. 24).

Bush revealed three models for reforming teacher education. One model involved a four year program with little or no practice component. A pre-teaching core curriculum would be a mandate and then a license to undergo the actual practicum would need to be secured.

A second proposed model by Bush (1978) involved a four year program with only those individuals possessing a definite commitment to teaching enrolled. Extensive field work with practice beginning the first year would be utilized.

The third Bush model proposed was described (p. 27) as ". . . a multi-year graduate, practice-based model, would enroll persons ranging from those who had not heretofore considered teaching to those who had chosen and completed Model 1." This program would involve

much observation, and interaction among all facets of the school society.

Monahan (1978) also related a new model for teacher education. He suggested "that teachers in training have at least two or three years beyond the junior year in college" (p. 29). He noted that teaching preparation in the past placed more emphasis on "content rather than process" (p. 30). Further, Monahan stated that "a re-assessment of the substance of teacher" (p. 30) be done. Also,

. . . it demands as well a strong commitment to helping teachers to learn somehow that only they are individually responsible for their own continuing education needs after initial licensure. Finally, there must be opportunity and time to develop effective teaching techniques; to try to know what teaching is; and to help young people to know how to cope with a variety of changing demands and changing values (p. 30).

Summary

There appears to be a general consensus that there are many identifiable problems concerning the public schools that influence the decision of teachers to remain or withdraw from teaching. Research showed that teacher job satisfaction or morale can be measured and would therefore give those individuals involved in education some knowledge pertaining to ways to alleviate the teacher drop-out problem.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The present study was designed to analyze the student teacher program in home economics and present public school position and why first year teachers continue or withdraw from teaching. As was shown in Chapters I and II, retaining teachers in the teaching field is a major concern for administrators and the teacher education departments in institutions of higher education. This chapter describes the type of research design, sample plan, instrumentation procedure, and the data analysis used in the study.

Type of Research Design

The type of research design selected for use in this research study was descriptive. Best (1977) stated that:

A descriptive study describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing. It is primarily concerned with the present, although it often considers past events and influences as they relate to current conditions (p. 116).

Best further stated that descriptive research deals with variable relationships. The variables selected for this study are not to be manipulated. Descriptive research also relates to a present condition.

There are various classifications of descriptive research available for use as research methods. One of these research methods is called the survey.

Survey research is an analytical or explanatory method. This method is most generally used to obtain opinions or attitudes of individuals. Surveys also gather data from a large number of cases at a particular time. Best (1977) further stated that:

The survey is an important type of study. It must not be confused with the mere clerical routine of gathering and tabulating figures. It involves a clearly defined problem and definite objectives. It requires expert and imaginative planning, careful analysis and interpretation of the data gathered, and logical and skillful reporting of the findings (p. 118).

The present study was of the descriptive method utilizing the survey. The criterion variable, first year home economics teachers, and the decision to remain or withdraw from teaching, was examined for determining if certain variates--job satisfaction, student teaching experience, and selected aspects within the public school system--were determinants of the teachers' decision of continuing to teach or not continuing to teach.

Sample Plan

The sample for the study consisted of all home economics teachers in those states comprising Region VI of the American Vocational Association (AVA). Those states included Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico. All states, except New Mexico, participated in the study. The procedure for obtaining the sample varied within each state.

A visit was made to the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Homemaking Division, Oklahoma City, to ask for support in inviting the Region VI member states of the AVA to participate in the study. Ms. Nedra Johnson, State Supervisor, contacted each of the state directors of Homemaking Education in each of the five states (Appendix C). The State Supervisors responded by sending a postal card to the researcher indicating their decision to participate or not to participate. The states of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and Louisiana responded positively.

Procedure for Obtaining Sample and
Data Collection Procedure

Oklahoma - The names of first year teachers who had returned to teaching were compiled by comparing names of employed home economics teachers for the 1978-79 school year with the names of those home economics teachers who were employed during the 1977-78 school year. This procedure enabled the researcher to obtain a list of those first year teachers who were not employed as returning home economics teachers. The names and home or school addresses of the first year home economics teachers who selected to stay in teaching, were obtained from the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education.

The decision to contact all the first year teachers for inclusion in the study was made. A total of 20 first year teachers comprised the invited sample. Eighteen of those were returning teachers and two were non-returning teachers. The subjects were sent a cover letter which explained the study (Appendix D). The letter included

the signature of the Vocational Home Economics State Supervisor. Included along with the cover letter were the Background Information Sheet (BIS) and the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PSTO) (Appendix D). The subjects were asked to return the completed Background Information Sheet and the completed Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

A follow-up packet was sent approximately two weeks after the first mailing to those who had not responded. The group that responded comprised the participating sample for the study. As soon as Packet I had been returned the researcher mailed Packet II. Packet II consisted of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement. A follow-up packet was sent to those who had not responded to this phase of the research study after a two week time period had elapsed.

Arkansas - The State Supervisor, Home Economics Education, Department of Education, Little Rock, compiled a list of first year teachers during the 1977-78 school year who were continuing to teach in the 1978-79 school year. A list was also made of those teachers who had decided not to teach during the 1978-79 school year (a total of 10). Addresses of these 10 teachers were not available. The names, home or school addresses of those who remained in teaching were then mailed to the researcher. A total of 33 names comprised the invited sample from Arkansas. The same procedure for mailing Packet I and Packet II was then followed as explained in the Oklahoma sample (see p. 44).

Missouri - The State Director of Home Economics Education, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City,

responded by indicating a comprehensive list of beginning teachers was not available. The State Director contacted each of the universities in Missouri who offered a certified vocational home economics degree program. Seven universities were contacted: Northeast Missouri State University, Kirksville; Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville; Southeast Missouri State University, Springfield; Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg; University of Missouri, Columbia; and Lincoln University, Jefferson City. An invited sample of 60 teachers was sent Packets I and II using the same procedure as previously described in the Oklahoma sample (see p. 44). Six of the 60 subjects were not employed as teachers during the 1978-79 school year.

Louisiana - The State Director of Home Economics, Department of Education, Baton Rouge, responded to the request for a list of beginning teachers by stating there was not enough staff to determine which teachers were first-year teachers. Therefore, a list of home economics teachers for the 1977-78 school year and a list of home economics teachers for the 1978-79 school year were mailed to the researcher. A comparison of the two lists was made to determine which names appeared for the first time on the 1978-79 list. A total of 178 names was compiled. These teachers were then sent a letter explaining the research. Also included was a postal card with three definitions of teaching positions given (Appendix C). The teacher was asked to check his/her present teaching position and return the card to the researcher. A total of 118 postal cards was returned with a total of five teachers indicating they were first

year teachers in the 1977-78 school year and were returning for the 1978-79 school year. These five teachers comprised the participating sample. The same procedure for mailing Packets I and II, as described in the Oklahoma sample (see p. 44), was then followed.

Texas - The Director, Homemaking Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, responded positively to Ms. Johnson's request to participate in the study. Texas is divided into 10 areas with Homemaking Education Consultants located in each area. The Director corresponded with each Area Consultant and asked for their cooperation. Three of the Areas, I, VI, and VII, responded positively. The Director then mailed the addresses of these Area Consultants to the researcher and the researcher followed up with a request for the list of first year teachers in the 1977-78 school year. The Area Consultants were also asked to co-sign a letter of support for the study along with the State Director. The invited sample consisted of 28 teachers from Area I, 22 from Area VI, and 23 from Area VII. Of the 28 teachers in Area I, 22 were returning and six had left the teaching field. The 22 teachers in Area VI consisted of eight who did not return to teaching and 14 who selected to return. Area VII consisted of 18 teachers who returned and four who did not return to teaching. The same procedure for mailing Packets I and II was then followed as explained in the Oklahoma sample (see p. 44).

Instrumentation Procedure

The research study used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO), Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement (PTOS), Purdue Student-Teacher

Opinionaire (PSTO), and a Background Information Sheet in obtaining the data. The instrumentation was thus divided into four parts to enable the researcher to meet the objectives of the study. The objectives were:

1. To compare the difference in job satisfaction of first year home economics teachers who remain in teaching their second year with those first year teachers that leave the teaching profession.
2. To determine if specific variables in the student teaching experience influence the decision of first year teachers to remain or to leave the teaching field.
3. To determine if specific variables in the public school system influence first year home economics teachers to remain in or to leave the teaching field.

Analysis and tabulation for the objectives one through three were then calculated.

Background Information Sheet (BIS)

Sixteen items, which required selection of the appropriate response by placing a letter to the left of the statement, were selected for the Background Information Sheet (Appendix D). Information requested from this form included: age; sex; marital status; spouse employment status; highest education attainment of respondent; spouse's highest educational attainment; and number of years teaching experience. Also included were number of children; ages of children; professional organization membership; father's highest educational attainment; father's present occupation; mother's highest educational attainment; mother's present occupation; spouse attitude toward respondent being employed; plans to continue in teaching; and plans to

return to teaching after leaving. The open-ended questions, "What is (are) your reasons for deciding to remain in the teaching field?" and "What is (are) your reasons for deciding to leave the teaching field?" were included to allow the respondents to list other factors that might have influenced their decision to remain or to leave teaching. This background information was needed so that the researcher could determine if specific background variables of the home economics teachers, who had completed their first year of teaching, were influential in affecting their decision to remain or to leave the teaching field.

In selecting variables for inclusion on the Background Information Sheet, research indicated by Spivey (1977) concerning morale of vocational teachers; Indiresan (1976) concerning satisfied and dissatisfied teachers; Bienstok and Sayres (1963) concerning job satisfaction among junior high teachers; and Bledsoe (1967) concerning performance of beginning teachers, that age, as requested in BIS 1, was important in research designed to determine teacher job satisfaction. In the BIS, Items 2 and 3 were concerned with marital status and the sex of the participants. These factors were included in studies completed by Bienstok and Sayres (1963), Bledsoe (1967), and the National Education Association's (NEA) annual study of teacher profile for the year 1975-76. The NEA study also included a statement concerning the employment of the spouse, so Item 4 on the BIS relates to this variable. The number of years teaching experience, BIS Item 7, was identified as being important in studies of faculty morale by Gubser (1969) and Jones (1969), Spivey (1977), Indiresan

(1976), a study of teacher dropout by Erickson (1968), and the NEA study.

Items 8 and 9, the number and ages of children, were cited by NEA (1977) in the study concerning the status of the public school teacher. Membership in professional organizations were included in research by the NEA (1977) and also by Indiresan (1971) as being influential in teachers continuing to teach. This is Item 10 on the BIS.

Item 11, father's highest educational attainment, was used in research relating to job satisfaction and teacher morale (Erickson, 1968; Bledsoe, 1967). Father's occupation was identified as important by the NEA (1977) report on the status of the public school teacher. This is Item 12 on the BIS.

The mother's educational attainment, Item 13, was included in public school research by the NEA (1977), Bledsoe's research on beginning teachers (1967), and Erickson's research on teacher dropout (1969). Items 16 and 17 related to future plans to continue in teaching and were cited for use in research by Bledsoe (1967) and Indiresan's research on teacher satisfaction (1976). Bledsoe (1967) also asked if there were plans to continue in teaching if the decision was made to leave the teaching field at that time.

The researcher's decision to include other background information was based on the objectives of the study and the need for these variables to be included in the analysis of the data. Those additional variables selected by the researcher were: highest academic degree of respondents, Item 5; mother's present occupation, Item 14;

spouse's attitude toward respondent's employment, Item 15; and highest academic degree of spouse, Item 6.

Reliability of the Background Information Sheet was established by determining the test-retest stability of the items when administered to a class of graduate students in home economics. Most of the respondents had previous high school home economics teaching experience. The BIS was administered to the class and three weeks later the re-test of the instrument was completed. Responses to 16 of the items on the BIS, excluding items 17 and 18, were recorded for each respondent on the test and on the re-test. Each item was analyzed to determine if there was a relationship between the test and re-test using percentage calculation. Ten of the 16 items had a 100 percent comparison. Five of the items had an 85 percent comparison, and one item had a 71 percent comparison.

Validity of the instrument was assessed by an item evaluation by the graduate class of home economics students. The researcher explained the purpose and objectives of the study to the class. Since most of the graduate students had previous high school teaching experience, the importance of inclusion of each of the statements was to be evaluated by these graduate students. Clarity of each statement was also evaluated by the same class. Suggestions for changing the BIS, as noted by the graduate class, were examined and the necessary corrections to the instrument were completed.

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PS-TO) was selected for use in the research study to meet the objective concerning the

student teaching experience. The use of the PS-TO was to determine if specific student teaching variables influenced the decision of first year home economics teachers to remain or to leave the teaching field.

The PS-TO consists of 60 items which are divided into nine factors. Those factors identified, as well as the number of items for each factor, are listed as given by Bentley and Price (1972, addendum) as follows:

Factor Number	Factor Title	No. of Items
1	Rapport with Supervising Teacher	8
2	Rapport with Principal	8
3	Rapport with University Supervisor	7
4	Teaching as a Profession	7
5	School Facilities and Services	5
6	Professional Preparation	6
7	Rapport with the Students	8
8	Student Teacher Rapport with Other Teachers	6
9	Student Teacher Load	5

(See Appendix B for description of each factor.)

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item while they were involved in the student teaching experience. Respondents were asked to select which level of agreement they would assign each item. The levels of agreement were arranged with the following definitions as given by Bentley and Price (1976).

If you agree with the statement, blacken the space under A
 If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the statement, blacken the space under PA
 If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the statement, blacken the space PD
 If you disagree with the statement, blacken the space D
 (p. 1).

The reliability of the PS-TO was established by using the "Cronback Coefficient Alpha" for each of the nine factors, as noted by Bentley and Price (1972, addendum, p. 2). The sample used for the establishment of the reliability was a group of 179 student teachers. The reliability coefficient was established for each of the factors as given below:

Factor	Cronback Coefficient Alpha Correlations
1. Rapport with Supervising Teacher	.84
2. Rapport with Principal	.93
3. Rapport with University Supervisor	.82
4. Teaching as a Profession	.72
5. School Facilities and Services	.76
6. Professional Preparation	.76
7. Rapport with Students	.79
8. Rapport with Other Teachers	.78
9. Student Teacher Load	.69

The validity of the PS-TO was explained by Bentley and Price (1972) as

. . . to the extent that student-teachers' responses are made anonymously, are self consistent, and content validity is exhibited, at least adequate validity may be assumed (addendum, p. 2).

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) was selected for use in the study to compare the difference in job satisfaction among first year home economics teachers who remain in teaching their second year with those first year teachers that leave the teaching profession. The PTO was also used to determine if specific variables in the public school

system influenced first year home economics teachers to remain or to leave the teaching field.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire consists of 100 items which are divided into 10 factors. Those factors identified as well as the number of items for each factor are listed as given by Bentley and Rempel (1970, p. 9):

Factor Number		Number of Items
1	Teacher Rapport with Principal	20
2	Satisfaction with Teaching	20
3	Rapport Among Teachers	14
4	Teacher Salary	7
5	Teacher Load	11
6	Curriculum Issues	5
7	Teacher Status	8
8	Community Support of Education	5
9	School Facilities and Services	5
10	Community Pressures	5

(See Appendix A for description of each factor.)

The reliability of the PTO was established for each of the 10 factors as noted by Bentley and Rempel (1970, p. 5). The sample used for the reliability establishment was a group of Indiana and Oregon teachers, a total of 3,023 high school teachers. The coefficients established for each factor were:

Factor (N=3023)		Correlation
1	Teacher Rapport with Principal	.88
2	Satisfaction with Teaching	.84
3	Rapport Among Teachers	.80
4	Teacher Salary	.81
5	Teacher Load	.77

Factor (N=3023)		Correlation
6	Curriculum Issues	.76
7	Teacher Status	.81
8	Community Support of Education	.78
9	School Facilities and Services	.80
10	Community Pressures	.62

Factor 2, Satisfaction with Teaching, which consists of 20 items, relates to the variate of job satisfaction. Objective one compares the difference in job satisfaction of returning and non-returning first year home economics teachers. Objective three, relating to selected public school variables and their influence on first year home economics teachers, can be explained by using Factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. These factors consist of 80 items.

A PTO Supplement of 20 items was added to include two additional factors deemed important in determining teacher morale. Teacher Rapport with School Board and Teacher Rapport with Superintendent were used in relation to Objective three concerning the public school variables.

Respondents of the study were asked to reveal their level of agreement with each of the 120 items. The same instructions as given for the PS-T0 were included on the PTO and PTOS (see PS-T0, p. 51).

Data Analysis

The data were collected in February and March, 1979, from home economics teachers who had been employed as first year teachers in home economics during the school year 1978-79. The respondents were sent two opinionnaires. The first mailing to the respondents in

February contained a cover letter explaining the study, a Background Information Sheet, and the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement were mailed as soon as the first mailing had been returned. Follow-up letters were used to facilitate prompt responses. Each opinionnaire was coded so that those responding to the survey would not be recontacted.

The Background Information Sheet responses to 17 questions were analyzed for the frequency distributions of each question. The BIS Item 18 asked for open-ended responses to two questions. A committee of two home economics education professors, a home economics education graduate student, and the researcher analyzed each response to the separate questions of Item 18 and grouped the responses into similar subject areas. Frequency tabulations for the responses in the subject areas were then completed (Appendix D).

The hypotheses of the study determined the statistical procedures used for analyzing the data. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, and Helwig, 1976) was used for analysis. The research study consisted of two groups--a group of returning home economics teachers and a group of non-returning home economics teachers. Three statistical procedures were used: F test, student's t, and the tabulated t' test.

Respondents were asked to mark their opinions of each item on the PS-TO, PTO, and PTOS according to the directions given on the Opinionnaires and explained in Chapter III, Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire, p. 51. The procedure used for recording responses for

statistical analysis to the PS-TO, PTO, and PTOS was the following: a "1" was recorded for items marked "agree"; a "2" was recorded for items marked "probably agree"; a "3" was recorded for items marked "probably disagree"; and a "4" was recorded for items marked "disagree."

The items of the instruments (PS-TO-60 items, PTO-100 items, PTOS-20 items) were grouped into three variables which make up the three hypotheses. Hypothesis I, formulated for the job satisfaction variable, consisted of the 20 items of Factor 2, "Job Satisfaction," PTO. Hypothesis II, formulated for the student teaching experience, variable, consisted of the 60 items of the PS-TO. Hypothesis III, formulated for the public school variable, consisted of Factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the PTO and the two factors of the PTOS.

The first statistical procedure was the F test. This test was used to determine if the variances of the two groups were equal. The .05 level was set for acceptance or non-acceptance of the F value for equal variances. If the probability or the F value was greater than .05, then the variances were equal; if the probability of the F value was significant beyond the .05 level, then the judgment of equal variances was not accepted. The formula for determining the F value (Anderson and Bancroft, 1952, p. 83) is

$$F = \frac{s_1^2}{s_2^2}$$

The second statistical procedure, the calculation of the student's t test, was used to determine which group had a significant difference in means. The student's t test, which assumes equal

variances, was used to test items that had equal variances as determined by the F value. The formula for determining the student's t value (Anderson and Bancroft, 1952, p. 81) was

$$\frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s \sqrt{(1/n_1) + (1/n_2)}}$$

The third statistical procedure used was the Cochran and Cox tabulated t' test. This is one method for testing means differences when the variances are unequal. This is an approximate test and "utilizes a weighted mean of the tabular t values for the two samples, weighted by the two sample variances" (Anderson and Bancroft, 1952, p. 82). The formula for this test is as follows:

$$d = \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$$

and

$$s_d = \frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}$$

The approximate tabular value for $t' = d/s_d$ is

$$t'_a = \frac{(w_1 t_{a1} + w_2 t_{a2})}{(w_1 + w_2)}$$

where $w_i = s_i^2/n_i$ and t_{ai} is t_a for $(n_i - 1)$ degrees of freedom.

The F test was used to determine equality of variances. Based upon these findings, those items in the instruments that were

determined to be of equal variances were then further tested for mean difference with the student's t test. Those items that were determined to be not significant by the F test were tested through the use of the Cochran and Cox tabulated t' test to determine mean differences. The null hypotheses, stating no differences between two sample means, was accepted or not accepted based upon the student's t test or Cochran and Cox's tabulated t' test.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was designed to determine why beginning teachers in home economics were making the decision to continue or withdraw from teaching after one year of teaching experience. This chapter was organized in the following sequence: (1) accepting sample; (2) characteristics of the sample; and (3) the findings of the study.

Accepting Sample

Returns were received from 121 respondents for the BIS and PS-T0 (Packet I), which comprised 73.33 percent of the total eligible sample of 165 potential participants. Returns for the PTO and PTOS (Packet II) were received from 98 of the 121 respondents to Packet I. The original sample obtained from the state supervisors of home economics totaled 191. Those judged ineligible to participate, a total of 26, were on the basis of year graduating from college and those packets returned because of incorrect address.

Arkansas had 29 in the invited sample with 20 participants in Packet I and 14 participating in Packet II. Louisiana had five teachers in the invited sample, with three of the five who participated by returning both packets. Missouri's total participants were 37 teachers for Packet I and 32 teachers who responded to Packet II. Fourteen teachers from Oklahoma responded to Packet I and 12 teachers

responded to Packet II. Texas had the largest percentage of the invited sample, with a total of 61 participants invited, and 47 who participated for Packet I. Thirty-seven of the Texas participants responded to Packet II (Table I).

TABLE I
RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS OF THE FIVE STATES

State	Invited Sample		Participating Sample			
	n	%	Packet I		Packet II	
			n	%	n	%
Arkansas	29	17.6	20	16.52	14	14.2
Louisiana	5	3.0	3	2.47	3	3.0
Missouri	53	32.1	37	30.57	32	32.7
Oklahoma	17	10.3	14	11.57	12	12.2
Texas						
Area I	23	13.9	19	15.70	18	18.3
Area VI	17	10.3	12	9.91	7	7.1
Area VII	<u>21</u>	<u>12.7</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>13.22</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12.2</u>
Total	165	99.8 ^a	121	99.96 ^a	98	99.7 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

The sample consisted of two groups, those who left the teaching field after one year of teaching and those who remained in teaching for the second year. The largest number of participants who left the teaching field was from Texas, which identified two to leave teaching

from Area I, three from Area VI, and two from Area VII. This percent was 36.1 of the total sample from Texas in the study. This was six percent of the total sample of teachers from all states participating. Arkansas and Louisiana reported no teachers had left teaching (Table II).

TABLE II
TOTAL TEACHERS WHO LEFT THE TEACHING FIELD
(PARTICIPATING SAMPLE)

State	n Reported	Percent of Sample by State	Percent of Total Sample
Arkansas	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0
Missouri	4	10.81	3.3
Oklahoma	1	7.14	.8
Texas			
Area I	2	8.9	1.7
Area VI	3	17.7	2.6
Area VII	<u>2</u>	12.5	<u>1.7</u>
Total	12		10.1

Characteristics of the Respondents

The BIS characteristics of the continuing home economics teachers and noncontinuing teachers used in this study were: age; sex;

marital status; spouse employment; highest college degree; highest educational degree of spouse; years of teaching experience; number of children; ages of children; number of professional organization memberships; father's highest education; father's present occupation; mother's highest education; mother's present occupation; spouse attitude toward employment; and plans to continue in teaching. Information was obtained from the respondents to each of the items.

Personal Characteristics

Sixty (55.05 percent) of the returning teachers and eight (66.67 percent) of the non-returning teachers ranged from 20-24 years of age and was the largest group; the smallest group, two returning teachers (1.83 percent) was over 45 years of age. All 121 respondents to this question were female. The marital status revealed that 71 (66.15 percent) of the 109 returning teachers who responded to this question were married. Nine (75.0 percent) of the 12 non-returning teachers were married. Thirty of the 109 returning teachers (27.52 percent) and two (16.67 percent) of the non-returning teachers were single (Table III).

Item 4 on the BIS form pertained to employment of the spouse. Sixty-one of the 104 returning teachers (55.96 percent) indicated their spouses were employed full-time. Seven (58.33 percent) of the 12 non-returning teachers indicated their spouses were employed full-time. Three returning teachers (2.75 percent) and none of the non-returning teachers indicated that the spouse was not gainfully employed (Table III).

TABLE III
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Personal Characteristics	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
1. Age				
20-24	8	66.67	60	55.05
25-29	4	33.33	31	28.44
30-34	0	0	9	8.26
35-39	0	0	4	3.67
40-44	0	0	3	2.75
Over 45	0	0	2	1.83
Total	12	100.00	109	100.00
2. Sex				
Female	12	100.00	109	100.00
Male	0	0	0	0
Total	12	100.00	109	100.00
3. Marital Status				
Divorced, Separated, or Widowed	1	8.33	8	7.34
Married	9	75.0	71	65.14
Single	2	16.67	30	27.52
Total	12	100.00	109	100.00
4. Employment of Spouse				
Not Married	3	25.00	33	30.27
No, Not Gainfully Employed	0	0	3	2.75
Yes, Employed Full-Time	7	58.33	61	55.96
Yes, Employed Part-Time	2	16.67	7	6.42
No Response	0	0	5	4.58
Total	12	100.00	109	99.98 ^a
8. Number of Children				
None	10	83.33	82	75.23
1-2	2	16.67	20	18.35
3-4	0	0	6	5.50
5-6	0	0	1	.92
More than 6	0	0	0	0
Total	12	100.00	109	100.00
9. Ages of Children				
Does not Apply	9	75.0	80	70.79
Under 6 Years	3	25.0	15	13.27
6-11 Years	0	0	5	4.42
11-17 Years	0	0	8	7.07
18 Years or Older	0	0	5	4.42
Total	12	100.00	113	99.97 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

Number and ages of children were elicited in Items 8 and 9 on the BIS. A total of 92 respondents indicated they had no children. Of this group, 82 were returning teachers and 10 were respondents who left the teaching field. Twenty returning teachers (18.35 percent) indicated they had one or two children; six (5.50 percent) reported having three or four children; and one (.92 percent) indicated having five or six children. None reported having more than six children (Table III).

Eighty returning teachers marked the "does not apply" category in regard to ages of children. Nine (75.0 percent) of the non-returning teachers also checked this category. Fifteen (13.27 percent) of the returning teachers checked the "under 6 years of age" of children, while three (25.00 percent) of the non-returning teachers checked this age group. The returning teachers had children in each of the age groups (Table III).

The respondents were asked to check the certificate or educational degrees they held. Most teachers indicated the bachelor's degree. Ninety-seven (89.81 percent) of the 108 returning teachers and ten (83.33 percent) of the 12 non-returning indicated the bachelor's degree. One returning teacher (.92 percent) held a doctor's degree, and one returning teacher (.92 percent) had completed 30 hours above the master's degree. Of those non-returning teachers, one (8.33 percent) teacher indicated the certificate educational level and one (8.33 percent) indicated the master's degree level (Table IV).

TABLE IV
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF NON-RETURNING AND
RETURNING TEACHERS

Degree Possessed	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
Certificate	1	8.33	2	1.85
Bachelor's	10	83.33	97	89.81
Doctor's	0	0	1	.92
Master's	1	8.33	7	6.48
Master's Plus 30 Hours	0	0	1	.92
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>.92</u>
Total	12	99.99 ^a	109	100.90 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

Item 6 of the BIS asked for the educational level of the spouse. Seven categories were listed. Fifty-six (51.37 percent) of the returning teachers and five (41.67 percent) of the non-returning teachers indicated that the question did not apply to them. Seventeen returning teachers (15.59 percent) and four non-returning teachers (33.33 percent) had spouses with bachelor's degrees. Hours above master's and master's levels of education were indicated by four (3.66 percent) the returning teachers as their spouses' educational levels. Five returning teachers (4.58 percent) and one non-returning teacher (8.33 percent) had spouses with doctor's degrees (Table V).

TABLE V
ACADEMIC DEGREE OF SPOUSE OF RETURNING AND
NON-RETURNING TEACHERS

Degree	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
Bachelor's	4	33.33	17	15.59
Certificate	1	8.33	5	4.58
Doctor's	1	8.33	5	4.58
Does not Apply	5	41.67	56	51.37
Hours above Bachelor's	1	8.33	9	8.25
Hours above Master's	0	0	4	3.66
Master's	0	0	4	3.66
No Response	0	0	9	8.25
Total	12	99.99 ^a	109	99.94 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

Number of years of teaching vocational home economics was asked for in Item 7. The study used teachers who had taught for only one year in the public school. The responses that could be selected for this item were: one year, two years, or other. The questionnaires were mailed to the eligible teachers during their second year of teaching. Therefore, some selections for response to this item were assumed to be for two years of teaching experience.

Item 7 intended to determine if the home economics teacher had taught in a subject matter area other than home economics. Sixty-six respondents (60.55 percent) of the returning teachers had two years

experience, with the non-returning group reporting one (8.33 percent) in this year level. Twenty-nine (26.61 percent) of the returning teachers had one year of experience, and 10 respondents (83.33 percent) of those who left, had one year experience (Table VI).

TABLE VI
YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND MEMBERSHIP IN
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF RETURNING
AND NON-RETURNING TEACHERS

Category	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
Teaching Experience				
One	10	83.33	29	26.61
Other	1	8.33	14	12.84
Two	<u>1</u>	<u>8.33</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>60.55</u>
Total	12	99.99 ^a	109	100.00
Professional Organization Membership				
1-2	9	75.00	60	55.05
3-4	0	0	33	30.28
More than 4	0	0	8	7.34
None	<u>3</u>	<u>25.00</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7.34</u>
Total	12	100.00	109	100.00

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

Membership in professional organizations was asked for in Item 10. Of those teachers who left teaching, nine (75.00 percent) belonged to one or two organizations and the remaining three non-returning respondents did not belong to any professional organizations. The greatest number of returning teachers belonged to one or two organizations (55.05 percent or 60 respondents). Eight of the returning teacher respondents indicated membership in more than four organizations (Table VI).

The respondents' fathers' educational level and present occupation were elicited in Items 11 and 12. The educational level indicated by both groups, teachers who left teaching and those remaining, as having the highest percent was that of fathers graduating from high school, technical, or business school. As can be seen in Table VII, the percent of returning teachers was 32.11 and non-returning teachers was 58.33 percent. Both groups showed similarity in fathers' occupation by checking the occupation of managerial worker or self-employed. Thirty-one returning teachers (28.44 percent) and seven non-returning teachers (58.33 percent) checked the occupations. Twenty returning teachers checked that their fathers were retired (18.34 percent). Two non-returning teachers marked the semi-skilled or skilled occupational categories for 16.67 percent (Table VII).

Mother's occupation and education were asked for in Items 13 and 14. Again, high school graduation, technical, or business school was the most frequently indicated educational level by both groups. Forty-seven returning teachers (43.12 percent) and seven (58.33 percent) of the non-returning teachers indicated this educational level. Unemployment of mothers was the occupational area most often selected

TABLE VII

MOTHER'S AND FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF RETURNING AND
NON-RETURNING TEACHERS

Classification	Non-Returning				Returning			
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
Educational Attainment								
Completed Elementary School	0	0	2	16.67	14	12.84	12	11.01
Graduate Professional School	0	0	1	8.33	12	11.01	10	9.17
Graduated from College	2	16.67	0	0	17	15.60	19	17.43
Graduated from High, Technical, or Business School	7	58.33	7	58.33	35	32.11	47	43.12
No Formal Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Some College	1	8.33	1	8.33	15	13.76	14	12.84
Some Elementary School	2	16.67	0	0	4	3.67	0	0
Some High, Technical, or Business School	0	0	1	8.33	12	11.01	7	6.42
Total	12	100.00	12	99.99 ^a	109	100.00	109	99.99 ^a

TABLE VII (Continued)

Classification	Non-Returning				Returning			
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
<u>Occupation</u>								
Clerical or Sales Worker	0	0	2	16.67	6	5.50	12	11.00
Managerial Worker or Self Employed	7	58.33	2	16.67	31	28.44	16	14.67
Professional or Semi- Professional	1	8.33	1	8.33	17	15.59	19	17.43
Retired	1	8.33	1	8.33	20	18.34	13	11.92
Skilled or Semi-Skilled	2	16.67	0	0	16	14.67	8	7.33
Unemployed	0	0	4	33.33	0	0	28	25.68
Unskilled	0	0	0	0	1	.91	0	0
Other	1	8.33	2	16.67	15	13.76	12	11.00
No Response	0	0	0	0	3	2.75	1	.91
Total	12	99.99 ^a	12	100.00	109	99.96 ^a	109	99.97 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

by both groups. Twenty-eight (25.68 percent) of the returning teachers checked this occupational area for their mother (Table VII).

Item 15 asked the question, "Does your spouse want you to be employed?" Four non-returning teachers indicated the "no" category (33.33 percent); four checked the "yes" category (33.33 percent); and four checked the "does not apply" category (33.33 percent). The returning teachers (63 or 57.79 percent) checked the "yes" category (Table VIII).

TABLE VIII
SPOUSE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD HOME ECONOMICS TEACHER
BEING EMPLOYED AS A TEACHER

Item	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
15. Does your spouse want you to be employed?				
No	4	33.33	6	5.50
Yes	4	33.33	63	57.79
Does not Apply	4	33.33	37	33.94
No Response	0	0	3	2.75
Total	12	100.00	109	99.98 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

Item 16 asked about the respondents' plans to continue in the teaching field. Both groups checked that they did plan to continue in teaching; 17 returning teachers (15.60 percent) responded they did not plan to continue in the teaching profession and four (33.33 percent) of the non-returning teachers indicated they did not plan to continue in teaching. Information for plans on returning to teaching after once leaving the field was asked in Item 17. Sixty-four (58.71 percent) of the returning teachers and six (50.00 percent) of the non-returning teachers responded that they had "not reached" a decision. Fifty percent of the non-returning teachers indicated they would not return. The non-returning teachers also replied they had "not reached a decision" as the most frequent selection. Only one respondent in this group checked that she would not return to teaching (Table IX).

Item 18 contained two questions which were open-ended. The first question asked, "What is (are) your reasons for deciding to remain in the teaching field?" The responses were categorized into six classification areas by subject matter. A panel of two home economics education professors, a graduate student in home economics education, and the researcher reviewed the statements made by the respondents and then classified the statements by subject areas.

The subject area of "enjoy teaching" received 38 statements by all the teachers, and the area of "enjoy students" had 32 statements. "Working conditions" were cited the fewest number of times, with only three statements (Table X). Statements of the respondents for this question are located in Appendix E.

TABLE IX
FUTURE TEACHING PLANS OF RETURNING AND
NON-RETURNING TEACHERS

Item	Non-Returning		Returning	
	n	%	n	%
16. Do you plan to continue in the teaching profession?				
No	4	33.33	17	15.60
Yes	7	58.33	70	64.22
No Decision	<u>1</u>	<u>18.33</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>20.18</u>
Total	12	99.99 ^a	109	100.00
17. If you have decided to leave the teaching profession, do you plan to return at a later time?				
No	1	8.33	6	5.50
Yes	5	41.67	18	16.51
No Decision	6	50.00	64	58.71
No Response	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>19.26</u>
Total	12	100.00	109	99.98 ^a

^aDue to the rounding off of numbers, the percent does not always equal 100.

TABLE X

REASONS SUGGESTED BY HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS
FOR REMAINING IN THE TEACHING FIELD

Classification Area	Number of Statements
Enjoy Teaching	38
Enjoy Students	32
Time	18
Economic	17
Contributions to Society	12
Miscellaneous	12
Working Conditions	3
Total	132

The second part of the item asked the question, "What is (are) your reasons for deciding to leave the teaching field?" Statements were also classified with seven subject areas being identified by the non-returning teachers. The "discipline concerns" and "career changes" categories received the most statements made by the non-returning teachers, with 11 responses. The "time" subject area was cited by two respondents. "Family," "frustration-pressure," and "financial" were each cited, with one statement each (Table XI). A list of the statements made by the respondents is located in Appendix E.

TABLE XI
 REASONS SUGGESTED BY NON-RETURNING HOME
 ECONOMICS TEACHERS FOR LEAVING
 THE TEACHING FIELD

Classification Area	Number of Statements
Discipline Concerns	3
Career Changes	3
Time	2
Family	1
Frustration-Pressure	1
Financial	<u>1</u>
Total	11

Findings of the Study

The findings section of the research study was organized by the frequency distribution for the returning teachers and the non-returning teachers from the PS-TO, PTO, and PTOS instruments. Then, outcomes of the statistical analysis were discussed.

Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire

The PS-TO consisted of nine factors with different items within the instrument contributing toward each of the factor's score. In this section, the frequency distribution of the items within each of the factors will be discussed. Appendix G contains a brief description for each item of the PS-TO.

Factor 1 - "Rapport with Supervising Teacher." Eight statements contributed to Factor 1. As can be seen from Table XIV, most of the 109 returning teachers and the 12 non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for these statements. Item 6, which related to the "supervising teacher recognizing good teaching," received "Agree" checks from 75 returning teachers (68.8 percent). All other items, with the exception of Items 58 (47 "Agree" checks, 43.12 percent) and 52 (43 "Agree" checks, 39.45 percent) received over 50 percent of agreement checks from the returning teachers. Item 58, "freedom to question teaching methods used," received "Disagree" checks from 11 (10.09 percent) of the returning teachers (Table XII).

The 12 non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for all eight items from 50 to 67 percent of the time. Item 18, "provided help," received "Disagree" checks from two (16.67 percent) of the 12 non-returning teachers (Table XII).

Factor 2 - "Rapport with Principal." This factor contained eight statements. Both groups, non-returning and returning teachers, checked the "Probably Agree" category most frequently for the items in this factor. "Fair judgment of work by principal," Item 42, received "Probably Agree" checks from 56 (51.85 percent) of the 108 returning teachers who responded to this statement. Item 35, "discussion of school problems encouraged," received "Disagree" checks from 29 (26.85) percent of the returning teachers (Table XIII).

Six of the 12 non-returning teachers (50 percent) checked in the "Probably Agree" category for Item 47, "principal making work pleasant;" for Item 56, "principal recognizing good teaching;" and

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 1 - "RAPPORT WITH
SUPERVISING TEACHER"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
5	"subject matter made interesting"																			
	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	12	59	54.13	37	33.94	10	9.17	3	2.75	109		
6	"teacher recognizes good teaching"																			
	8	66.67	3	25.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	12	75	68.81	29	26.61	5	4.59	0	0.00	109		
18	"provided help"																			
	8	66.67	2	16.67	0	0.00	2	16.67	12	70	64.22	25	22.94	10	9.17	4	3.67	109		
34	"effective conference time"																			
	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	12	57	52.29	27	24.77	15	13.76	10	9.17	109		
38	"new methods encouraged"																			
	6	50.00	3	25.00	3	25.00	0	0.00	12	61	55.96	30	27.52	13	11.93	5	4.59	109		
52	"creativity present in teaching"																			
	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	12	43	39.45	41	37.61	15	13.76	10	9.17	109		
55	"well-satisfied with experience"																			
	8	66.67	3	2.48	0	0.00	1	8.33	12	58	53.21	39	35.78	8	7.34	4	3.67	109		
58	"freedom to question teaching methods"																			
	7	58.33	4	33.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	12	47	43.12	26	23.85	25	23.94	11	10.09	109		

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 2 - "RAPPORT WITH PRINCIPAL"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X		n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X	
1	"problems handled adequately"																	
	5	41.17	3	25.00	3	25.00	1	8.33	12	38	35.19	50	46.30	10	9.26	10	9.26	108
9	"interest shown"																	
	3	25.00	5	41.67	4	33.33	0	0.00	12	25	22.94	43	39.45	26	23.85	15	13.76	109
22	"understood teaching assignment"																	
	4	33.33	5	41.67	0	0.00	3	25.00	12	28	25.69	42	38.53	27	24.77	12	11.01	109
35	"discussion of school problems encouraged"																	
	3	25.00	4	33.33	1	8.33	4	33.33	12	18	16.67	27	25.00	34	31.48	29	26.85	108
42	"fair judgment of work"																	
	4	33.33	5	41.67	2	16.67	1	8.33	12	34	31.48	56	51.85	12	11.11	6	5.56	108
47	"made work pleasant"																	
	4	33.33	6	50.00	0	0.00	2	16.67	12	21	19.44	46	42.59	32	29.63	9	8.33	108
56	"recognized good teaching"																	
	3	25.00	6	50.00	3	25.00	0	0.00	12	30	27.78	52	48.15	20	18.52	6	5.56	108
59	"freedom to discuss school problems"																	
	2	16.67	6	50.00	1	8.33	3	25.00	12	18	16.51	34	31.19	33	30.28	24	22.02	109

for Item 59, "discussing school problems." Most "Disagree" checks (33.33 percent) by four non-returning teachers were indicated for Item 35, "discussion of school problems" (Table XIII).

Factor 3 - "Rapport with University Supervisor." Seven statements were identified for this factor. Most of the returning teachers and the non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for these statements. Item 7, "university supervisor's evaluation" received "Agree" checks from 73 (66.97 percent) of the returning teachers. Item 30, "adequate observation time for judgment" received "Disagree" checks by 19 (17.43 percent) of the returning teachers (Table XIV).

At least six or more of the 12 non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for all items in this factor. Nine (75.0 percent) non-returning teachers indicated most agreement with Item 7, "university supervisor's evaluation." Items 7 and 28 each received no "Disagree" checks (Table XIV).

Factor 4 - "Teaching as a Profession." Seven statements pertained to Factor 4. Table XV reveals that most of the returning teachers checked the "Probably Agree" category for these statements. None of the seven statements received more than 50 percent selection in the "Agree" category, with the exception of Item 23, where 57 (52.29 percent) of the 109 returning teachers checked this category. Item 23 was described as "enjoy teaching." The "Disagree" category was indicated by 14 (12.84 percent) teachers. Item 37 is to "select teaching again as a career" (Table XV).

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
 FACTOR 3 - "RAPPORT WITH
 UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
7	"justified evaluation"																	
9	75.00		3	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	73	66.97	26	23.85	5	4.59	5	4.59	109
17	"conferences were productive"																	
6	54.55		3	27.27	1	9.09	1	9.09	11	40	36.70	42	38.53	17	15.60	10	9.17	109
28	"constructive criticism given"																	
10	83.33		1	8.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	12	74	66.89	19	17.43	9	8.26	7	6.42	109
30	"adequate observation time for judgment"																	
7	58.33		3	25.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	36	33.03	29	26.61	25	25.94	19	17.43	109
46	"observation time was comfortable"																	
6	50.00		5	41.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	12	44	40.37	38	34.86	17	15.60	10	9.17	109
54	"freedom to discuss teaching problems"																	
8	66.67		2	16.67	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	57	52.29	35	32.11	11	10.09	6	5.50	109
60	"provided help"																	
7	58.33		4	33.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	12	52	48.15	35	32.41	8	7.41	13	12.04	108

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 4 - "TEACHING AS A PROFESSION"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	
	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z		n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z		
13	"provides social status"																		
	8	66.67	4	33.33	0	0	0	0	12	32	29.36	44	40.37	21	19.27	12	11.01	109	
15	"challenging profession"																		
	4	33.33	6	50.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	51	46.79	35	32.11	15	13.76	8	7.34	109	
19	"provides occupational security"																		
	4	33.33	6	50.00	2	16.67	0	0	12	33	30.28	47	43.12	20	18.35	9	8.26	109	
20	"provides prestige"																		
	6	50.00	6	50.00	0	0	0	0	12	30	27.52	49	44.95	21	19.27	9	8.26	109	
23	"enjoy teaching"																		
	5	41.67	5	41.67	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	57	52.29	40	36.70	10	9.17	2	1.83	109	
26	"affords opportunity for societal contributions"																		
	6	50.00	5	41.67	1	8.33	0	0	12	35	35.22	46	42.20	24	22.02	4	3.67	109	
37	"select teaching again for a career"																		
	3	25.00	4	33.33	3	25.10	2	16.67	12	44	40.37	35	32.11	16	14.68	14	12.84	109	

The 12 non-returning teachers indicated the "Agree" and "Probably Agree" categories most often for this factor. Three of the items received 50 percent or more in both of those categories. The "Agree" category was selected for Items 13, 20, and 26. The "Probably Agree" category was checked for Items 15, 19, and 20. Two items received one "Disagree" check and one, Item 37, had two checks of "Disagree." These were Item 15, "challenging profession," and Item 23, "enjoy teaching" (Table XV).

Factor 5 - "School Facilities and Services." Five statements contributed to this factor. Most of the 109 returning teachers and the 12 non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for these statements. Item 3, which related to "supplies and equipment provided," received "Agree" checks from 78 returning teachers (71.56 percent). Item 48, "adequate audio-visual equipment," received 73 "Agree" checks (66.97 percent). Item 53 also received more than 50 percent selection of "Agree" checks by 58 (53.21 percent) of the returning teachers. Items 32, 48, and 50 had four teachers each who checked the "Disagree" category. The "Disagree" category was checked by no fewer than two (1.83 percent) returning teachers for each item (Table XVI).

The 12 non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category more than 50 percent for four of the five statements. Item 3, "supplies and equipment provided," and Item 48, "adequate audio-visual equipment," received an 83.33 percent selection (10 teachers). Item 50, "availability of library materials" was checked in the "Disagree" category by only one non-returning teacher (Table XVI).

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
 FACTOR 5 - "SCHOOL FACILITIES
 AND SERVICES"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree		Probably Agree		Probably Disagree		Disagree		N	Agree		Probably Agree		Probably Disagree		Disagree		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
3	"supplies and equipment provided"																	
	10	83.33	1	8.33	1	8.33	0	0	12	78	71.56	24	22.02	5	4.59	2	1.83	109
32	"individual student differences provided for in curriculum"																	
	5	41.67	6	5.00	1	8.33	0	0	12	35	32.11	53	48.62	17	15.60	4	3.67	109
48	"adequate audio-visual equipment"																	
	10	83.33	2	16.67	0	0	0	0	12	73	66.97	26	23.85	6	5.50	4	3.67	109
50	"availability of library materials"																	
	6	50.00	5	41.67	0	0	1	8.33	12	50	45.87	44	40.37	11	10.09	4	3.67	109
53	"efficient method for providing materials"																	
	8	66.67	4	33.33	0	0	0	0	12	58	53.21	40	36.70	9	8.26	2	1.83	109

Factor 6 - "Professional Preparation." Six statements related to professional preparation. Only one item received over a 50 percent selection in the "Agree" category for the returning teachers. Item 39 was checked by 56 returning teachers (51.38 percent). Item 39 related to "previous lesson planning experience helpful." Item 40, "adequate preparation for discipline problems," was checked by 43 teachers (39.45 percent) in the "Disagree" category (Table XVII).

Non-returning teachers indicated the "Agree" category from 50 percent to 58.33 percent for four of the items (12, 24, 39, and 44). Item 40, relating to "discipline," was checked by five of the 12 non-returning teachers in the "Disagree" category (41.67 percent) (Table XVII).

Factor 7 - "Rapport with Students." Eight statements comprised this factor. Item 11, "satisfactory teaching assignment" was checked by 74 (67.89 percent) of 109 teachers in the "Agree" category. Item 27, "students meeting expectations," was only checked in the "Agree" category by 32 (29.36 percent) returning teachers (Table XVIII).

Eleven of the 12 non-returning teachers indicated the "Agree" category of Item 11, "satisfactory teaching assignment" (91.67 percent). Six of the eight statements received from 50 percent to 91.67 percent selection in the "Agree" category. The "Disagree" category was checked one time each for Item 27, "met expectations" and Item 29, "satisfaction gained from student teaching experience" (Table XVIII).

Factor 8 - "Rapport with Other Teachers." Most of the returning and non-returning teachers checked the "Probably Agree" category for the six statements of this factor. The "Probably Agree" category was

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 6 - "PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers								Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
12	"competent professional preparation"																	
	7	58.33	4	33.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	39	35.78	41	37.61	18	16.51	11	10.09	109
24	"methods courses were helpful"																	
	6	50.00	4	33.33	0	0	2	16.67	12	32	29.63	40	37.04	21	19.44	15	13.89	108
39	"previous lesson planning helpful"																	
	8	66.67	2	16.67	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	56	51.38	28	25.69	14	12.84	11	10.09	109
40	"preparation for discipline problems"																	
	1	8.33	1	8.33	5	41.67	5	41.67	12	7	6.42	21	19.27	38	34.86	43	39.45	109
43	"well-prepared for experience"																	
	3	25.00	7	58.33	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	34	31.19	50	45.87	19	17.43	6	5.50	109
44	"subject-matter courses adequate"																	
	7	58.33	3	25.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	49	45.37	38	35.19	17	15.74	4	3.70	108

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 7 - "RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
2	"school prepared students for citizenship"																	
	2	16.67	9	75.0	1	8.33	0	0	12	32	29.63	64	59.26	10	9.26	2	1.85	108
11	"satisfactory teaching assignment"																	
	11	91.67	1	8.33	0	0	0	0	12	74	67.89	28	25.69	4	3.67	3	2.75	109
16	"recognized professional ability"																	
	6	50.00	3	41.67	1	8.33	0	0	12	48	44.04	56	51.38	5	4.59	0	0	109
27	"met expectations"																	
	4	33.33	7	58.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	32	29.36	56	51.38	17	15.60	4	3.67	109
29	"satisfaction gained from student teaching experience"																	
	7	58.33	4	33.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	48	44.04	41	37.61	16	14.68	4	3.67	109
45	"appreciative of help given"																	
	6	50.00	6	50.00	0	0	0	0	12	42	38.53	49	44.95	17	15.60	1	.92	109
49	"student contacts satisfying"																	
	7	58.33	5	41.67	0	0	0	0	12	63	57.80	40	36.70	5	4.59	1	.92	109
51	"showed respect"																	
	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	0	0	12	62	56.88	43	39.45	3	2.75	1	.92	109

checked from 41.22 percent to 55.05 percent for each of the items. The "Disagree" category was checked for each item by two or three non-returning teachers. The "Agree" category for Item 25, "congeniality present," was checked by 48 (44.04 percent) of the returning teachers (Table XIX).

The non-returning teachers checked the "Probably Agree" category of Item 31, "high professional ethics," with 66.67 percent. Item 25, "congeniality present," was checked the most often (seven non-returning teachers, 58.33 percent) for the "Agree" category. The "Disagree" category was checked by one of the teachers for each of the items, with the exception of Item 10 (Table XIX).

Factor 9 - "Student Teacher Load." Five statements contributed to Factor 9. Item 4, "teaching load being equal to other teachers," was checked by 77 (70.64 percent) returning teachers in the "Agree" category. Item 14, "reasonable student teaching load," had 72 returning teachers (66.06 percent) who checked the "Agree" with this statement. Item 8, "no restriction on non-professional activities" was checked by 27 (25 percent) returning teachers in the "Disagree" category (Table XX).

Ten of the 12 non-returning teachers (83.33 percent) checked the "Agree" category for Item 14, "reasonable student teaching load." Item 4, "teaching load being equal to other teachers," was checked in the "Agree" category by eight (66.67 percent) of the non-returning teachers. The "Disagree" category was checked by five non-returning teachers (41.67 percent) for Item 8 relating to "no restriction on non-professional activities" (Table XX).

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 8 - "RAPPORT WITH OTHER TEACHERS"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X		n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X	
10	"respected other"																	
	5	41.67	6	50.00	1	8.33	0	0	12	37	34.26	51	41.22	18	16.67	2	1.85	108
21	"cooperation present"																	
	6	50.00	3	25.00	2	16.67	1	8.33	12	37	34.58	49	49.79	19	17.76	2	1.78	107
25	"congeniality present"																	
	7	58.33	4	33.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	48	44.04	50	45.87	9	8.26	2	1.83	109
31	"high professional ethics"																	
	3	25.0	8	66.67	0	0	1	8.33	12	28	25.93	58	53.70	19	17.59	3	2.78	108
33	"worked well together"																	
	4	33.33	7	58.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	32	29.36	55	50.46	19	17.43	3	2.75	109
57	"harmony shown"																	
	4	33.33	7	58.33	0	0	1	8.33	12	34	31.19	60	55.05	13	11.93	2	1.83	109

TABLE XX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PS-TO
FACTOR 9 - "STUDENT TEACHER LOAD"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
4	"equal to other teachers"																			
	8	66.67	3	25.0	1	8.33	0	0	12	77	70.64	20	18.35	6	6.42	5	4.59	109		
8	"no restriction on non-professional activities"																			
	2	16.67	3	25.0	2	16.67	5	41.67	12	27	25.00	32	29.63	22	20.37	27	25.00	108		
14	"reasonable teaching load"																			
	10	83.33	2	16.67	0	0	0	0	12	72	66.06	27	24.77	8	7.34	2	1.83	109		
41	"hours required reasonable"																			
	6	50.00	4	33.33	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	30	27.52	43	39.45	25	22.94	11	10.09	109		
36	"prepared to handle extracurricular activities"																			
	6	50.00	4	33.33	1	8.33	1	8.33	12	34	31.19	53	48.62	14	12.84	8	7.34	109		

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO)

The PTO consists of 10 factors relating to the public school. A total of 100 items was contained in the instrument. The frequency distribution of each item by the factors will be discussed in this section. A brief description for each item of the PTO is located in Appendixes F and H.

Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal." Twenty statements contributed to Factor 1. Items 5 and 72 are negative toward the principal items. Item 72, "teachers' meetings are not profitable," was checked by 29 (29.59 percent) returning teachers in the "Disagree" category. Item 70, "principal supervises rather than 'snoopervises' the teachers," was agreed with by 44 (44.90 percent) returning teachers. This was the only item where over 40 percent of the returning teachers checked the "Agree" with the statements (Table XXI).

Five non-returning teachers (71.43 percent) indicated the "Agree" category for Item 70, relating to "principal acting as a supervisor, not a 'snoopervisor.'" Five non-returning teachers (62.50 percent) also checked the "Disagree" category for Item 5 which related to "favoritism being shown to teachers" (Table XXI).

Factor 2 - "Job Satisfaction." Four of the items, Q030, Q056, Q060, and Q076) are negative job satisfaction statements. Items Q086, "I think I'm as competent as most other teachers," was checked in the "Agree" category by 68 (69.39 percent) returning teachers, and Item Q089, "really enjoy working with my students," was checked in the "Agree" category by 62 (63.27 percent) of these teachers. Three

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 1 - "TEACHER RAPPOR
 WITH PRINCIPAL"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z		n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z			
Q02	"faculty work appreciated and recognized"																			
	3	37.50	3	37.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	29	29.59	36	36.73	23	23.47	10	10.20	98		
Q03	"freedom to criticize administrative policy"																			
	1	12.50	3	37.50	3	37.50	1	12.50	8	12	12.24	24	24.49	37	37.76	25	25.51	98		
Q05	"favoritism to teachers shown"																			
	0	0	0	0	3	37.50	5	62.50	8	18	18.37	24	24.49	28	28.57	28	28.57	98		
Q07	"close contact maintained with faculty"																			
	5	62.50	0	0	1	12.50	2	25.00	8	20	20.41	36	36.73	24	24.49	18	18.37	98		
Q12	"leadership apparent"																			
	2	25.00	2	25.00	1	12.50	3	37.50	8	13	13.27	24	24.49	36	36.73	25	25.51	98		
Q033	"work is pleasant"																			
	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0	1	14.29	7	20	20.41	43	43.88	19	19.39	16	16.33	98		
Q038	"good teaching procedures recognized"																			
	3	42.86	4	57.14	0	0	0	0	7	33	34.02	46	47.42	16	16.49	2	2.06	97		
Q041	"communication structure well organized"																			
	3	42.86	2	28.57	2	28.57	0	0	7	26	26.80	36	37.11	20	20.62	15	15.46	97		

TABLE XXI (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Q043	"interest shown to department"																			
	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	16	16.49	41	42.27	24	24.74	16	16.49	97		
Q044	"belongingness promoted"																			
	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	23	23.96	30	31.25	29	30.21	14	14.58	96		
Q061	"concerned with faculty problems"																			
	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0	1	14.29	7	23	23.47	42	42.86	16	16.33	17	17.35	98		
Q062	"discussion of problems encouraged"																			
	3	42.86	1	14.29	2	28.57	1	14.29	7	35	35.71	21	21.43	20	20.41	22	22.45	98		
Q069	"interest shown in relation to problems"																			
	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0	1	14.29	7	29	29.59	39	39.80	19	19.89	11	11.22	98		
Q070	"acts as a supervisor"																			
	5	71.43	2	28.57	0	0	0	0	7	44	44.90	32	32.65	12	12.24	10	10.20	98		
Q072	"teachers meetings are not profitable"																			
	0	0	2	28.57	3	42.86	2	28.57	7	17	17.35	19	19.39	33	33.67	29	29.59	98		
Q073	"understands problems with teaching assignment"																			
	3	37.50	3	37.50	2	25.00	0	0	8	26	26.53	44	44.90	17	17.35	11	11.22	98		
Q074	"judges work fairly"																			
	3	37.50	5	62.50	0	0	0	0	8	37	37.76	40	40.82	12	12.24	9	9.18	98		

TABLE XXI (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q092	"comfortable atmosphere present when classroom visits made"																	
	4	50.00	1	12.50	0	0	3	37.50	8	39	39.8	34	34.69	15	15.31	10	10.20	98
Q093	"teachers abilities used effectively"																	
	4	50.00	1	12.50	2	25.00	1	12.50	8	28	28.57	44	44.9	17	17.35	9	9.18	98
Q095	"discussion of personal and group problems encouraged"																	
	3	42.86	2	28.57	0	0	2	28.57	7	32	34.04	28	29.79	19	20.21	15	15.96	94

other items received "Agree" checks from over 50 percent of the 98 returning teachers. These were: Item Q046, "student contact highly satisfying and rewarding"; Item Q050, "feel successful and competent in present position"; and Q083, "there is no more challenging work than teaching." Item Q056, "at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers better prepared," was checked by 62 returning teachers (63.27 percent) in the "Disagree" category. None of the other statements were checked by over 46.94 percent (Item Q076) of the returning teachers in the "Disagree" category (Table XXII).

Six (75.0 percent) of the eight responding non-returning teachers checked the "Agree" category for Item Q089. This statement referred to "really enjoy working with my students." Nine other items received 50 percent or more of "Agree" checks from the non-returning teachers. These were: Q046, "contacts with students satisfying and rewarding," 71.43 percent; Q019, "teaching gives a great deal of satisfaction," 62.50 percent; Q047, "feel I'm important part of school system," 57.14 percent; Q050, "feel successful and competent in present position," 57.14 percent; Q051, "enjoying working with student organizations," 57.14 percent; Q058, "other teachers think I'm a good teacher," 57.14 percent; Q083, "no more challenging work than teaching," 50 percent; Q086, "think I am as competent as other teachers," 50 percent; and Q0100, "well satisfied with present teaching position," 50 percent. The "Disagree" category was checked by five (71.43 percent) non-returning teachers for Item Q056, "feel disadvantaged professionally for others teachers are better prepared." Items Q030, "if could earn as much money in other occupation, I'd stop teaching," and Item Q060,

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 2 - "JOB SATISFACTION"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q019	"personal satisfaction received"																	
	5	62.50	2	25.00	0	0	1	12.50	8	48	48.98	32	32.65	13	13.27	5	5.10	98
Q024	"contribution to society"																	
	2	28.57	4	57.14	0	0	1	14.29	7	33	33.67	43	43.88	14	14.29	8	8.16	98
Q026	"enjoy teaching"																	
	3	42.86	3	42.86	0	0	1	14.29	7	48	48.98	35	35.71	9	9.18	6	6.12	98
Q027	"repeat the selection of teaching as a profession"																	
	2	28.57	1	14.29	2	28.57	2	28.57	7	36	36.73	32	32.65	16	16.33	14	14.29	98
Q029	"encourages teaching occupation to high scholastic students"																	
	1	14.29	3	42.86	1	14.29	2	28.57	7	29	29.59	32	32.65	23	23.47	14	14.29	98
Q030	"leave teaching for same pay in another occupation"																	
	1	14.29	3	42.86	0	0	3	42.86	7	14	14.29	22	22.45	34	34.69	28	28.57	98
Q046	"student contact is satisfying"																	
	5	71.43	1	14.29	1	14.29	0	0	7	56	57.14	34	34.69	8	8.16	0	0	98
Q047	"importance in school system felt"																	
	4	57.14	1	14.29	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	38	38.78	44	44.90	16	16.33	0	0	98

TABLE XXII (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q050	"feel successful"																	
	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0	1	14.29	7	53	54.08	41	41.84	2	2.04	2	2.04	98
Q051	"enjoy extracurricular activities"																	
	4	57.14	1	14.29	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	46	46.94	36	36.73	11	11.22	5	5.10	98
Q056	"not adequately prepared for occupation"																	
	1	14.29	0	0	1	14.29	5	71.43	7	1	1.02	6	6.12	29	29.59	62	63.27	98
Q058	"other teachers regard personal ability as good quality"																	
	4	57.14	2	28.57	0	0	1	14.29	7	54	55.10	43	43.88	1	1.02	0	0	98
Q060	"profession undesirable because of pressure"																	
	1	14.29	2	28.57	1	14.29	3	42.86	7	10	10.20	21	21.43	33	33.67	34	34.69	98
Q076	"students actions source of irritations"																	
	1	12.50	2	25.00	4	50.00	1	12.50	8	1	1.02	6	6.12	45	45.92	46	46.94	98
Q078	"respec. and confidence shown by students"																	
	3	37.50	3	37.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	46	46.94	45	45.92	6	6.12	1	1.02	98
Q082	"students appreciative of help"																	
	2	25.0	5	62.50	1	12.50	0	0	8	30	30.61	57	58.16	8	8.16	3	3.06	98
Q083	"teaching is challenging"																	
	4	50.00	1	12.50	0	0	3	37.50	8	51	52.04	22	22.45	16	16.31	9	9.18	98

TABLE XXII (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n		Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	
Q086	"as competent as other teachers"																	
	4	50.00	3	37.50	0	0	1	12.50	8	68	69.39	28	28.57	2	2.04	0	0	98
Q089	"enjoy working with students"																	
	6	75.00	1	12.50	0	0	1	12.50	8	62	63.27	34	34.69	2	2.04	0	0	98
Q100	"satisfied with present position"																	
	3	50.00	1	16.67	0	0	2	33.33	6	35	37.23	36	38.30	15	15.96	8	8.51	94

"stress and strain make teaching undesirable for me," were checked in the "Disagree" category by 42.86 percent of the non-returning teachers (Table XXII).

Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers." Fourteen statements were concerned with "Rapport Among Teachers." Two of the items (Q018 and Q054) are negative statements about teacher rapport. Two items, Q048, "competency of teachers in school compares favorably with teachers in other schools" and Q052 "staff is congenial to work with," received over 50 percent of "Agree" checks by the returning teachers. Item Q018, "petty issues and feuding present among teachers" was checked by 40 (40.82 percent) returning teachers in the "Disagree" category. Item Q054, "tendency to form cliques," received "Disagree" checks from 22 percent of the returning teachers (Table XXIII).

Item Q054, "faculty forms cliques" received "Agree" checks from five of the seven (71.43 percent) non-returning teachers. Item Q018, "great deal of griping, arguing among teachers," received three of eight (37.50 percent) "Disagree" checks from the non-returning teachers (Table XXIII).

Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary." Six statements were identified for this factor. None of the six items received more than 48.98 percent "Agree" or "Probably Agree" selection (48 returning teachers for Item Q036). Item Q036 related to "fairness present in salary allocation," and these 48 returning teachers checked the "Probably Agree" category. Item Q09, "pay raise system satisfactory," was checked in the "Disagree" category by 26 (26.53 percent) returning teachers. Twenty-five

TABLE XXIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
FACTOR 3 - "RAPPORT AMONG TEACHERS"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q018	"petty issues and feuding present"																	
	3	37.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	3	37.50	8	8	8.16	19	19.39	31	31.63	40	40.82	98
Q022	"respect each other"																	
	2	25.00	2	25.00	3	37.50	1	12.50	8	48	48.98	38	38.78	12	12.24	0	0	98
Q023	"cooperation present"																	
	1	12.50	3	37.50	4	50.00	0	0	8	32	32.65	47	47.96	16	16.33	3	3.06	98
Q028	"new faculty readily accepted as professionals"																	
	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	47	47.96	36	36.73	14	14.29	1	1.02	98
Q048	"teacher competency equivalent to others"																	
	3	42.86	3	42.86	1	14.29	0	0	7	57	58.16	30	30.61	10	10.20	1	1.02	98
Q052	"congenial staff"																	
	2	28.57	4	57.14	1	14.29	0	0	7	51	52.04	39	39.80	8	8.16	0	0	98
Q053	"teachers are well-prepared"																	
	3	42.86	3	42.86	1	14.29	0	0	7	43	43.88	49	50.00	6	6.12	0	0	98
Q054	"teachers cliques present"																	
	5	71.43	2	28.57	0	0	0	0	7	24	24.49	34	34.69	18	18.37	22	22.45	98

TABLE XXIII (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Q055	"teachers work in harmony"																	
	1	14.29	4	57.14	2	25.57	0	0	7	44	45.36	41	42.27	12	12.37	0	0	97
Q077	"work enjoyable because of teacher cooperation"																	
	3	37.50	3	37.50	2	25.00	0	0	8	34	34.69	49	50.00	13	13.27	2	2.04	98
Q080	"students values and attitudes positively influenced by teachers"																	
	1	12.50	5	62.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	23	23.47	50	51.02	21	21.43	4	4.08	98
Q084	"other teachers respect work"																	
	3	37.50	4	50.00	1	12.50	0	0	8	27	27.55	60	61.22	9	9.18	2	2.04	98
Q087	"high professional standards present"																	
	2	25.00	3	37.50	2	25.00	1	12.50	8	27	27.84	50	51.55	19	19.59	1	1.03	97
Q090	"initiative and creativity shown in teaching"																	
	1	12.50	6	75.00	1	12.50	0	0	8	24	24.49	53	54.08	18	18.37	3	3.06	98

returning teachers (25.51 percent) checked the "Disagree" category for Item Q065, "salary schedule recognizes teacher competency" (Table XXIV).

None of the six items for this factor received over a 42.86 percent selection by the non-returning teachers. Three teachers, of the seven non-returning teachers (42.86 percent), checked the "Agree" category for Item Q032, "school tries to meet other fringe benefit needs of teachers." Item Q036, "fairness present in salary allocation," and Item Q065, "salary schedule recognizes teacher competency," were each checked in the "Probably Agree" category by three teachers (42.86 percent). The "Disagree" category was checked by three teachers (37.50 percent) for Item Q075, "salaries equivalent to other school districts" (Table XXIV).

Factor 5 - "Teacher Load." Eleven statements comprised Factor 5. Each of the 11 statements was stated negatively. Most of the teachers in both groups expressed the "Probably Disagree" or "Disagree" categories for these statements. Returning teachers (54 of them, 55.67 percent) checked the "Probably Disagree" category for Item Q034, "inadequate time for professional contacts." Another item checked by more than 50 percent was Item Q042, "unreasonable teaching load." Fifty-three returning teachers (54.08 percent) checked the "Disagree" category. Item Q01, "much time spent in reporting," was checked by 26 teachers (26.53 percent) in the "Agree" column and by 36 teachers (36.73 percent) in the "Probably Agree" category (Table XXV).

Six of the seven non-returning teachers (85.71 percent) for Item Q042, "unreasonable teaching load," selected the "Disagree"

TABLE XXIV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 4 - "TEACHER SALARY"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X		n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X	
Q04	"good communication line regarding salary"																	
	2	25.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	8	14	14.29	33	33.67	32	32.65	19	19.39	98
Q09	"pay raise system satisfactory"																	
	2	25.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	8	13	13.27	27	27.55	32	32.65	26	26.53	98
QQ32	"school tries to meet other financial needs of teachers"																	
	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	18	18.56	39	40.21	25	25.77	15	15.46	97
Q036	"fairness present in salary allocation"																	
	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	19	19.39	48	48.98	22	22.45	9	9.18	98
Q039	"salary increase policy understood"																	
	1	14.29	3	42.86	1	14.29	2	28.57	7	19	19.39	48	48.98	17	17.35	14	14.29	98
Q065	"salary schedule recognizes teacher competencies"																	
	1	14.29	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	7	11	11.22	34	34.69	28	28.57	25	25.51	98
Q075	"salaries equivalent to other school districts"																	
	2	25.00	3	37.50	0	0	3	37.50	8	26	26.53	36	36.73	18	18.37	18	18.37	98

TABLE XXV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
FACTOR 5 - "TEACHER LOAD"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers								Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Q01	"much time spent in reporting"																	
	4	50.00	0	0	3	37.50	1	12.50	8	25	26.53	36	36.73	26	26.53	10	10.20	98
Q06	"unreasonable amount of reporting expected"																	
	1	12.50	2	25.00	3	37.50	2	25.00	8	7	7.14	17	17.35	45	45.92	29	29.59	98
Q08	"community time is excessive"																	
	1	12.50	2	25.00	3	37.50	2	25.00	8	5	5.10	9	9.18	44	44.90	40	40.82	98
Q010	"greater teaching load than other teachers"																	
	1	12.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	5	62.50	8	16	16.33	19	19.39	31	31.63	32	32.65	98
Q011	"excessive extra-curricular load"																	
	0	0	3	37.50	1	12.50	4	50.00	8	13	13.27	25	25.51	36	36.73	24	24.49	98
Q014	"excessive hours for position"																	
	3	37.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	3	37.50	8	12	12.24	25	25.51	37	37.76	24	24.49	98
Q031	"scheduling not advantageous"																	
	0	0	2	28.57	0	0	5	71.43	7	13	13.40	14	14.43	32	32.99	38	39.18	97
Q034	"inadequate time for professional contacts"																	
	0	0	2	28.57	1	14.29	4	57.14	7	3	3.09	10	10.31	54	55.67	30	30.93	97

TABLE XXV (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers								Returning Teachers										
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4				
	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X	N	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X	N	
Q040	"problem students assigned to classes"																		
	1	14.29	2	28.57	0	0	4	57.14	7	85	22	22.68	33	34.02	21	21.65	21	21.65	97
Q042	"unreasonable teaching load"																		
	0	0	0	0	1	14.29	6	85.71	7	98	3	3.06	6	6.12	36	36.73	53	54/08	98
Q045	"non-professional activities hampered"																		
	0	0	2	28.57	1	14.29	4	57.14	7	98	4	4.08	18	18.37	41	41.84	35	35.71	98

category. Seven of the 11 statements were checked "Disagree" by more than 50 percent of the teachers. These items were: Q010, "greater teaching load than other teachers," 62.50 percent; Q011, "excessive extracurricular load," 50.00 percent; Q031, "scheduling not advantageous," 71.43 percent; Q034, "inadequate time for professional contacts, 57.14 percent; Q042, described above; and Q045, "non-professional activities hampered" (57.14 percent). Fifty percent of the non-returning teachers indicated Item Q01, "much time spent in reporting," in the "Agree" category. Item Q014, "excessive hours for position" was also checked in the "Agree" category by three (37.50 percent) of the non-returning teachers (Table XXV).

Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues." Five items were involved in making up Factor 6. Items Q025 and Q079 were stated in the negative form. Item Q025 was stated as "major revisions needed" and Item Q079 was "school purposes not achieved."

The five statements relating to curriculum issues were checked as "Probably Agree" by the non-returning teachers and returning teachers. Item Q088, "provides good preparation," was checked by 58 (59.18 percent) returning teachers in the "Probably Agree" category. Items Q017, "well balanced curriculum offered" and Item Q020, "individual student differences recognized in curriculum planning," were each selected in the "Probably Agree" category by 38 (38.78 percent) of the returning teachers. Item Q017, "well balanced curriculum offered," was also selected by 32 (32.65 percent) teachers in the "Agree" column. Item Q079, "school purposes not achieved," was checked in the "Probably Disagree" category by 51 (52.04 percent) of the returning

teachers. Item Q025, "major revisions needed" was checked by 45 (45.92 percent) of the returning teachers in the "Probably Disagree" category (Table XXVI).

Fifty percent of the non-returning teachers indicated the "Probably Agree" category for Items Q020, "individual student differences recognized in curriculum planning," and Item Q088, "provides good preparation," Item Q017, "well balanced curriculum," was also checked by 50 percent of the teachers in the "Agree" category. The "Disagree" category was checked by three non-returning teachers (37.50 percent) for Item Q079, "school purposes cannot be achieved" and also by three (37.50 percent) non-returning teachers in the "Probably Disagree" category (Table XXVI).

Factor 7 - "Teacher Status." Eight items made up Factor 7; one item, Q071, was stated in a negative context. None of the items was selected by more than 48.98 percent of 48 of the returning teachers. The "Probably Agree" category for Item Q035, "teacher feels a part of the community," was checked for 48.98 percent. The returning teachers indicated Item Q071, "not accepted by community," in the "Disagree" category, with 38 teachers (38.78 percent) checking this response. Thirty-eight teachers (38.78 percent) also checked the "Disagree" category for Item Q064, "standard of living is acceptable for the family." Two items, Q064 and Q071, as described above, were checked by 42 (42.86 percent) returning teachers in the "Probably Disagree" category (Table XXVII).

The non-returning teachers checked two items in the "Agree" category by more than 50 percent selections. Item Q063, "desired

TABLE XXVI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 6 - "CURRICULUM ISSUES"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z		n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	
Q017	"well balanced curriculum offered"																	
	4	50.00	3	37.50	1	12.50	0	0	8	32	32.65	38	38.78	16	16.33	12	12.24	98
Q020	"individual student differences recognized in curriculum planning"																	
	1	12.50	4	50.00	2	25.00	1	12.50	8	24	24.49	38	38.78	26	26.53	10	10.20	98
Q025	"major revisions needed"																	
	1	14.29	3	42.86	1	14.29	2	28.57	7	13	13.27	26	26.53	45	45.92	14	14.29	98
Q079	"school purpose cannot be achieved"																	
	1	12.50	1	12.50	3	37.50	3	37.50	8	3	3.06	15	15.31	51	52.04	29	29.59	98
Q088	"provides good preparation"																	
	3	37.50	4	50.00	0	0	1	12.50	8	14	14.29	58	59.18	21	21.43	5	5.10	98

TABLE XXVII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
FACTOR 7 - "TEACHER STATUS"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Q013	"desired social status met"																			
	5	62.50	3	37.50	0	0	0	0	8	31	31.63	40	40.82	21	21.43	6	6.12	98		
Q015	"material and cultural needs met"																			
	3	37.50	4	50.00	1	12.50	0	0	8	33	34.02	30	30.93	27	27.84	7	7.22	97		
Q035	"teachers feel part of the community"																			
	2	28.57	4	57.14	0	0	1	14.29	7	27	27.55	48	48.98	17	17.35	6	6.12	98		
Q037	"occupational security present"																			
	2	28.57	4	57.14	0	0	1	14.29	7	31	31.63	40	40.82	15	15.31	12	12.24	98		
Q063	"desired prestige provided"																			
	5	71.43	2	28.57	0	0	0	0	7	36	37.11	36	37.11	18	18.56	7	7.22	97		
Q064	"standard of living is acceptable for family"																			
	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	3	42.86	7	5	5.10	13	13.27	42	42.86	38	38.78	98		
Q068	"community respect for teachers"																			
	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	27	27.55	45	45.92	19	19.39	7	7.14	98		
Q071	"not accepted by community"																			
	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	3	42.86	7	5	5.10	13	13.27	42	42.86	38	38.78	98		

prestige provided," was checked by five (71.43 percent) non-returning teachers, and Item Q013, "desired social status met," was checked by five (62.50 percent) of the non-returning teachers. Three items: Q015, Q035, and Q037, were selected for the "Probably Agree" category with more than a 50 percent response. These items were: Q015, "material and cultural needs met", four non-returning teachers (50.00 percent); Q035, "teachers feel part of the community," four non-returning teachers (57.14 percent); and Q037, "occupational security present," four non-returning teachers, (57.14 percent). Three non-returning teachers (42.86 percent) checked the "Disagree" category of Item Q064, "standard of living is acceptable for family." Three non-returning teachers (42.86 percent) checked "Disagree" for Item Q071, "difficult to gain acceptance in community (Table XXVII).

Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education." Only one item, Q097, "supports good educational programs," received more than a 50 percent selection by the returning teachers. The "Probably Agree" category was checked by 50 of these returning teachers (53.19 percent) for Item Q097. Three other items: Q066, Q094, and Q096, were checked by 43 (43.88 percent) or more teachers in the "Probably Agree" category. These items were: Q066, "understands good education" (43.88 percent); Q094, "concern with school system" (47.96 percent); and Q096, "supports ethical procedures in teacher appointment and re-appointment" (48.39 percent). Thirteen returning teachers (13.27 percent) checked the "Disagree" category of Item Q066, "understands good education." The "Probably Disagree" category was checked by 22 (22.68 percent) teachers for Item Q067, "provides good place for family

life." The category was also checked by 22 teachers (22.45 percent) for Item Q094, "concern with school system" (Table XXVIII).

Item Q066, "understands good education," was checked by four (57.14 percent) non-returning teachers in the "Agree" category. Four (57.14 percent) non-returning teachers also checked the "Probably Agree" category for Item Q096, "supports ethical procedures in teacher appointment and reappointment." Two teachers (25 percent) checked the "Disagree" category of Item Q094, "concern with school system" (Table XXVIII).

Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services." Five statements were made regarding school facilities and services. Item Q049, "adequate audio-visual equipment," was checked in the "Agree" category by 51 returning teachers (52.04 percent). No other item was selected by over 50 percent of the group of returning teachers. Item Q057, "adequate clerical services," was checked by 32 returning teachers (32.65 percent) in the "Disagree" category (Table XXIX).

Five non-returning teachers (71.43 percent) checked Item Q049, "adequate audio-visual equipment," in the "Agree" category. Five non-returning teachers (62.50 percent) also checked the "Agree" category for Item Q016, "adequate supplies and equipment." Item Q021, "well defined procedure of obtaining materials," was checked by five non-returning teachers (62.50 percent) in the "Probably Disagree" category. Two teachers (28.57 percent) checked the "Probably Disagree" and "Disagree" categories for Item Q059, "adequate library facilities" (Table XXIX).

TABLE XXVIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 8 - "COMMUNITY SUPPORT
 OF EDUCATION"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X		n	X	n	X	n	X	n	X			
Q066	"understands good education"																			
	4	57.14	1	14.29	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	22	22.45	43	43.88	20	20.41	13	13.27	98		
Q067	"provides good place for family life"																			
	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	39	40.21	25	25.77	22	22.68	11	11.34	97		
Q094	"concern with school system"																			
	3	37.50	3	37.50	0	0	2	25.00	8	22	22.85	47	47.96	22	22.45	7	7.14	98		
Q096	"supports ethical procedures in teacher appointment and reappointment"																			
	1	14.29	4	57.14	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	23	24.73	45	48.39	15	16.13	10	10.75	93		
Q097	"supports good educational program"																			
	3	42.86	2	28.57	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	31	32.98	50	53.19	9	9.57	4	4.26	94		

TABLE XXIX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 9 - "SCHOOL FACILITIES
 AND SERVICES"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Q016	"adequate supplies and equipment"																			
	5	62.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	41	41.84	35	35.71	10	10.20	12	12.24	98		
Q021	"well defined procedures for obtaining materials"																			
	0	0	2	25.00	5	62.50	1	12.50	8	20	20.41	41	41.84	22	22.45	15	15.31	98		
Q049	"adequate audio-visual equipment"																			
	5	71.43	1	14.29	1	14.29	0	0	7	51	52.04	25	25.51	15	15.31	7	7.14	98		
Q057	"adequate clerical services"																			
	2	28.57	3	42.86	1	14.29	1	14.29	7	17	17.35	22	22.45	27	27.55	32	32.65	98		
Q059	"adequate library facilities"																			
	3	42.86	0	0	2	28.57	2	28.57	7	26	26.53	26	26.53	24	24.49	22	22.45	98		

Factor 10 - "Community Pressures." Five statements were relating to community pressures. Four of the statements were negatively stated. None of the items of "Agree" or "Probably Agree" received more than the 43.88 percent of checks by the returning teachers. Item Q091, "freedom to discuss controversial issues in class," was checked in the "Probably Agree" category by 43 returning teachers (43.88 percent). The only item checked by the returning teachers, by more than 50 percent of the group, was Item Q098 relating to "excessive participation being expected." Fifty-eight returning teachers (61.70 percent) checked the "Probably Disagree" category for this item (Table XXX).

Non-returning teachers checked the "Disagree" category of Item Q081, "unreasonable personal standards expected" with seven participants (87.50 percent) indicating this response. Item Q085, "nonprofessional activities unduly restricted," was selected by five non-returning teachers (62.50 percent) in the "Disagree" category. Another Item, Q098, was checked in the "Probably Disagree" category with 57.14 percent, with four non-returning teachers indicating this position. This item related to "community expecting teachers to participate in too many social activities." In the "Probably Agree" category, Items Q085 and Q091 each had two non-returning teachers or 25 percent checking this response. Item Q085 related to "nonprofessional activities unduly restricted." Item Q091, related to "freedom to discuss controversial issues" (Table XXX).

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement (PTOS)

The PTOS consisted of two factors. Each factor contained 10 items. This section will discuss the frequency distribution of

TABLE XXX

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTO
 FACTOR 10 - "COMMUNITY PRESSURES"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers										Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Q081	"unreasonable personal standards expected"																			
	0	0	0	0	1	12.50	7	87.50	8	8	8.86	14	14.29	42	42.86	34	34.69	98		
Q085	"nonprofessional activities unduly restricted"																			
	0	0	2	25.00	1	12.50	5	62.50	8	12	12.37	8	8.25	40	41.24	37	38.14	97		
Q091	"freedom to discuss controversial issues in classes"																			
	1	12.50	2	25.00	2	25.00	3	37.50	8	23	23.47	43	43.88	24	24.49	8	8.16	98		
Q098	"excessive participation expected"																			
	1	14.29	1	14.29	4	57.14	1	14.29	7	8	8.51	10	10.64	58	61.70	18	19.15	94		
Q099	"pressures interfere with teaching"																			
	1	14.29	0	0	3	42.86	3	42.86	7	3	3.19	8	8.51	38	40.43	45	47.87	94		

these factors. A brief description for each item of the PTOS is located in Appendix H.

Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with School Board." Ten statements pertained to relationships with the school board. Two items received over 50 percent selection by the returning teachers. Item S07, "meets educational needs of the community," was checked by 52 returning teachers (55.32 percent) in the "Probably Agree" category. Item S06, "ethical procedures followed," was also checked in the "Probably Agree" category by 48 (51.06 percent) returning teachers. The item checked most by teachers in the "Agree" category was S08, "good relationship with superintendent," with 42 teachers (44.68 percent) indicating this category. In the "Probably Disagree" category for Item S09, "teachers are not restrained in presenting problems," 34 teachers (35.79 percent) indicated this response. Item S010, the "Disagree" category, was checked by 25 (26.32 percent) returning teachers (Table XXXI).

The "Agree" category was checked for four items by 50 percent or more of the non-returning teachers. These four items were: S02, "understands quality education" (50.0 percent); S04, "allows superintendent and staff right to their responsibilities" (50.0 percent); S06, "ethical procedures followed" (75 percent); and S07, "meets educational needs of community" (62.50 percent). Three of the non-returning teachers indicated the "Probably Disagree" category for Item S09, "teachers are not restrained in presenting problems" (37.50 percent). All 10 of the items were checked in the "Disagree" category by either one (12.50 percent) or by two (25.0 percent) of the non-returning teachers (Table XXXI).

TABLE XXXI

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTOS
"TEACHER RAPPORT WITH SCHOOL BOARD"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers									
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
S01	"educational decisions rather than political"																		
	3	37.50	3	37.50	0	0	2	25.00	8	18	18.95	35	36.84	26	27.37	16	16.84	95	
S02	"understands quality education"																		
	4	50.00	2	25.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	28	29.47	42	44.21	18	18.95	7	7.37	95	
S03	"concerned with teacher problems"																		
	1	12.50	4	50.00	2	25.00	1	12.50	8	15	15.79	41	43.16	29	30.53	10	10.53	95	
S04	"allows superintendent and staff right to their responsibilities"																		
	4	50.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	2	25.00	8	39	41.05	38	40.00	11	11.58	7	7.37	95	
S05	"effort made to provide adequate financing"																		
	3	37.50	3	37.50	0	0	2	25.00	8	36	37.89	42	44.21	12	12.63	5	5.26	95	
S06	"ethical procedures followed"																		
	4	75.00	0	0	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	22	23.40	48	51.06	17	18.09	7	7.45	94	
S07	"meets educational needs of the community"																		
	5	62.50	2	25.00	0	0	1	12.50	8	30	31.91	52	55.32	8	8.51	4	4.26	94	
S08	"good relationship with community"																		
	3	37.50	1	12.50	2	25.00	2	25.00	8	42	44.68	39	41.49	10	10.64	3	3.19	94	

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers										
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
S09	"teachers are not restrained in presenting problems"																			
	3	37.50	1	12.50	3	37.50	1	12.50	8	15	15.79	24	25.26	34	35.79	22	23.16	95		
S010	"teachers participation sought in policy making"																			
	2	25.00	3	37.50	1	12.50	2	25.00	8	15	15.79	24	25.26	31	32.63	25	26.32	95		

Factor 2 - "Teacher Rapport with Superintendent." Ten statements constituted this factor. Only one item, S012, was selected by more than 50 percent of the returning teachers. Forty-nine (52.13 percent) returning teachers indicated the "Probably Agree" category to "ethical procedures followed." The item with the most "Disagree" checks (15 teachers, 15.96 percent) was Item S017 relating to "imagination and creativity present." Three items in the "Probably Disagree" category had more than 20 percent selection. Item S013, "democratic policy followed" was checked by 26 teachers (27.37 percent). Item S017, "imagination and creativity present" was selected by 23 (24.47 percent) teachers. Item S011, "concerned with teacher problems," was checked by 23 teachers (23.16 percent) (Table XXXII).

Seven of the 10 statements were checked "Agree" by 50 percent or more of the non-returning teachers. These items were: S012, "ethical procedures followed," six non-returning teachers (75.0 percent); S013, "democratic policy followed," five non-returning teachers (62.50 percent); S014, "understands quality education," six non-returning teachers (75.0 percent); S016, "works well with administrative staff," four non-returning teachers (50.0 percent); S018, "leadership apparent," six non-returning teachers (75.0 percent); S019, "teachers informed about new policies," four non-returning teachers (50.0 percent); and S020, "community well informed," four non-returning teachers (50.0 percent). Responses of the non-returning teachers in the "Disagree" category were not more than two teachers (25 percent) for any one item (Table XXXII).

TABLE XXXII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS FOR PTOS
 "TEACHER RAPPORT WITH SUPERINTENDENT"

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		N
n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	N		n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	n	Z	
S011	"concerned with teacher problems"																	
	3	37.50	4	50.00	1	12.50	0	0	8	21	22.11	44	46.32	22	23.16	8	8.42	95
S012	"ethical procedures followed"																	
	6	75.00	2	25.00	0	0	0	0	8	25	26.60	49	52.13	16	17.02	4	4.26	94
S013	"democratic policy followed"																	
	5	62.50	3	37.50	0	0	0	0	8	30	31.58	34	35.79	26	27.37	5	5.26	95
S014	"understands quality education"																	
	6	75.00	2	25.00	0	0	0	0	8	44	46.32	38	40.00	11	11.58	2	2.11	95
S015	"innovative teaching encouraged"																	
	3	37.50	4	50.00	0	0	1	12.50	8	31	32.63	42	44.21	15	15.79	7	7.37	95
S016	"works well with administrative staff"																	
	4	50.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	0	0	8	29	30.85	39	41.49	15	15.96	11	11.70	94
S017	"imagination and creativity present"																	
	3	37.50	4	50.00	0	0	1	12.50	8	17	18.09	39	41.49	23	24.47	15	15.96	94
S018	"leadership apparent"																	
	6	75.00	0	0	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	37	38.95	38	40.00	14	14.74	6	6.32	95

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Item	Non-Returning Teachers									Returning Teachers								
	Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4			Agree 1		Probably Agree 2		Probably Disagree 3		Disagree 4		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
S019	"teachers informed about new policies"																	
	4	50.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	0	0	8	28	30.11	36	38.21	16	17.20	13	13.98	93
S020	"community well informed"																	
	4	50.00	2	25.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	8	32	34.04	34	36.17	18	19.15	10	10.64	94

Statistical Analysis

The first year home economics teachers were asked to reveal their level of agreement with each of the items of the PS-T0, PTO, and PTOS. The levels of agreement and the scoring were arranged as follows: a score of "1" was "Agree"; a "2" was "Probably Agree"; a "3" was "Probably Disagree"; and a "4" was "Disagree."

The null hypothesis formulated for the variable of job satisfaction was stated as follows:

H_1 : There will be no significant difference in job satisfaction of home economics teachers completing the first year of teaching and their decision to remain or not to remain in the teaching field.

Factor 2, "Job Satisfaction," of the PTO was utilized as the basis for acceptance or non-acceptance for the above stated hypothesis. The null hypothesis was accepted. Factor 2 consisted of 20 statements. Only one of the items had a significant difference of the means (Appendix H). Data for the student's t and tabulated t' tests for each item are located in Appendix F.

The F value, .1322, for Item Q076, "students' actions are a source of irritation," determined that the two groups had equal variances. The eight non-returning teachers' mean was 2.6250. The 98 returning teachers' mean response to this item was 3.3877. The student's t value was 3.0811 and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0026. Thus, Item Q076, that there was no difference between the groups in response to this item, was not accepted; the means were significantly different between the groups. This result indicated that the non-returning teachers thought that students' actions were a source of irritation and the returning

teachers did not have this opinion in regard to students' actions (Table XXXIII).

The null hypothesis formulated for the variable of student teaching experience was stated as follows:

H₂: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or leave the teaching field in relation to student teaching experience.

The nine factors of the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionnaire, consisting of 60 items, were analyzed to test the above hypothesis. The null hypothesis was accepted. Four of the 60 items were determined to have significant means differences between the two groups. Factors reporting significant items were: Factor 4 - "Teaching as a Profession," Item 13 and Item 20; Factor 5 - "School Facilities and Services," Item 48; and Factor 7 - "Rapport with Students," Item 11.

The F value .0190, for PS-T0, Item 13, "teaching provides social status" determined that the two groups did not have equal variance. The mean of the 12 non-returning teachers for this item was 1.333. The returning teachers, 109 of them, obtained a 2.1192 mean. In accordance with unequal variance, the tabulated t' test was calculated. The resulting t' value was -4.6433, with an observed significant difference level of .0001. That there was no difference between group means in response to this item was not accepted for the means were significantly different between the groups. Results indicated that the non-returning teachers were satisfied with their social status in the community. The returning teachers were also satisfied with their social status, but not to the same extent as the non-returning teachers (Table XXXIV).

TABLE XXXIII

SUMMARY OF t TESTS RESULTS OF THE TWO GROUPS
ON JOB SATISFACTION

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t" Value	Prob>(T)
Item Q076, "students action source of irritation"					
Non-returning	8	2.6250	.9161		
Returning	98	3.3877	.6522	-3.0811 ^a	.0026*

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

^aStudent's t test used

TABLE XXXIV

SUMMARY OF t TESTS RESULTS OF THE TWO GROUPS
ON STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t" Value	Prob>(T)
Item 13, "Provides social status"					
Non-returning	12	1.3333	.4936 ^c	-4.6433 ^b	.0001*
Returning	109	2.1192	.9595 ^c		
Item 20, "provides prestige"					
Non-returning	12	1.5000	.5222	2.2116 ^a	.0289*
Returning	109	2.0825	.8936		
Item 48, "adequate audio-visual equipment"					
Non-returning	12	1.6666	.3892 ^c	-2.1778 ^b	.0405*
Returning	109	1.4587	.7641 ^c		
Item 11, "satisfactory teaching assignment"					
Non-returning	12	1.0833	.2886 ^c	-3.0865 ^b	.0045*
Returning	109	1.4128	.6966 ^c		

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

^aStudent's t test used^bCochran and Cox tabulated t' test used^cUnequal variances

The F value, .0526, for PS-T0 Item 20, "teaching provides prestige," determined that the two groups had equal variances. Non-returning teachers (12) had a mean score of 1.50.

Returning teachers (109 of them) had a mean score of 2.0825. The student's t value was 2.2116 and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0033. That there was no significant difference between group means in response to this item was not accepted. The means were significantly different between the groups. The results indicated that the non-returning teachers were of the opinion that teaching provided prestige. The returning teachers also were of the opinion that teaching provided prestige but not to the same extent as the non-returning teachers (Table XXXIV).

The F value, .0179, for PS-T0 Item 48, "adequate audio-visual equipment" determined that the two groups did not have equal variances. Non-returning teachers (12) had a mean score of 1.6666. The mean of the returning teachers (109) was 1.4587. The tabulated t' test for unequal variances was calculated, resulting in a t' value of -2.1778. The observed significant difference level was .0405, indicating that the means were significantly different. Thus, results indicated that non-returning teachers did not agree at the same magnitude as returning teachers to the statement that "the school provided adequate audio-visual equipment" (Table XXXIV).

The F value, .0032, for PS-T0 Item 11, "satisfactory teaching assignment," determined that the two groups did not have equal variances. The mean of the 12 non-returning teachers for this item was 1.083. The returning teachers group (109) had a mean value of 1.4128. The tabulated t' test value for unequal variances was -3.0865, with

an observed significant difference level of .0045, thus the means were significantly different between the groups. Results signified that the non-returning teachers agreed to the statement that their student teaching assignment was satisfactory. Returning teachers were also of the same opinion but to a lesser degree than the non-returning teachers (Table XXXIV).

The null hypothesis formulated for the variable of "public school experience" was stated as follows:

H₃: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or not to remain in the teaching field in relation to selected public school experience variables.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Factors 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement were selected for the objective of evaluating the null hypothesis. The t test procedure was used to compare mean difference between the group of teachers who remained and those who left the teaching field. Data for the student's t, tabulated t', and F value for each item are located in Appendix H.

Results of the t tests revealed eight of the 100 items for this variable were determined to have significantly different means for the two groups. Factors with significant items on the PTO were: Factor 1, "Teacher Rapport with Principal," Item Q005; Factor 3, "Rapport Among Teachers," Items Q022 and Q054; Factor 7, "Teacher Status," Item Q013; Factor 10, "Community Pressures," Items Q081 and Q091. The PTOS indicated that Factor 12, "Superintendent," Items S012 and S013, were significant. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

The F value of .0474, for the negatively stated PTO Item Q005, "favoritism to teachers shown by principal," determined that the two groups did not have equal variances. The mean of the eight non-returning teachers was 3.6250. The 98 returning teachers' mean response to this item was 2.6734. In accordance with unequal variance, the tabulated t' test was calculated. The resulting t' value was 4.4644, with an observed significant difference level of .0007, which indicated that the means were significantly different between the groups. Results signify that non-returning teachers did not feel that favoritism was being shown by the principal; however, the returning teachers did indicate that favoritism was shown by the principal (Table XXXV).

The F value, .0605, for PTO Item Q022, "teachers do not take advantage of each other," determined that the two groups had equal variances. The mean of the eight non-returning teachers was 2.3750. The 98 returning teachers' mean response to this item was 1.6326. The student's t value was 2.7850, and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0064. Thus, that there was no difference between the groups in response to this item, was not accepted. The means were significantly different between the groups. These results indicated that the non-returning teachers and returning teachers were of similar opinion in regard to teachers not taking advantage of one another. However, the returning teachers indicated a higher level of agreement to the statement than did the non-returning teachers (Table XXXV).

The F value, .0482, for the negatively stated PTO Item Q054, "teacher cliques present," indicated equal variances. The mean for

TABLE XXXV

SUMMARY OF t TESTS RESULTS OF THE TWO GROUPS ON
SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOL VARIABLES

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t" Value	Prob>(T)
Item Q005, "favoritism to teachers shown"					
Non-returning	8	3.6250	.5175 ^c	4.4644 ^b	.0007 ^d
Returning	98	2.6734	1.0819 ^c		
Item Q022, "no advantage taken of other teachers"					
Non-returning	8	2.3750	1.0606	2.7850 ^a	.0064 ^d
Returning	98	1.6326	.6944		
Item Q054, "teacher cliques present"					
Non-returning	7	1.2857	.4879	-5.1305 ^a	.0003 ^d
Returning	98	2.3877	1.0900		
Item Q013, "desired social status met"					
Non-returning	8	1.3750	.5175	-2.0289 ^a	.0450 ^d
Returning	98	2.0204	.8849		

TABLE XXXV (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	"t" Value	Prob>(T)
Item Q081, "unreasonable personal standards expected"					
Non-returning	8	3.8750	.3535 ^c	5.3820 ^b	.0001*
Returning	98	3.0408	.9072 ^c		
Item Q091, "freedom to discuss controversial issues in class"					
Non-returning	8	2.8750	1.1259	2.1113 ^a	.0371*
Returning	98	2.1734	.8854		
Item S12, "ethical procedures followed"					
Non-returning	8	1.2500	.4629	-2.6250 ^a	.0100*
Returning	94	1.9893	.7328		
Item S13, "democratic policy followed"					
Non-returning	8	1.3750	.5175	-2.1340 ^a	.0353*
Returning	95	2.0631	.8969		

*Indicates significance at the .05 level

^aStudent's t test used

^bCochran and Cox tabulated t' test used

^cUnequal variances

the seven non-returning teachers for this item was 1.2857. The 98 returning teachers had a mean of 2.3877. The student's t test value was -5.1305, and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0003. That there was no difference between group means in response to this item was not accepted, as the means were significantly different between the groups. These results signify that the non-returning teachers thought that teacher cliques were present and the returning teachers thought cliques were present but not to the extent as the non-returning teachers (Table XXXV).

The F value, .1357, for PTO Item Q013, "desired social status met," indicated that the two groups had equal variances. The means of the eight non-returning teachers was 1.3750. Returning teachers, 98 of them, had a mean score of 2.0204. The student's t value was -2.0289, and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0450. That there was no significant difference between group means in response to this item was not accepted, as the means were significantly different between the groups. Results indicated that the non-returning teachers were satisfied with their social status as were the returning teachers, but not to the extent of the non-returning teachers (Table XXXV).

The F value, .0154, for PTO Item Q081, "unreasonable personal standards expected by the community," determined that equal variances for the groups were not equal. This is a negative item. The mean of the non-returning teachers was 3.8750. The mean of the returning teachers was 3.0408. The tabulated t' test for unequal variances was calculated, resulting in a t' value of 5.3820. The observed

significant difference level was .0001, indicating that the means were significantly different. These results signify that non-returning teachers probably disagreed with the personal standards of the community being unreasonable. The returning teachers also indicated they probably disagreed about unreasonable personal standards set by the community (Table XXXV).

The F value, .2776, for PTO Item Q091, "freedom to discuss controversial issues in class," had different variances. Non-returning teachers, eight of them, had a mean score of 2.8750 to this statement. The returning teachers (98 of them) had a mean score of 2.1734. The student's t value was 2.113, and was significant at the level of .0371. That there was no difference between groups' means in response to this item was not accepted, for the means were significantly different between the groups. Results indicated that non-returning teachers could discuss controversial issues in class. The returning teachers also indicated that they could discuss controversial issues, but to a greater degree than could the non-returning teachers (Table XXXV).

The F value, .1436 for PTOS, Item S012, "ethical procedures followed by superintendent," resulted in equal variances being accepted. The non-returning teachers, eight of them, had a mean score of 1.2500. Returning teachers (94) indicated a mean score of 1.9893. The student's t value was -2.6250 and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0100. That there was no difference between groups' means in response to this item was not accepted, for the means were significantly different between the groups. The returning teachers agreed that the superintendent did follow ethical procedures but that the non-returning teachers' opinions regarding the superintendent's

actions were stronger in agreement than were the returning teachers (Table XXXV).

The F value, .1269, for the PTOS, Item S013, "democratic policy followed," was determined to have equal variances. Non-returning teachers, eight of them, had a mean score of 1.3750. Returning teachers (95) had a mean score of 2.0631. The student's t value was -2.1340, and the resulting observed significant difference level was .0353. That there was no difference between groups' means in response to this item was not accepted, for the means were significantly different between the groups. These results signify that the teachers probably agreed that the superintendent followed a democratic policy. However, the non-returning teachers expressed this opinion to a greater positive extent (Table XXXV).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Each area of the research study is summarized in this section. Areas summarized are the statement of the problem, objectives, hypotheses, survey sample, instrument design, data collection, and statistical treatment.

Statement of the Problem

The problem identified in this study was to examine the student teaching experience as it related to home economics teachers. Factors within the student teaching experience program may support satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the teaching profession. Factors in the public school system may also contribute to this attitude toward the teaching field. Therefore, this study of first year home economics teachers' opinions regarding the student teaching experience and selected areas within the public school system would serve as a basis for educators to understand factors that may influence beginning teachers to remain or withdraw from teaching.

Objectives

Four objectives were identified for this study. These objectives

were to:

1. Compare the difference in job satisfaction of first year home economics teachers who remain in teaching their second year with those first year teachers who leave the teaching profession.
2. Determine if specific variables in the student teaching experience influence the decision of first year teachers to remain or to leave the teaching field.
3. Determine if specific variables in the public school system influence first year home economics teachers to remain or to leave the teaching field.
4. Make recommendations for further research studies in the area of teacher persistence by home economics teachers.

Hypotheses

Three null hypotheses were tested in this study. They are stated as follows:

- H₁: There will be no significant difference in job satisfaction of home economics teachers completing the first year of teaching and their decision to remain or not to remain in the teaching field.
- H₂: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or to leave the teaching field in relation to student teaching experience variables.
- H₃: There will be no significant difference of first year home economics teachers' decisions to remain or to leave the teaching field in relation to selected public school variables.

Survey Sample

The sample for this study consisted of home economics teachers who had completed their first year of teaching home economics during the 1977-78 school year in those states comprising Region VI of the

American Vocational Association. Those states included Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. Areas I, VI, and VII of the Texas Education Agency participated for the state of Texas. A listing of eligible teachers was obtained by various sources for each state because of the organization and structure of Home Economics Education within the five states. State Directors of Homemaking Education, teacher education institutions, and a list of homemaking teachers prepared utilizing results of a survey conducted by the researcher, were methods used for determining the sample for the study. The various methods used in obtaining the sample did not always enable the researcher to obtain the necessary addresses of non-returning teachers. Thus, the size of the participating non-returning teachers group (12) was considerably smaller than the returning teacher group (109).

Instrument Design

Four instruments were used in this study. Instruments used with established validity and reliability were the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (PS-TO), 60 items; the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO), 100 items; and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement (PTOS), 20 items. The opinionnaires were purchased and used in their entirety. Information as to purchase of the instruments can be found in Appendix E.

The fourth instrument entitled the Background Information Sheet (BIS) was developed by the researcher. The instrument was developed to study the background of the sample. Eighteen items were selected for use in this instrument. One open-ended response question was used to elicit the respondents' reasons for deciding to remain or leave the

teaching field. During the information sheet development, the researcher sought input from a graduate class of home economics students in regard to the establishment of validity and reliability of the instrument.

Data Collection

The PS-T0 and BIS (Packet I) were mailed to 191 vocational home economics teachers who were believed to meet the sample criteria of the study. However, only 165 of the 191 teachers were eligible to participate because of the limitation that the 1977-78 school year must be the graduation date for the sample. Incorrect addresses and unavilable addresses also limited the sample. Follow-up letters were used to obtain a return rate of 73.33 percent for the first mailing, Packet I, which consisted of the PS-T0 and the BIS. The number of respondents to Packet I was 121. Those respondents to Packet I were sent the PTO and PTOS (Packet II). The number of returns for the PTO and PTOS was 98 teachers.

Statistical Treatment

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used for analysis of data. The student's t test and the tabulated t' test were used to determine mean difference between the group of returning teachers and the non-returning teachers, as outlined by the hypotheses.

Conclusions

Data analysis indicated that each of the three null hypotheses was accepted, even though some items within each hypothesis indicated

a significant difference in means for the two groups of teachers. The following conclusions were based on the data obtained from the first year homemaking teachers through the use of the Purdue Opinionaires and a personal data questionnaire.

The data for this study was collected during January and February of 1979. The time of year the opinionaires were mailed could have influenced the level of agreement selected by both groups. The non-returning teachers, by this time, had been out of the classroom situation for six to eight months. Thus, their responses may have been of a different level of agreement than if these non-returning teachers had been asked to reveal their opinions in May or June of the year that they decided to leave the teaching field. The returning teachers were still involved in the teaching situation and could be viewing the school year in a more realistic manner. Also, the returning teachers had more than 12 months teaching experience in relation to the nine months of the non-returning teachers.

Since each of the null hypotheses were accepted, the variables of the student teaching experience and the teaching experience were determined not to be influential in the decision of home economics teachers to remain or not to remain in the teaching field for this sampling of teachers and non-returning teachers. Therefore, because teachers are leaving the teaching field, there may be other variables that are being more influential in their decision. Both groups of teachers, non-returning and returning, expressed similar levels of agreement to the items of the PS-TO, PTO, and PTOS. The fact that these teachers revealed similar agreement further indicated that

other variables may be involved. As was stated before, sample size must be considered.

An open-ended response question elicited reasons for leaving the teaching field from the non-returning teachers. Non-returning teachers indicated "discipline concerns" as a reason for leaving. The present research study contained few statements relating to discipline. This study indicated no significant items in regard to discipline by the two groups of participants; yet, three of the 11 non-returning teachers responding to this question indicated this was a reason. Also, public opinion polls indicated that this was a cause for concern by the public schools.

"Career changes" was another area cited by the non-returning teachers as being a reason for leaving the teaching field. There were very few statements on the opinionnaires related to career changes.

"Time" required for teaching position was another subject area cited by the non-returning teachers as a reason for leaving. Again, this area was not included as a factor in the instruments.

"Family reasons," "frustration-pressure," and "financial" reasons were also cited as being perceived causes of first year teacher drop-outs. These three areas were also not covered in depth as a part of the opinionnaires. A specific family area cited by the non-returning teacher group was to begin raising a family. The non-returning teachers indicated that the parents and students had more rights than the teachers. Because this is an era when teachers are constantly being challenged, teachers may feel threatened by the students and be afraid to exercise an authoritative role.

Financial reasons were also cited as a reason for leaving. A factor entitled, "Teacher Salary" was included as a factor on the PTO. However, none of the five items of this factor were tested to be significant.

Recommendations

The present study indicated some areas of concern of beginning home economics teachers and identified items that may be related to teachers leaving or remaining in the teaching profession. The following suggested studies would provide teacher educator institutions with data with which to structure the education programs so fewer beginning teachers would select to leave the teaching field.

Related Studies

The time of year for collecting data for a similar study needs to be close to the time of decision making in regard to remaining or leaving the teaching field. Thus, opinions of those not returning could be more realistic in regard to the teaching situation.

The t test for determining difference of means between groups was used in this study. Dependent upon the focus of the research, a different statistical analysis could be used to provide variable analysis.

A study similar to the research conducted in this study could be formulated using different variables pertaining to the public school, the teachers' demographic variables, or student teaching experience variables. Specific areas, such as identified in the open-ended response questions, could be studied in depth to determine

which variables influence the first year teacher to leave the teaching field or to remain in the teaching field.

Teachers not returning to the teaching field and those returning indicated that students' actions were a probable source of irritation to them. Teachers are always involved in interaction with students and a study of undergraduate education programs to determine the amount of student contact by the student teacher before the student-teaching experience would enable educators to examine the teacher education programs for this aspect. Educators could then make recommendations as to length of program, course content, and class activities, so that future teachers would have contact with the students before the student teaching experience occurs.

The present study involved several factors that could influence job satisfaction. Discipline was indicated by the literature to be a problem source of teachers. A study that would incorporate the variable of discipline in relation to job satisfaction of teachers would provide further insight into teacher persistence in teaching.

Another area of concern as indicated by this study involves the discussion of controversial issues in the public school classroom. A study which would investigate the degree of academic freedom allowed the public school teachers in relation to job satisfaction would also enable educators to discover why teachers elect to leave the teaching field. The subject matter areas covered in home economics classes in high school may lend themselves to making academic freedom more of an issue than other subject matter areas in the high school.

Studies using several teacher groups could also provide insight into teacher turnover. A study using the same instruments (PTO, PS-TO,

PTOS) comparing states within the region could be undertaken to determine if demographic location makes a difference in job satisfaction and the teachers' decision to remain in teaching. Also, school size could be studied in relation to job satisfaction and persistence in teaching.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. and Bancroft, T. Statistical Theory in Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.
- Assaults on Teachers. Today's Education, 1972, 61(2), 30-32.
- Barr, A., Goodnight, J., Sall, J., and Helwig, J. A User's Guide to SAS 76. Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, 1976.
- Belasco, J., and Alutto, J. Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1972, 8, 44-58.
- Bentley, R., and Price, J. Manual for the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1972.
- Bentley, R., and Price, J. The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1976.
- Bentley, R., and Rempel, A. Changing teacher morale: an experiment in feedback of identified problems of teachers and principals. Division of Education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1967, 1-54.
- Bentley, R., and Rempel, A. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1970.
- Bentley, R., and Rempel, A. Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Supplement. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1972.
- Bentley, R., and Rempel, A. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1973.
- Best, J. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- Bienenstok, T., and Sayres, W. Problems in job satisfaction among junior high school teachers. Albany, N.Y.: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Research, 1963, 1-67 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 013245)
- Burkinshaw, M. The Successful Teacher. London: Hogarth, 1935.

- Bledsoe, J. Comparison between selected characteristics and performance of provisionally and certified beginning teachers in Georgia. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, 1967, 1-227. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. 015553)
- Bloch, A. The battered teacher. Today's Education, 1977, March-April, 58-63.
- Browning, R. How to tackle the problem of teacher turnover. School Management, 1963, 7(6), 80-81.
- Bruce, W. Teachers vs. school boards. American School Board Journal, 1964, 149(5), 29.
- Bush, R. The status of the career teacher: its effect upon the teacher dropout problem. Stanford University, 1969, 1-10. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 029 858)
- Bush, R. We know how to train teachers: why no do so! The Education Digest, 1978, 43(March), 24-27.
- Canaan, E. A History of the Theories of Production and Distribution in English Political Economy from 1776 to 1848. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1967.
- Clarke, J. The image of the teacher. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 38, 280-285.
- Cohen, L. Students perceptions of the school practice period. Research in Education, 1969, 2, 52-58.
- Coverdale, G. Some determinants of teacher morale in Australia. Educational Research, 1973, 16(1), 34-39.
- Cramer, J. (Ed.). The hard rules of enforcing discipline in your schools. American School Board Journal, 1978, 165(3), 29-32.
- Cruickshank, D., Kennedy, J., and Myers, B. Perceived problems of secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 68, 154-159.
- Daniels, S. Meeting problems of the first year teacher. Physical Educator, 1975, 32(2), 134-135.
- Davenport, H. Value and Distribution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908.
- Edgerton, S. Teachers in role conflict: the hidden dilemma. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59, 120-122.
- Edwards, R. Morale, mental health, and teaching conditions. Peabody Journal of Education, 1963, 41, 17-22.

- Erickson, E. Teacher mobility, teacher dropout and the expectations of family and friends. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1968, 1-71. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 021 785)
- Fetter, F. Economic Principles, Volume I. New York: The Century Co., 1925.
- Gaede, O. Reality shock: a problem among first-year teachers. The Clearing House, 1978, 51, 405-409.
- Gallup, G. Ninth annual gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public school. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59(1), 34.
- Good, C. V. (Ed). Dictionary of Education, 3rd. Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
- Graham, R. The teacher corps. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1968, 41-52. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 024 621)
- Gubser, M. Authoritarianism among teachers and school principals and its possible relationship to faculty morale. The Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 63(1), 36-39.
- Haubrich, V. The motives of prospective teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1960, 11(3), 381-386.
- Hilton, J. Alleged acceptance of the occupational role of teaching. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 210-215.
- Indiresan, J. Background and general attitude variables distinguishing satisfied and dissatisfied engineering teachers. Higher Education, 1976, 5(3), 277-284.
- Jones, R. Morale of teachers of mentally retarded children: an exploratory investigation. Education and Training of Mentally Retarded, 1969, 4(1), 4-10.
- Kennedy, J., Cruickshank, D., and Myers, B. Problems of beginning secondary teachers in relation to school location. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69(5), 167-172.
- Landsmann, L. Is teaching hazardous to your health? Today's Education, 1978, 67(2), 49-50.
- Lovell, J., and Phelps, M. Supervision in Tennessee as perceived by teachers, principals, and supervisors. Educational Leadership, 1977, 35(3), 226-228.
- Mason, W., Dressell, R., and Bain, R. Sex role and the career orientation of beginning teachers. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29(4), 371-383.

- Mill, J. Principles of Political Economy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Miller, L. Morale of Virginia ag teachers. The Agricultural Education Magazine, 1976, 49(5), 116-117.
- Monahan, W. Some straight talk about teacher preparation. The Education Digest, 1978, 43, 28-30.
- Moore, H. A moving equilibrium of demand and supply. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 1925, 39, 357.
- National Education Association. The American Public School Teacher, 1971. Washington, D.C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1971.
- National Education Association. The American Public School Teacher, 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1973.
- National Education Association. Teacher Opinion Poll, 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1973.
- Nelson, R., and Thompson, W. Why teachers quit. The Clearing House, 1963, 37(8), 467-472.
- Patton, F. Diminishing Returns in Agriculture. New York: Columbia University, 1926.
- Pratt, D. Predicting teacher survival. The Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 71, 12-18.
- Price, J. An instrument for measuring student teacher morale. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1971, 8(1), 47-48.
- Ream, M. The status of the American public school teacher, 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: Research Division, National Education Association, 1977, 66-71.
- Ross, C., and Swick, K. An explanatory study in the development of positive changes in student-teacher attitudes toward inner-city teaching. Education and Urban Society, 1969, 2(7), 112-117.
- Sanoff, A. Why teachers are under fire. The Education Digest, 1978, 43, 2-4.
- Sebring, R. Teacher-administrator conflict: can it be resolved? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1978, 62, 37-41.
- Selden, D. Teacher workload and teacher dropout. 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 032 272)

- Snow, R. Anxieties and discontents in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1963, 64(7), 318-321.
- Spivey, G. Relationships between the morale and change orientation of vocational education teachers in Alabama. Montgomery: Alabama Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, 1977, 106. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 143 822)
- Wells, R. Teacher survival in the classroom. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, 11(2), 64-73.
- Wolfe, W., and Wolfe, W. Teacher dropouts: still a dilemma. School and Society, 1964, 92(April), 193-194.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE FACTOR EXPLANATION

Description of the Factors

The following is a brief description of the 10 factors included in the revised Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (Bentley and Rempel, 1970, p. 4).

Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal" deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal--his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

Factor 2 - "Satisfaction with Teaching" pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers" focuses on a teacher's relationships with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation, preparation, ethics, influence, interests, and competency of his peers.

Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary" pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?

Factor 5 - "Teacher Load" deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues" solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

Factor 7 - "Teacher Status" samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education" deals with the extent to which the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services" has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10 - "Community Pressures" gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

APPENDIX B

PURDUE STUDENT-TEACHER OPINIONAIRE

FACTOR EXPLANATION

Description of the Factors

The following is a brief description of the nine factors included in the Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionnaire (Bentley and Price, 1972, p. 5).

Factor 1 - "Student Teacher Rapport with the Supervising Teacher" deals with the student teacher's feelings about his supervising teacher: his competency as a teacher, his willingness and ability to work with student teachers, and his evaluation of the student teacher's work.

Factor 2 - "Student Teacher Rapport with the Principal" deals with the student teacher's feelings about the principal; his professional competency, his interest in student teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

Factor 3 - "Student Teacher Rapport with the University Supervisor" focuses on his working relationships with student teachers, adequacy of time spent with and in the student teaching school, and his evaluation of the student teacher's work.

Factor 4 - "Teaching as a Profession" pertains to the student teacher's evaluation of teaching in terms of personal desires and contributions, satisfaction with teaching, and rewards and demands of the teaching profession.

Factor 5 - "School Facilities and Services" pertains to the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 6 - "Professional Preparation" has to do with subject matter courses, lesson planning, training for extra-curricular activities, and adequacy of education courses.

Factor 7 - "Student Teacher Rapport with the Students" samples feelings about treatment received from students, reaction to student behavior, acceptance by students, and degree of satisfaction from contacts with students.

Factor 8 - "Student-Teacher Rapport with other Teachers" focuses on student-teacher relationships with other teachers on the school faculty. The items pertain to student-teacher opinion regarding professional ethics, cooperativeness, helpfulness, and congeniality of teachers in the student teaching school.

Factor 9 - "Student Teacher Load" pertains to such matters as time demands, restriction on non-professional activities, record keeping and clerical work, and their load as compared with other teachers.

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE



OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Home Economics Education 4024 North Lincoln Blvd. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105 405-521-2321
November 15, 1978

Miss Rachel Anderson
 X Miss Ann Gorman
 Home Economics Department
 Home Economics West
 Oklahoma State University
 Stillwater, OK 74074

Dear Rachel:

The enclosed letter has been mailed to the following:

Mrs. Phyllis Herriage, Director
 Home Economics Education
 Dept. of Elementary & Secondary Educ.
 P.O. Box 480
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Ms. Frances Rudd, State Super
 Home Economics Educ.
 Dept. of Educ.
 Arch Ford Educ. Bldg., 305 W
 Little Rock, AR 72201

Ms. Elizabeth Smith, State Supervisor
 Homemaking Education
 Texas Educ. Agency
 201 East 11th St., Room 430
 Austin, TX 78701

Dr. Virginia Crossno,
 Home Economics Section
 State Dept. of Educ.
 P.O. Box 44064
 Baton Rouge, LA 70804

I have not included New Mexico as they do not have a State Supervisor and only one person left on their staff at this time.

Sincerely,

Nedra Johnson
 State Supervisor
 Home Economics Education

NJ:mm
 Encl.

SEE OKLAHOMA FIRST

November 7, 1978

Mrs. Phyllis Herriage, Director
Home Economics Education
Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Phyllis

We would very much appreciate your help in a study which we hope will be beneficial to all of us.

We have a doctoral candidate, in Home Economics Education, at the Oklahoma State University, who is conducting a study that may give us some insights into the problem of teacher turnover. She is looking for factors in the teacher preparation programs and the first year of teaching home economics environment that influence these beginning teachers to remain in teaching or withdraw from the teaching profession.

Rachel Anderson is the graduate student. She is a native of Texas, and her high school teaching experiences were in Texas. She has University teaching experiences in both Texas and Oklahoma.

Rachel needs our help to do this study. She needs the names and addresses of all the Vocational Home Economics teachers who started their first year of teaching in Home Economics in the 1977-78 school year. She then needs to know how many continued to teach Home Economics in 1978-79 (names and addresses) and those who did not continue to teach (names and addresses). Would you be willing to help her?

Rachel would also like for you to co-sign the letter which she will mail to all these teachers and former teachers in your State. She will mail the letter to you for your signature upon receipt of your approval card.

Rachel has said that she will mail us a summary of her findings and recommendations. I hope you will be able to assist her. Please return the enclosed self addressed postal card indicating your response to this request.

Sincerely,

Nedra Johnson
State Supervisor
Home Economics Education

NJ:mm
Encl.

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
372-6211, Ext. 486

74074

November 21, 1978

Mrs. Phyllis Herriage, Director
Home Economics Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dear Mrs. Herriage:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

As Ms. Johnson stated in her letter to you on November 7, I need some information concerning vocational home economics teachers in Missouri. The postal card that you returned to me stated that the list would not be complete, however, any information that you can supply would be greatly appreciated. I need for you to send me the following: 1) the names of beginning vocational home economics teachers in Missouri in the 1977-78 school year, and 2) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who continued to teach in the 1978-79 school year, and 3) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who did not continue to teach in the 1978-79 school year.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature. I have enclosed a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am looking forward to receiving your list of teachers.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosures


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 372-6211, Ext. 486

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help! As a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a research study involving graduates in the May-July classes of 1977 with majors in vocational home economics education, who taught home economics in the public schools of Missouri during the 1977-78 school year. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching profession.

The questionnaire is in two parts. Part I, which is enclosed with this letter, consists of a Background Information sheet and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire, Part II, which is to be mailed approximately one month from now, consists of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 7, 1979. The coding of each questionnaire is used for data analysis on the computer and for follow-up purposes to be carried out by the researcher. The questionnaires and all information provided by the participants in the study will be held in strictest confidence.

Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Phyllis Herriage

Phyllis Herriage, Director
 Home Economics Education
 State of Missouri

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman, Thesis Adviser
 Home Economics Education

Enclosures

INSTRUCTIONS

I appreciate your willingness in taking the time to complete the two questionnaires in this packet. The estimated time for completing the questionnaires is 30 minutes. As a former vocational homemaking teacher, I realize that your time is precious; but I hope that you will take a few minutes now to complete the questionnaires.

The directions for the Background Information sheet are given on the questionnaire. Do not omit any items.

The directions for completing the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire are given on the instrument. However, there is no need to complete the blanks of the opinionaire. Complete only items 1-60. Do not omit any items.

As stated in the cover letter, Part II of the research study will be mailed to you upon my receipt of this packet. When finished with these two questionnaires, place them in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and return to me by February 15, 1979.

Thanks,

Rachel Anderson

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
(405) ~~374-6111~~ 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

A few weeks ago a questionnaire that pertained to your experience as a vocational home economics teacher in the public school system was mailed to you with a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your return. As a former vocational homemaking teacher, I realize how busy you are, but your return would be very helpful to me. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire as well as a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return. My plans for analyzing the data collected were to be completed in March and your cooperation in helping me meet this deadline will be appreciated.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please disregard this letter if you have returned the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
(405) 744-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

Thanks for completing Packet I of my research study. I hope you are ready for Packet II! The estimated time for completing the questionnaire is 25 to 30 minutes.

The directions for the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire are explained on the instrument. Again, do not complete any of the personal information asked. You need only complete items 1-100.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Supplement should be answered in the same manner as the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Indicate your opinion by circling one of the responses given. Disregard the instructions given on the first page of the Supplement. Do not write your name on the instrument as all responses will remain anonymous. Do not omit any items.

After both instruments have been completed, place them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope which is enclosed and return them to me within 10 days.

Your cooperation in this project is much appreciated.

I hope that the remainder of your school year is a pleasant one.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
(405) ~~746-2333~~ 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

A few weeks ago Packett II of my research study was mailed to you with a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your return. As a former vocational homemaking teacher, I realize that you are busy. Please take a few minutes now and complete the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and the Supplement that I have enclosed. Your return is very important for my study. My plans for analyzing the data collected were to be completed in March and your cooperation in helping me meet this deadline will be appreciated.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please disregard this letter if you have returned the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rachel Anderson".

Rachel Anderson
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

ARTHUR L. MALLORY
Commissioner

State of Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
P. O. BOX 490
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102

December 12, 1978

Ms. Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074


Dear Ms. Anderson:

In order to assist with your Teacher Turnover Study, I have asked our seven vocational teacher education institutions to respond to your request for a list of new teachers. Each institution would have complete information and follow-up on their graduates. Our state office files would not provide a complete listing, which I am sure you need.

The letter with my signature is enclosed and you should be receiving our lists soon.

I wish you luck in your research and will be anxious to have the results.

Sincerely,


Phyllis Herriage, Director
Home Economics Education

mm

Enclosure



SOUTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY • SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI 65802 • (417)

February 13, 1979

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Department of Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Ms. Anderson:

Dr Joyce Waldron, teacher educator here in our department at Southwest Missouri State University has compiled a list of teachers who taught their first year in 1977-1978. We do not have the follow-up information which you request but hope this original list will help you secure the additional information which you desire.

Best wishes in the pursuit of your graduate program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Jacquelyn Ledbetter'.

Jacquelyn Ledbetter, Head
Department of Home Economics

JL/jb



Department of Home Economics

December 18, 1978

Ms. Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Ms. Anderson:

I recently received a letter from Ms. Phyllis Herriage, Director Home Economics Education in Missouri, requesting that I send you the names of first year teachers from Northwest Missouri State University who did not return to teaching this year. The information indicated that these were to be first year teachers in Missouri. We only placed two graduates in teaching in Missouri in 1977-78. Others were placed in Nebraska, Illinois, Wyoming, Iowa and Texas.

Mrs. Sandra Pippert Gerlt taught as a first year teacher at Ludlow, Missouri last year. She did not return to teaching this fall. Her current address is Mrs. Sandra Pippert Gerlt, RR #1, Red Oak, Iowa.

Ms. Renee Voltmer was placed in a Middle School in St. Joseph, Missouri. She returned to teach at the same school this fall. Her address is Ms. Renee Voltmer, 3436 Messanie, St. Joseph, Missouri 64501.

I hope this information is adequate to facilitate your research, if not please contact me.

Sincerely,

Frances Shipley
Frances Shipley, Acting Chairman

FS/kt

**SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY****CAPE GIRARDEAU, MISSOURI 63701****CAPE GIRARDEAU (314) 334-8211
IN ST. LOUIS 241-0195****January 25, 1979**

**Ms. Rachel Anderson
Department of Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074**

Dear Ms. Anderson:

I explained by telephone to you the cause for my delay in sending the list from Southeast Missouri State University you requested. I am sorry that was the situation.

The addresses are the latest available from our Placement Office combined with our personal knowledge. I suggest you ask that the questionnaire be forwarded since some of the addresses are parents addresses I am sure.

Many of the graduates of 1976-77 did not go into teaching in 1977-78 since the job market was tight. I have indicated the first year teachers in the listing who have remained in teaching; others may be just beginning this year due to the availability of positions.

Good luck on your research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Grace Hoover".

**Mrs. Grace Hoover, Chairperson
Home Economics Department**

GH:sb



CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY WARRENSBURG, MISSOURI 64093

January 4, 1979

Rachel Anderson
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dear Ms. Anderson:

The Home Economics Department at Central Missouri State University has received your request for a report on Vocational Home Economics teacher in Missouri who began teaching in 1977-78 and whether they continued in 1978-79 for a Teacher Turnover Study you were conducting. You will find enclosed a list of Vocational Home Economics students who completed requirements for certification at the institution in May or August, 1977, and began teaching 1977-78. The list also indicates those who continued to teach 1977-78.

Your research is of interest to those who teach, advise and supervise Vocational Home Economics students. A copy of your research results is requested if possible. Best wishes as you continue your study.

Sincerely yours,

Wanda Beard

Wanda Beard, Instructor
Home Economics Education
Central Missouri State University
252 Grinstead Building
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

Enclosure

cc: R. Youmans
W. Beard



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

Department of Home Economics Education
372-6211, Ext. 456

74074

November 21, 1978

Mrs. Phyllis Herriage, Director
Home Economics Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dear Mrs. Herriage:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

As Ms. Johnson stated in her letter to you on November 7, I need some information concerning vocational home economics teachers in Missouri. The postal card that you returned to me stated that the list would not be complete, however, any information that you can supply would be greatly appreciated. I need for you to send me the following: 1) the names of beginning vocational home economics teachers in Missouri in the 1977-78 school year, and 2) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who continued to teach in the 1978-79 school year, and 3) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who did not continue to teach in the 1978-79 school year.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature. I have enclosed a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am looking forward to receiving your list of teachers.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosures

*In all three categories
the answer is 0.*

*L. F. Knight
Lincoln Univ.
Tuperson City*


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 XXXXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help! As a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a research study involving graduates in the May-July classes of 1977 with majors in vocational home economics education, who taught home economics in the public schools of Oklahoma during the 1977-78 school year. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching profession.

The questionnaire is in two parts. Part I, which is enclosed with this letter, consists of a Background Information sheet and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire. Part II, which is to be mailed approximately one month from now, consists of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by February 15, 1979. The coding of each questionnaire is used for data analysis on the computer and for follow-up purposes to be carried out by the researcher. The questionnaires and all information provided by the participants in the study will be held in strictest confidence.

Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Nedra Johnson

Ms. Nedra Johnson
 State Supervisor
 Home Economics Education
 State of Oklahoma

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman
 Thesis Adviser
 Home Economics Education

Enclosures



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help! As a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a research study involving graduates in the May-July classes of 1977 with majors in vocational home economics education, who taught home economics in the public schools of Arkansas during the 1977-78 school year. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching profession.

The questionnaire is in two parts. Part I, which is enclosed with this letter, consists of a Background Information sheet and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire, Part II, which is to be mailed approximately one month from now, consists of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by February 15, 1979. The coding of each questionnaire is used for data analysis on the computer and for follow-up purposes to be carried out by the researcher. The questionnaires and all information provided by the participants in the study will be held in strictest confidence.

Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Frances Rudd

Ms. Frances Rudd, State Supervisor
 Home Economics Education
 Department of Education
 State of Arkansas

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman
 Thesis Adviser
 Home Economics Education

Enclosure

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
XXXXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

January 15, 1979

Mrs. Frances Rudd, State Supervisor
Home Economics Education
Department of Education
Arch Ford Education Building, 305W
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dear Mrs. Rudd:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the research study that I am conducting while a student at Oklahoma State University. I received your list of the teachers needed for my research and appreciated the promptness of your reply.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature? I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosures

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
372-6211, Ext. 486

74074

November 21, 1978

Mrs. Frances Rudd, State Supervisor
Home Economics Education
Department of Education
Arch Ford Education Building, 305W
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Dear Mrs. Rudd:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

As Ms. Johnson stated in her letter to you on November 7, I need some information concerning Vocational Home Economics teachers in Arkansas. I need for you to send me the following: 1) the names of beginning vocational home economics teachers in Arkansas in the 1977-78 school year, and 2) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who continued to teach in the 1978-79 school year and 3) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who did not continue to teach in the 1978-79 school year.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature? I have enclosed a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am looking forward to receiving your list of teachers.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosure



J. KELLY NIX
State Superintendent

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

January 3, 1979

Ms. Rachel Anderson
135 HEW
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

Dear Ms. Anderson

We do not have the staff to determine which teachers are first year teachers, but we are sending a copy of the teachers list for 1977-78 and 1978-79. You may compare and identify those teachers who are teaching for the first time and contact them individually to participate in your research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Virginia Crossno".

Virginia Crossno, Ed.D.
Director of Home Economics

VC:dlg
Encls.

CC: Miss Nedra Johnson
State Supervisor
Home Economics Education

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
XXXXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

January 15, 1979

Dr. Virginia Crossno
Director of Home Economics
Department of Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Dear Dr. Crossno:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University. I received your list of teachers in Louisiana and am currently working on determining my sample.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature? I have enclosed a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosures



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 XXXXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help! As a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a research study involving graduates in the May-July classes of 1977 with majors in vocational home economics education, who taught home economics in the public schools of Louisiana during the 1977-78 school year. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching profession.

The questionnaire is in two parts. Part I, which is enclosed with this letter, consists of a Background Information sheet and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire. Part II, which is to be mailed approximately one month from now, consists of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by February 15, 1979. The coding of each questionnaire is used for data analysis on the computer and for follow-up purposes to be carried out by the researcher. The questionnaires and all information provided by the participants in the study will be held in strictest confidence.

Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Virginia Crossno

Dr. Virginia Crossno
 Director of Home Economics
 Department of Education
 State of Louisiana

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman
 Thesis Adviser
 Home Economics Education

Enclosures


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 624-5046

74074

January 16, 1979

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help as a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University. I am conducting a research study involving beginning teachers in vocational home economics. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching field.

A part of the sample for my study is to be composed of beginning teachers in the state of Louisiana. The Director of Home Economics, Dr. Virginia Crossno, informed me that there was not a comprehensive list of beginning teachers in Louisiana. Therefore, I need your help in compiling such a list.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed postal card and returning it to me by February 1, 1979. Please check the description which best identifies your present position in vocational home economics.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson *Anna M. Gorman*

 Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student

 Anna M. Gorman
 Thesis Advisor

Home Economics Education Home Economics Education

Enclosure

Please check (✓) the definition of your present position:

Beginning teacher: a teacher who has completed the basic requirements for vocational certification and is concurrently completing the first year of teaching vocational home ec.

First Year Teacher: a teacher who has completed the basic requirements for vocational certification and has concurrently completed one year of teaching voc. home economics

Experienced Teacher: a teacher who has completed the basic requirements for vocational certification and has completed two or more years of teaching home economics or is returning to teaching after a delayed absence.

Am not currently employed as a vocational homemaking teacher

Name

Address

Texas Education Agency



November 28, 1978

201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas
78701

- STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
- STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ms. Rachel Anderson
135 Hew
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 94074

Dear Rachel:

Recently I had a letter from Nedra Johnson asking us to assist you with a study on influences causing beginning Home Economics teachers to stay in teaching or withdraw from teaching.

Three area consultants for Homemaking Education have agreed to help you with your study. They are:

Mrs. Ima Dora Haile
Area Consultant, Homemaking Education
Texas Education Agency
Suite 10
705 West Sixth Street
Plainview, Texas 79072

Mrs. Phoebe Denney
Area Consultant, Homemaking Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Mrs. Norma Shipman
Area Consultant, Homemaking Education
Texas Education Agency
P. O. Box 7
Sulphur Springs, Texas 75482

Will you please communicate with these consultants about your proposed study and the information you need from them. I am enclosing a map of Texas which shows the areas they serve.

I will be glad to cosign a letter to the teachers if you want me to do so, or you might like for the area consultants to cosign with you since they have closer contact with their teachers than I do.

Best wishes for a successful study.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth F. Smith
Mrs. Elizabeth F. Smith
Director, Homemaking Education

EFS:gb
Enclosure

cc: Ms. Nedra Johnson
Mrs. Ima Dora Haile
Mrs. Norma Shipman
Mrs. Phoebe Denney

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
XXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

December 4, 1978

Mrs. Elizabeth F. Smith, Director
Homemaking Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Mrs. Smith:

Thank you for responding to Ms. Nedra Johnson's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

In your letter of November 28, you indicated that you would be willing to co-sign a letter to the participants in the study. I am presently corresponding with the Area Consultants regarding their signature on the letter. As soon as this process is completed, I will be in further contact with you.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the study.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
Graduate Student

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**Department of Home Economics Education
XXXXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

December 4, 1978

Mrs. Phoebe Denney
Area Consultant, Homemaking Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Mrs. Denney:

Thank you for responding to Mrs. Elizabeth Smith's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

The purpose of my study is to give insight into the problem of teacher turnover. I am looking for factors in the teacher preparation programs and the first year of teaching home economics that influence these beginning teachers to remain in teaching or withdraw from the teaching profession.

I need some information concerning Vocational Home Economics teachers in Area VII. I need for you to send me the following: 1) the names of beginning vocational home economics teachers in Area VII in the 1977-78 school year; and 2) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who continued to teach in the 1978-79 school year and 3) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who did not continue to teach in the 1978-79 school year.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature? I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am looking forward to receiving your list of teachers.

Sincerely,

Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education

Enclosure


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 624-5046

74074

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I need your help! As a doctoral candidate in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting a research study involving graduates in the May-July classes of 1977 with majors in vocational home economics education, who taught home economics in the public schools of Texas during the 1977-78 school year. The objective of the study is to discover what factors influence beginning teachers to remain in teaching or to leave the teaching profession.

The questionnaire is in two parts. Part I, which is enclosed with this letter, consists of a Background Information sheet and the Purdue Student Teacher Opinionaire. Part II, which is to be mailed approximately one month from now, consists of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Will you help me by completing the enclosed questionnaires and returning them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by **February 28, 1979**. The coding of each questionnaire is used for data analysis on the computer and for follow-up purposes to be carried out by the researcher. The questionnaires and all information provided by the participants in the study will be held in strictest confidence.

Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Rachel Anderson

Rachel Anderson
 Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Norma Shipman

Mrs. Norma Shipman
 Area VI Consultant, Homemaking Education
 Texas Education Agency

Elizabeth Smith

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith
 Director, Homemaking Education
 Texas Education Agency
 State of Texas

Anna M. Gorman

Anna M. Gorman
 Thesis Adviser
 Home Economics Education

Enclosure



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 XXXXXXXXXX 624-5046

74074

December 4, 1978

Mrs. Norma Shipman
 Area Consultant, Homemaking Education
 Texas Education Agency
 P. O. Box 7
 Sulphur Springs, TX 75482

Dear Mrs. Shipman:

Thank you for responding to Mrs. Elizabeth Smith's request to participate in the Teacher Turnover Study that I am conducting while a student at the Oklahoma State University.

The purpose of my study is to give insight into the problem of teacher turnover. I am looking for factors in the teacher preparation programs and the first year of teaching home economics that influence these beginning teachers to remain in teaching or withdraw from the teaching profession.

I need some information concerning Vocational Home Economics teachers in Area VI. I need for you to send me the following: 1) the names of beginning vocational home economics teachers in Area VI in the 1977-78 school year; and 2) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who continued to teach in the 1978-79 school year and 3) the names and addresses of those beginning teachers who did not continue to teach in the 1978-79 school year.

I have enclosed a copy of the letter which will be mailed to the participants in the study. Would you please co-sign the letter with my signature? I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the letter.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am looking forward to receiving your list of teachers.

Sincerely,

 Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
 Home Economics Education

Enclosure

Texas Education Agency

- STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
- STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas

78701

January 23, 1979

Ms. Rachel Anderson, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

Dear Ms. Anderson:

Please accept my apologies for the tardiness of my response to your request. As you can see, our record is very good. The delay was in getting forwarding addresses for those who left.

Thank you for using our area in your survey. I would be interested in seeing the results of your study.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Phoebe G. Denney".

Phoebe G. Denney, Consultant
Homemaking Education

PGD/blm

cc: Elizabeth F. Smith

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENTS

The Purdue Student-Teacher Opinionaire
the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, and the
Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Supplement
are available for purchase from the
following source:

The University Book Store
360 State Street
West Lafayette, Indiana 47906

Code No.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Directions: Please answer each of the questions carefully. Choose the response that best identifies your situation. Write the letter of that response in the blank to the left of the question.

- ___ 1. What is your age?
 - a. 20-24
 - b. 25-29
 - c. 30-34
 - d. 35-39
 - e. 40-44
 - f. over 45

- ___ 2. What is your sex?
 - a. female
 - b. male

- ___ 3. What is your current marital status?
 - a. divorced, separated, widowed
 - b. married
 - c. single

- ___ 4. If married, is your spouse gainfully employed?
 - a. I am not married
 - b. No, not gainfully employed
 - c. Yes, employed full-time
 - d. Yes, employed part-time

- ___ 5. What is the highest college degree you have received?
 - a. bachelor's
 - b. certificate
 - c. doctor's
 - d. master's
 - e. master's plus 30 hours

- ___ 6. What is the highest academic degree which your spouse has received?
 - a. bachelor's
 - b. certificate
 - c. doctor's
 - d. does not apply to me
 - e. hours above bachelor's
 - f. hours above master's
 - g. master's

- ___ 7. How many years have you taught vocational home economics?
 - a. one year
 - b. other
 - c. two years

- ___ 8. How many children do you have?
- none
 - 1-2
 - 3-4
 - 5-6
 - more than 6
- ___ 9. What are the ages of your children?
- does not apply to me
 - under 6 years of age
 - 6-11 years
 - 11-17 years
 - 18 years or older
- ___ 10. In how many professional organizations are you a member?
- 1-2
 - 3-4
 - more than 4
 - none
- ___ 11. What was your father's highest educational attainment?
- completed elementary school
 - graduate or professional school
 - graduated from college
 - graduated from high, technical, or business school
 - no formal education
 - some college
 - some elementary school
 - some high, technical, or business school
- ___ 12. What is your father's present occupation?
- clerical or sales worker
 - Managerial worker or self-employed
 - Professional or semiprofessional worker
 - retired
 - skilled or semiskilled worker
 - unemployed
 - unskilled worker
 - other
- ___ 13. What was your mother's highest educational attainment?
- completed elementary school
 - graduate or professional school
 - graduated from college
 - graduated from high, technical, or business school
 - no formal education
 - some college
 - some elementary school
 - some high, technical, or business school

- ___ 14. What is your mother's present occupation?
- a. clerical or sales worker
 - b. managerial worker or self-employed
 - c. professional or semiprofessional worker
 - d. retired
 - e. skilled or semiskilled worker
 - f. unemployed
 - g. unskilled worker
 - h. other
- ___ 15. Does your spouse want you to be employed?
- a. no
 - b. yes
 - c. does not apply
- ___ 16. Do you plan to continue in the teaching profession?
- a. no
 - b. yes
 - c. no decision
- ___ 17. If you have decided to leave the teaching profession, do you plan to return at a later time?
- a. no
 - b. yes
 - c. no decision
18. What is (are) your reasons for deciding to remain in the teaching field?
19. What is (are) your reasons for deciding to leave the teaching field?

APPENDIX E

DATA FOR BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SHEET RESPONSES

REASONS SUGGESTED BY HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

FOR REMAINING IN THE TEACHING FIELD BY

SUBJECT AREA CLASSIFICATION

Enjoy Teaching

Enjoy the work

Enjoy the challenge

I enjoy it

I find it rewarding and feel good about myself in this position.

*I just like it.

I like teaching

It's right for me--I love it.

Rewarding experience

I believe in the importance of education and for me the profession is self-satisfying.

I enjoy it

Enjoy it

*Rewarding

I like it

Rewarding occupation; possibility for upward position.

I enjoy it

I love to teach

Challenging

I enjoy being gainfully employed.

I enjoy sharing my knowledge and experience with the students. Their eagerness to learn is a great reward. Every day is a new experience. I feel fully satisfied with my life as a teacher. At the present, I would not want to do anything else.

I enjoy the experience. I like being around young people and knowing that I am contributing to the improvement or enrichment of their lives now and in the future.

I like my job. I enjoy working. It is good for me to work.

I have to work and enjoy teaching very much.

I like what I do. Worthwhile and rewarding

I enjoy it

Very rewarding work

Enjoy my work majority of time

Teaching is challenging and fulfilling.

Personal satisfaction

Enjoyment

Rewarding

I enjoy teaching and FHA

I enjoy teaching

Enjoy it, need the money, need a vocation

I enjoy teaching and find it rewarding.

I like it. It gives me a sense of accomplishment.

I like teaching.

Challenging

I like my job.

Enjoy Students

I like the interaction with the students.

I like young people and I enjoy the fields that I teach.

I enjoy students and teaching offers me contact with young people. I also feel education is important.

I like to help the students to accomplish their goals.

I care very much for each student.

I enjoy teaching and being associated with teenagers. I feel I'm making a contribution toward tomorrow.

I try to prepare students for the responsibilities they'll have to take on after graduation.

Like teaching; like kids; security; versatility in preparations; myself also learning.

I enjoy working with young people.

Like youth and children

*Enjoy contact with youth; gives me a feeling of being helpful.

Rewarding, enjoy the students

I enjoy students and teaching.

I enjoy working with young people.

I love working with high school students--it is very rewarding and the hours are great.

I enjoy the contact with the students.

I enjoy working with the students; personal satisfaction from teaching enjoyment, challenge, love students.

Working with youth; good hours; fond of subject.

Enjoy students and subject.

I want to help students learn how to better themselves, their homes, and their communities.

There are more rewards than monetary rewards. I like high school students and working with young people. It is a profession I feel I can grow in intellectually.

If I stay, I enjoy teaching and the contact with the students.

I find it gives me great satisfaction and I love working with students.

Satisfaction of helping students

I enjoy my work and feel I can help others.

I enjoy teaching--the students and I have a good rapport. I like working outside the home.

Enjoy the student contact; the opportunity to be creative.

I enjoy working with people of all ages.

Enjoy students

Rewarding feeling of helping someone

Because I like to teach young people

Time

I still enjoy the same days off as my children and I enjoy the age group I am working with.

Flexible position lets me do my work as I see fit, within limits

Vacation; the few students who do care to learn; the variety work offers

Like working hours

Hours the same as my children; this is where my training can be used most effectively

Like the hours

Two months off in summer; hate to look for something else

My children are in high school and the hours work with their schedules

Like kids; satisfaction; like the area; like the summer vacation

Will return after pregnancy; like kids; rewarding

Enjoy summer months off

I'm home when my children are home

Summers off; hours coincide with my children
 Enjoy work with youth and hours and vacations
 Easily combined with raising a family
 I enjoy my working hours and being off in the summer
 The time
 The vacation

Economic Reasons

My husband is currently in pharmacy school and I am supporting the family.

*Economics; good retirement plan; stable income; good working conditions

The salary, holidays, and vacation time are good

Economics

Money

Need to work; like it

Benefits; retirement, vacation

Salary better than any other job I've qualified for

Right now, I need the money

It is a way of making money.

Have to work to maintain present standard of living

It gives me something to do.

The pay is pretty good.

We need my salary.

Money; rewarding; interesting; enjoy subject matter; like teenagers; teacher friends

To support myself

Supplementary income

Contributions to Society

To help in trend changing and attitude changing

My concern for the adults of tomorrow

I feel that I am making a contribution to society

An opportunity to help develop young minds and mature adults

Because of the personal fulfillment and enjoyment

I am interested in the youth of today.

I try to help prepare young people for their future.

Self-fulfillment; contact with students; good relations
with fellow workers

Varied teaching materials, subject matter, like to help people

Enjoy helping youngsters learn and improve their self-concepts

Work with students in learning how to live

Helping people grow

Miscellaneous

*The students need dedicated teachers like me.

The subject matter

Career

Subject matter; students

*I do not have enough to do at home to keep busy.

I like to teach about home economics.

Work qualifications; qualification

That's what I'm trained for and the money is better than any jobs
I've held.

The homemaking field. Education was my major in college. I feel
this is my best area.

To perfect my skills as a teacher

Is what I am trained to do; rewarding at times

Enjoy subject matter

Working Conditions

I like the working conditions and benefits.

Enjoyable working conditions

I like to work with people and my principal and superintendent
are very good to work with.

*Responses made by non-returning teachers.

REASONS SUGGESTED BY NON-RETURNING HOME
ECONOMICS TEACHERS FOR LEAVING THE
TEACHING FIELD BY SUBJECT AREA
CLASSIFICATIONS

Discipline Concerns

I left my particular situation on the basis that there was no discipline.

Discipline in schools

Discipline

Career Changes

Dropping Home Economics Cooperative Ed. from curriculum

Left for another position in the administration of a college

Unavailability of a job

Time

Hours necessary

Amount of time required for work

Family

I am going to have a baby.

Frustration-Pressure

The students and parents had more rights than the teachers.

Financial

I do not have to work. My salary only causes me to pay more income tax.

APPENDIX F

DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t'
FOR JOB SATISFACTION

TABLE XXXVI

DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' TEST FOR
JOB SATISFACTION

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	" t " value	Prob > (T)
Factor 2						
Item Q019 "personal satisfaction received"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	1.0606			
returning	98	1.7448	.0770	.3780	-0.3661 ^a	0.7150
Item Q024 "contribution to society"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.0000			
returning	98	1.9693	.9010	.5961	0.0862 ^a	0.9315
Item Q026 "enjoy teaching"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	1.0690			
returning	98	1.7244	.8708	.3678	0.3837 ^a	0.7020
Item Q027 "repeat the selecting of teaching as a profession"						
non-returning	7	2.5714	1.2724			
returning	98	2.0816	1.0519	.3980	1.1743 ^a	0.2430
Item Q029 "encourage teaching occupation to high scholastic students"						
non-returning	7	2.5714	1.1330			
returning	98	2.2249	1.0337	.6154	0.8551 ^a	0.3945
Item Q030 "leave teaching for same pay in another occupation"						
non-returning	7	2.7142	1.2535			
returning	98	2.7755	1.0207	.3670	-0.1511 ^a	0.8802

TABLE XXXVI (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 2						
Item Q046 "student contact is satisfying"						
non-returning	7	1.4285	.7867			
returning	98	1.5102	.0460	0.3840	-0.3185 ^a	0.7507
Item Q047 "importance in school system felt"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	1.2145			
returning	98	1.7755	.7111	0.0233	0.1756 ^b	0.8661
Item Q050 "feel successful"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	1.1126			
returning	98	1.5204	.6458	0.0211	0.4555 ^b	0.6641
Item Q051 "enjoy extracurricular activities"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	1.2149			
returning	98	1.7448	.8532	0.1383	0.3266	0.7446
Item Q056 "not adequately prepared for occupation"						
non-returning	7	3.4285	1.1338			
returning	98	3.5510	.0599	0.0218	-0.2823 ^b	0.7568
Item Q058 "other teachers regard personal ability as good quality"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	1.1126			
returning	98	1.4591	.5210	0.0008	0.6019 ^b	0.5687
Item Q060 "profession undesirable because of pressure"						
non-returning	7	2.8571	1.2149			
returning	98	2.9285	.9870	0.3624	-0.1823 ^a	0.8557

TABLE XXXVI (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 2						
Item Q076 "students' actions source of irritation"						
non-returning	8	2.0250	.8161			
returning	98	5.5877	.6522	0.1322	-3.0811 ^a	0.0026*
Item Q078 "respect and confidence shown by students"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	1.0590 ^c			
returning	98	1.6122	.6522 ^c	0.0277	1.0107 ^b	0.3441
Item Q082 "students appreciative of help"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.6408			
returning	98	1.8367	.6989	0.8849	0.1497 ^a	0.8813
Item Q083 "teaching is challenging"						
non-returning	8	2.2500	1.4880			
returning	98	1.8265	1.0156	0.0909	1.0926 ^a	0.2771
Item Q086 "is competent as other teachers"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	1.0350			
returning	98	1.3265	.5301	0.0013	1.1457 ^b	0.2883
Item Q089 "enjoy work with students"						
non-returning	8	1.5000	1.0650 ^c			
returning	98	1.3877	.5301 ^c	0.0013	0.2540 ^b	0.7770
Item Q100 "satisfied with present position"						
non-returning	6	2.1666	1.4719			
returning	98	1.9574	.9380	0.0763	0.5110 ^a	0.6105

TABLE XXXVI (Continued)

- * Indicates significance at the .05 level
- a Student's t test used
- b Cochran and Cox tabulated t' test used
- c Unequal variances

APPENDIX G

DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR
STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

TABLE XXXVII
 DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR STUDENT
 TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	" t " value	Prob > (T)
Factor 1						
Item 05 "rapport with supervising teacher"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.6741	0.6535	-0.4554 ^a	0.6496
returning	109	1.6055	.7700			
Item 06 "teacher recognizes good teaching"						
non-returning	12	1.4166	.6685	0.3867	0.3340 ^a	0.7390
returning	109	1.3577	.5696			
Item 18 "provided help"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	1.1547	0.0655	0.5563 ^a	0.5790
returning	109	1.5223	.8119			
Item 34 "effective conference time"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.6741	0.1485	-1.0080 ^a	0.3155
returning	109	1.6981	.9975			
Item 38 "new methods encouraged"						
non-returning	12	1.7500	.8660	0.8978	0.3749 ^a	0.7084
returning	109	1.6513	.8647			
Item 52 "creativity present in teaching"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.6741	0.2055	-1.5119 ^a	0.1332
returning	109	1.9266	.9497			

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 1						
Item 55 "well-satisfied with experience"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.9045			
returning	102	1.6146	.7806	0.4215	-0.4735 ^a	0.6353
Item 58 "freedom to question teaching methods"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9003			
returning	102	2.0000	1.0363	0.6304	-1.3371 ^a	0.1837
Factor 2						
Item 01 "problems handled adequately"						
non-returning	12	2.0000	1.0444			
returning	108	1.9259	.9038	0.4293	0.2652 ^a	0.7913
Item 09 "interest shown"						
non-returning	12	2.0833	.7925			
returning	109	2.2844	.9726	0.4604	-0.6904 ^a	0.4913
Item 22 "understood teaching assignment"						
non-returning	12	2.1666	1.1434			
returning	109	2.2110	.9532	0.2367	-0.1491 ^a	0.8817
Item 35 "discussion of school problems encouraged"						
non-returning	12	2.5000	1.2431			
returning	108	2.6851	1.0470	0.3569	-0.5705 ^a	0.5694

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 2						
Item 42 "fair judgment of work"						
non-returning	12	2.5000	1.2431			
returning	108	2.6851	1.0470	0.3569	-0.5705 ^a	0.5694
Item 47 "made work pleasant"						
non-returning	12	2.0000	1.0444			
returning	108	2.2685	.8712	0.3328	-0.9929 ^a	0.3228
Item 56 "recognized good teaching"						
non-returning	12	2.0000	.7385			
returning	108	2.0185	.8314	0.6974	-0.0739 ^a	0.9412
Item 59 "freedom to discuss school problems"						
non-returning	12	2.4165	1.0836			
returning	109	2.5779	1.0119	0.6656	-0.5206 ^a	0.6036
Factor 3						
Item 07 "justified evaluation"						
non-returning	12	1.2500	.4522 ^c			
returning	109	1.4678	.7884 ^c	0.0457	-1.4446 ^b	0.1646
Item 17 "conferences were productive"						
non-returning	11	1.7272	1.0090			
returning	109	1.9724	.9473	0.6871	-0.8136 ^a	0.4175

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 3						
Item 28 "constructive criticism given"						
non-returning	12	1.2506	.6215			
returning	109	1.5321	.8982	0.1742	-1.0584 ^a	0.2920
Item 30 "adequate observation time for judgment"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	.9847			
returning	109	2.2477	1.0984	0.7259	-1.7551 ^a	0.0818
Item 46 "observation time was comfortable"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	.8896			
returning	109	1.9357	.5640	0.8091	-0.9236 ^a	0.3576
Item 54 "freedom to discuss teaching problems"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.4962			
returning	109	1.6880	.8681	0.4489	-0.3910 ^a	0.6965
Item 60 "provided help"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9003			
returning	108	1.8333	1.0093	0.7104	-0.8214 ^a	0.4128
Factor 4						
Item 13 "provides social status"						
non-returning	12	1.3333	.4923 ^c			
returning	109	2.1192	.9595 ^c	0.0190	-4.6433 ^b	0.0001*

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 4						
Item 15 "challenging profession"						
non-returning	12	1.9166	.9003			
returning	109	1.8165	.9345	0.9658	0.3535 ^a	0.7243
Item 19 "provides occupational security"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	.7177			
returning	109	2.0458	.9066	0.3933	-0.7844 ^a	0.4344
Item 20 "provides prestige"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.5222			
returning	109	2.0825	.8936	0.0526	2.2116 ^a	0.0289*
Item 23 "enjoy teaching"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	.9374			
returning	109	1.6055	.7330	0.1969	0.9931 ^a	0.3227
Item 26 "affords opportunity for societal contributions"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.6685			
returning	109	1.9724	.8828	0.4241	-1.5621 ^a	0.1209
Item 37 "select teaching again for career"						
non-returning	12	2.3333	1.0730			
returning	109	2.0000	1.0363	0.7810	1.0540 ^a	0.2940

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 5						
Item 03 "supplies and equipment provided"						
non-returning	12	1.2500	.6215			
returning	109	1.3669	.6619	0.8779	-0.5842 ^a	0.5602
Item 32 "individual student difference provided for in curriculum"						
non-returning	12	1.8666	.6513			
returning	109	1.9082	.7881	0.4941	-1.0230 ^a	0.3084
Item 48 "adequate audio-visual equipment"						
non-returning	12	1.1665	.3892 ^c			
returning	109	1.4587	.7541 ^c	0.0179	-2.1778 ^b	0.0405
Item 50 "availability of library materials"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	.8876			
returning	109	1.7155	.7545	0.5290	-0.2002 ^a	0.8417
Item 53 "efficient method for providing materials"						
non-returning	12	1.3333	.4923			
returning	109	1.5871	.7227	0.1570	-1.1843 ^a	0.2387
Factor 6						
Item 12 "competent professional preparation"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9003			
returning	109	2.0091	.9670	0.8491	-1.4569 ^a	0.1478

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 6						
Item 24 "methods courses were helpful"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	1.1146			
returning	108	2.1759	1.0123	0.5748	-1.1013 ^a	0.2730
Item 39 "previous lesson planning helpful"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9962			
returning	109	1.8165	1.0107	1.0000	-0.7595 ^a	0.4490
Item 40 "preparation for discipline problems"						
non-returning	12	3.1666	.9374			
returning	109	3.0733	.9200	0.8371	0.3327 ^a	0.7399
Item 43 "well-prepared for experience"						
non-returning	12	2.0000	.8528			
returning	109	1.9724	.8439	0.8663	0.1071 ^a	0.9149
Item 44 "subject matter courses adequate"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	.9847			
returning	108	1.7777	.8464	0.4108	-0.4244 ^a	0.6720
Factor 7						
Item 02 "school prepared students for citizenship"						
non-returning	12	1.9166	.5149			
returning	108	1.8333	.6627	0.3543	0.4211 ^a	0.6745

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Item 11 "satisfactory teaching assignment"						
non-returning	12	1.0833	.2886 ^c			
returning	109	1.4125	.6966 ^c	0.0032	-3.0865 ^b	0.1083*
Item 16 "recognized professional ability"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.6685			
returning	109	1.6055	.5776	0.4247	-0.1243 ^a	0.9013
Item 27 "met expectations"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	.8348			
returning	109	1.9357	.07731	0.6378	-0.4324 ^a	0.4425
Item 29 "satisfaction gained from student teaching experience"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9003			
returning	109	1.7795	.8317	0.6298	-0.7706 ^a	0.4425
Item 45 "appreciative of help given"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.5222			
returning	109	1.7889	.7337	0.2089	-1.3255 ^a	0.1875
Item 49 "student contacts satisfying"						
non-returning	12	1.4165	.5149			
returning	109	1.4862	.6326	0.4565	-0.3673 ^a	0.7140
Item 51 "showed respect"						
non-returning	12	1.5000	.6741			
returning	109	1.4770	.6024	0.5233	0.1237 ^a	0.9017

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 8						
Item 10 "respected others"						
non-returning	12	1.6666	.6513			
returning	108	1.8611	.7545	0.6120	-0.8571 ^a	0.3931
Item 21 "cooperation present"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	1.0298			
returning	107	1.8691	.7658	0.1222	-0.1481 ^a	0.8825
Item 25 "congeniality present"						
non-returning	12	1.5833	.9003			
returning	109	1.6783	.7055	0.2007	-0.4329 ^a	0.6658
Item 31 "high professional ethics"						
non-returning	12	1.9160	.7929			
returning	108	1.9722	.7420	0.6730	-0.2444 ^a	0.8073
Item 33 "worked well together"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	.8348			
returning	109	1.9357	.7610	0.5864	-0.4385 ^a	0.6618
Item 57 "harmony shown"						
non-returning	12	1.8333	.8348			
returning	109	1.8440	.6962	0.3319	-0.0496 ^a	0.9606
Factor 9						
Item 04 "student teacher load"						
non-returning	12	1.4166	.6685			
returning	109	1.4495	.8106	0.4889	-0.1353 ^a	0.8926

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 9						
Item 03 "no restriction on non-professional activities"						
non-returning	12	2.8333	1.1934			
returning	108	2.4537	1.1222	0.6896	1.1049 ^a	0.2714
Item 14 "reasonable teaching load"						
non-returning	12	1.1666	.3892 ^c			
returning	109	1.4495	.7134 ^c	0.0310	-2.1509 ^b	0.0437*
Item 36 "prepared to handle extracurricula problems"						
non-returning	12	1.7500	.9653			
returning	109	1.9633	.8598	0.5139	-0.8060 ^a	0.4219
Item 41 "hours required reasonable"						
non-returning	12	2.1666	1.1140			
returning	109	2.1559	.9445	0.3722	0.0366 ^a	0.9709

* Indicates significance at the .05 level

a Student's t test used

b Cochran and Cox tabulated t' test used

c Unequal variances

APPENDIX H

DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR
SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOL VARIABLES

TABLE XXXVIII

DATA FOR STUDENT'S t AND TABULATED t' FOR SELECTED
PUBLIC SCHOOL VARIABLES

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	" t " value	Prob >(T)
Factor 1						
Item Q002 "faculty work appreciated and recognized"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	1.0690			
returning	98	2.1428	.5632	0.1585	-0.4002 ^a	0.6898
Item Q003 "freedom to criticize administrative policy"						
non-returning	8	2.5000	.5258			
returning	98	2.7653	.9717	0.9902	-0.7448 ^a	0.4581
Item Q005 "favoritism to teachers shown"						
non-returning	8	3.6250	1.5175 ^c			
returning	98	2.6734	1.0819 ^c	0.0474	4.4644 ^b	0.0007*
Item Q007 "close contact maintained with faculty"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	1.4142			
returning	98	2.4081	1.0130	0.1399	-1.0618 ^a	0.2908
Item Q012 "leadership apparent"						
non-returning	8	2.6250	1.3027			
returning	98	2.7448	.9876	0.2162	-0.3222 ^a	0.7479
Item Q033 "work is pleasant"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	1.1126			
returning	98	2.6163	.9801	0.5393	-1.5569 ^a	0.1226

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 1						
Item Q038 "good teaching procedures recognized"						
non-returning	7	1.5714	.5149			
returning	97	1.8659	.7586	0.3778	-1.0070 ^a	0.3163
Item Q041 "communication structure well organized"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	.8997			
returning	97	2.2474	1.0209	0.8162	-0.9833 ^a	0.3278
Item Q043 "interest shown to department"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.1547			
returning	97	2.4123	.9547	0.3984	-1.0889 ^a	0.2788
Item Q044 "belongingness promoted"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.1547			
returning	98	2.3541	1.0050	0.5116	-0.8917 ^a	0.3747
Item Q061 "concerned with faculty problems"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	1.1126			
returning	98	2.2755	1.0131	0.6194	-1.4075 ^a	0.1623
Item Q062 "discussion of problems encouraged"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	1.2149			
returning	98	2.2959	1.1771	0.7775	-0.3317 ^a	0.7408
Item Q069 "interest shown in relation to problems"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	1.1126			
returning	98	2.1224	.9660	0.5054	-1.0698 ^a	0.2872
Item Q070 "acts as a supervisor"						
non-returning	7	1.2857	.4879			
-returning	98	1.8775	.9871	0.0790	-1.5673 ^a	0.1201

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 1						
Item Q072 "teachers' meetings are not profitable"						
non-returning	7	3.0000	.8164			
returning	98	2.7551	1.0654	0.5205	0.5947 ^a	0.5534
Item Q073 "understands problems with teaching assignment"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.8345			
returning	98	2.1326	.8376	0.8060	-0.7526 ^a	0.4534
Item Q074 "judges work fairly"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	.5175			
returning	98	1.9265	.9333	0.1035	-0.9059 ^a	0.3671
Item Q092 "comfortable atmosphere present when classroom visits made"						
non-returning	8	2.2500	1.4880			
returning	98	1.9591	.9835	0.0667	0.7714 ^a	0.4422
Item Q093 "teacher's abilities used effectively"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	1.1952			
returning	98	2.0714	.9109	0.2243	-0.2082 ^a	0.8354
Item Q095 "discussion of personal and group problems encouraged"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	1.3451			
returning	94	2.1808	1.0772	0.3357	.0885 ^a	0.9296

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 3						
Item Q018 "petty issues and feuding present"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	1.4142			
returning	98	3.0510	.9672	0.0927	-1.4932 ^a	0.1384
Item Q022 "respect each other"						
non-returning	8	2.3750	1.0606			
returning	98	1.6320	.6944	0.0605	2.7850 ^a	0.0064*
Item Q023 "cooperation present"						
non-returning	8	2.3750	.7440			
returning	98	1.8979	.7797	0.9945	1.6688 ^a	0.0982
Item Q028 "new faculty readily accepted as professionals"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	1.0690			
returning	98	1.6836	.7543	0.1436	1.5122 ^a	0.1336
Item Q048 "teacher competency equivalent to others"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	.7559			
returning	98	1.5408	.7203	0.7347	0.6137 ^a	0.5408
Item Q052 "congenial staff"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	.6900			
returning	98	1.5012	.6432	0.6782	1.1708 ^a	0.2444
Item Q058 "teachers are well prepared"						
non-returning	7	1.7142	.7559			
returning	98	1.6224	.0009	0.3209	0.3842 ^a	0.7017

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 3						
Item Q054 "teacher cliques present"						
non-returning	7	1.2859	.4879 ^c			
returning	98	2.3877	1.0900	0.0482	-5.1305 ^b	0.0003*
Item Q055 "teachers work in harmony"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	.6900			
returning	97	1.6701	.6880	0.8522	1.7554 ^a	0.0822
Item Q077 "work enjoyable because of teacher cooperation"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.8345			
returning	98	1.8205	.7325	0.5180	0.1782 ^a	0.8589
Item Q080 "students values and attitudes positively influenced by teachers"						
non-returning	8	2.2500	.8864			
returning	98	2.0612	.7840	0.5373	0.6487 ^a	0.5179
Item Q084 "other teachers respect work"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	.7071			
returning	98	1.3571	.0580	0.6716	-0.4405 ^a	0.6605
Item Q087 "high professional standards present"						
non-returning	8	2.2500	1.0350			
returning	97	1.9381	.7190	0.1070	1.1384 ^a	0.2576
Item Q090 "initiative and creativity shown in teaching"						
non-returning	8	2.0000	.5345			
returning	98	2.0000	.7461	0.3525	0.0000 ^a	1.0000

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 4						
Item Q004 "good communication line regarding salary"						
non-returning	8	2.5000	1.1952			
returning	98	2.5714	.9632	0.3244	-0.1981 ^a	0.8434
Item Q009 "pay raise system satisfactory"						
non-returning	8	2.5000	1.1952			
returning	98	2.7244	1.0028	0.4103	-0.6003 ^a	0.5496
Item Q032 "school tries to meet other financial needs of teachers"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.1547			
returning	97	2.3814	.9622	0.4148	-1.000 ^a	0.3197
Item Q036 "fairness present in salary allocation"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	1.0690			
returning	98	2.2142	.8645	0.3535	-0.2080 ^a	0.8356
Item Q039 "salary increase policy understood"						
non-returning	7	2.5714	1.1338			
returning	98	2.2653	.9366	0.3962	0.8243 ^a	0.4117
Item Q065 "salary schedule recognizes teacher competency"						
non-returning	7	2.4285	.9759			
returning	98	2.6836	.9801	1.0000	-0.6654 ^a	0.5073
Item Q075 "salaries equivalent to other school districts"						
non-returning	8	2.5000	1.3093			
returning	98	2.2857	1.0551	0.3244	0.5425 ^a	0.5886

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 5						
Item Q001 "much time spent in reporting"						
non-returning	8	2.1250	1.2404			
returning	98	2.2040	.9520	0.2277	-0.2207 ^a	0.8258
Item Q006 "unreasonable amount of reporting expected"						
non-returning	8	2.7500	1.0350			
returning	98	2.9795	.8731	0.4225	-0.7055 ^a	0.4821
Item Q008 "community time is excessive"						
non-returning	8	2.7500	1.0350			
returning	98	3.2142	.8154	0.2809	-1.5175 ^a	0.1322
Item Q010 "greater teaching load than other teachers"						
non-returning	8	3.2500	1.1649			
returning	98	2.8061	1.0712	0.6393	1.1200 ^a	0.2653
Item Q011 "excessive extra-curricular load"						
non-returning	8	3.1250	.9910			
returning	98	2.7244	.9821	0.6475	1.1084 ^a	0.2703
Item Q014 "excessive hours for position"						
non-returning	8	2.5000	1.4142			
returning	98	2.7448	.9665	0.0921	-0.6540 ^a	0.5081
Item Q031 "scheduling not advantageous"						
non-returning	7	3.4289	.9759			
returning	97	2.9793	1.0400	0.9714	1.1069 ^a	0.2710

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob >(T)
Factor 5						
Item Q034 "inadequate time for professional contacts"						
non-returning	7	3.2857	.9511			
returning	97	3.1443	.7215	0.2409	0.4902 ^a	0.6251
Item Q040 "problem students assigned to classes"						
non-returning	7	3.0000	1.2909			
returning	97	2.4226	1.0688	0.4011	1.3619 ^a	0.1762
Item Q042 "unreasonable teaching load"						
non-returning	7	3.8571	.3779			
returning	98	3.4183	.7450	0.0856	1.5389 ^a	0.1269
Item Q045 "nonprofessional activities hampered"						
non-returning	7	3.2857	.9511			
returning	98	3.0918	.8383	0.5405	0.5862 ^a	0.5590
Factor 6						
Item Q017 "well balanced curriculum offered"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	.7440			
returning	98	2.0816	.9914	0.4290	-1.2714 ^a	0.2064
Item Q020 "individual student difference recognized in curriculum planning"						
non-returning	8	2.3750	.9161			
returning	98	2.2244	.9304	1.0000	0.4377 ^a	0.6626

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 6						
Item Q025 "major revisions needed"						
non-returning	7	2.5714	1.2338			
returning	98	2.6122	.8924	0.3027	-0.1149 ^a	0.9088
Item Q079 "school purposes cannot be achieved"						
non-returning	8	3.0000	1.0690			
returning	98	3.0816	.7553	0.1229	-0.2845 ^a	0.7766
Item Q088 "provides good preparation"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.9910			
returning	98	2.1734	.7325	0.1788	-1.0784 ^a	0.2834
Factor 7						
Item Q013 "desired social status met"						
non-returning	8	1.3750	.5175			
returning	98	4.0204	.8849	0.1357	-2.0289 ^a	0.0450*
Item Q015 "material and cultural needs met"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	.7071			
returning	97	2.0824	.9538	0.4078	-0.9624 ^a	0.3381
Item Q035 "teachers feel part of the community"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.0000			
returning	98	2.0204	.8370	0.4240	-0.0616 ^a	0.9510

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob >(T)
Factor 7						
Item Q063 "desired prestige provided"						
non-returning	7	1.2857	.4879			
returning	97	1.9587	.9232	0.1110	-1.9034 ^a	0.0398*
Item Q064 "standard of living is acceptable for family"						
non-returning	7	2.7142	1.3801 ^c			
returning	98	3.1530	.8415 ^c	0.0371	-0.8302 ^b	0.4368
Item Q068 "community respect for teachers"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.1547			
returning	98	2.0612	.8712	0.2323	-0.1758 ^a	0.8608
Item Q071 "not accepted by community"						
non-returning	7	2.7142	1.3801 ^c			
returning	98	3.1537	.8415 ^c	0.0371	-0.8302 ^b	0.4368
Factor 8						
Item Q066 "understands good education"						
non-returning	7	1.8571	1.2149			
returning	98	2.2448	.9531	0.2908	-1.0214 ^a	0.3094
Item Q067 "provides good place for family life"						
non-returning	7	2.1428	1.0690			
returning	97	2.0515	1.0446	0.7995	0.2231 ^a	0.8239

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob >(T)
Factor 8						
Item Q094 "concern with school system"						
non-returning	8	2.1250	1.2464			
returning	98	2.1428	.3494	0.0897	-0.0551	0.9562
Item Q096 "supports ethical procedures in teacher appointment and reappointment"						
non-returning	7	2.2857	.9511			
returning	98	2.1290	.9115	0.7501	0.4374 ^a	0.6628
Item Q097 "supports good educational program"						
non-returning	7	2.0000	1.1547			
returning	94	1.8510	.7614	0.0818	0.4807 ^a	0.6318
Factor 9						
Item Q016 "adequate supplies and equipment"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	1.1649			
returning	98	1.9285	1.0077	0.4817	-0.4766 ^a	0.6347
Item Q021 "well defined procedure for obtaining materials"						
non-returning	8	2.8750	.6408			
returning	98	2.3265	.9715	0.2432	1.5654 ^a	0.1205
Item Q049 "adequate audio-visual equipment"						
non-returning	7	1.4205	.7867			
returning	98	1.7755	.9582	0.6586	-0.9344 ^a	0.3523

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 9						
Item Q057 "adequate clerical service"						
non-returning	7	2.1425	1.0690			
returning	98	2.7051	1.0941	1.0000	-1.4322 ^a	0.1551
Item Q059 "adequate library facilities"						
non-returning	7	2.4285	1.3972			
returning	98	2.4285	1.1122	0.3233	0.0000 ^a	1.0000
Factor 10						
Item Q081 "unreasonable personal standards expected"						
non-returning	8	3.8750	.3535 ^c			
returning	98	3.0408	.9072 ^c	0.0154	5.3820 ^b	0.0001*
Item Q085 "nonprofessional activities unduly restricted"						
non-returning	8	3.3750	.9161			
returning	97	3.0515	.9828	0.9295	-0.8986 ^a	0.3709
Item Q091 "freedom to discuss controversial issues in classes"						
non-returning	8	2.8750	1.1259			
returning	98	2.1734	.8854	0.2776	2.1113 ^a	0.0371*
Item Q099 "pressures interfere with teaching"						
non-returning	7	2.7142	.9511			
returning	94	2.9148	.7986	0.4317	-0.6331 ^a	0.5281

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 11						
Item S01 "educational decisions rather than political"						
non-returning	8	2.1251	1.2464			
returning	95	2.4210	.9847	0.2872	-0.8001 ^a	0.4255
Item S02 "understands quality education"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	1.1259			
returning	95	2.0421	.8862	0.2802	-0.5016 ^a	0.6170
Item S03 "concerned with teacher problems"						
non-returning	8	2.2750	.9161			
returning	95	2.2576	.8741	0.7415	0.0530 ^a	0.9579
Item S04 "allows superintendent and staff right to their responsibilities"						
non-returning	8	2.1250	1.3562			
returning	95	1.8520	.8987	0.0690	0.7890 ^a	0.4320
Item S05 "effort made to provide adequate financing"						
non-returning	8	2.1250	1.2464			
returning	95	1.8526	.8375	0.0790	0.8484 ^a	0.3982
Item S06 "ethical procedures followed"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	1.1877			
returning	94	2.0957	.8433	0.1302	-1.4661 ^a	0.1458
Item S07 "meets educational needs of community"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	1.3606			
returning	94	1.8510	.7471	0.1217	-0.7938 ^a	0.4292

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob >(T)
Factor 11						
Item S08 "good relationship with superintendent"						
non-returning	8	2.3750	1.3024 ^c			
returning	94	1.7234	.7815 ^c	0.0230	1.3938 ^b	0.2038
Item S09 "teachers are not restrained in presenting problems"						
non-returning	8	2.2500	1.1649			
returning	95	2.6631	1.0064	0.4796	-1.1022 ^a	0.2730
Item S10 "teacher participation sought in policy making"						
non-returning	8	2.3750	1.1877			
returning	95	2.6947	1.0321	0.4939	-0.8321 ^a	0.4073
Factor 12						
Item S011 "concerned with teacher problems"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	.7071			
returning	95	2.1789	.8149	0.5750	-1.3480 ^a	0.1807
Item S012 "ethical procedures followed"						
non-returning	8	1.2500	.4629			
returning	94	1.9893	.7328	0.1426	-2.6250 ^a	0.0100*
Item S013 "democratic policy followed"						
non-returning	8	1.3750	.5175			
returning	95	2.0634	.8969	0.1269	02.1340 ^a	0.0353*

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Prob > F	"t" value	Prob > (T)
Factor 12						
Item S014 "understands quality education"						
non-returning	8	1.12500	.4629			
returning	95	1.6447	.7584	0.1673	-1.6275 ^a	0.1067
Item S015 "innovative teaching encouraged"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.9910			
returning	95	1.9789	.8870	0.5684	-0.3156 ^a	0.7529
Item S016 "works well with administrative staff"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	.8864			
returning	94	2.0851	.9689	0.8784	-0.4444 ^a	0.3472
Item S017 "imagination and creativity present"						
non-returning	8	1.8750	.9910			
returning	94	2.3829	.9028	0.7922	-1.4296 ^a	0.1560
Item S018 "leadership apparent"						
non-returning	8	1.6250	1.1877			
returning	95	1.8842	.8856	0.1919	-0.7739 ^a	0.4408
Item S019 "teachers informed about new policies"						
non-returning	8	1.7500	.8364			
returning	93	2.1505	1.010	0.7691	-1.0850 ^a	0.2806
Item S020 "community well informed"						
non-returning	8	1.8757	1.1259			
returning	94	2.0638	.9816	0.5020	-0.5166 ^a	0.6066

TABLE XXXVIII (Continued)

* Indicates significance at the .05 level

a Student's t test used

b Cochran and Cox tabulated t' test used

c Unequal variance

VITA

Rachel Ann Anderson

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: PERSISTENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING AS RELATED
TO STUDENT TEACHING AND TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Sulphur Springs, Texas, August 31, 1950,
the daughter of Billie N. and Lorine R. Anderson.

Education: Graduated from Sulphur Springs High School, Sulphur
Springs, Texas, in May, 1968; received Bachelor of Science
degree in Vocational Home Economics Education from East
Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, in May, 1972; re-
ceived Master of Science degree from East Texas State Uni-
versity, Commerce, Texas, in August, 1973; completed require-
ments for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State
University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1979.

Professional Experience: Vocational Home Economics Teacher, Sul-
phur Springs, Texas, 1972-76; Assistant Instruction, Home
Economics Department, East Texas State University, Commerce,
Texas, May, 1976-December, 1976, Graduate Teaching Associate,
Department of Home Economics Education, Oklahoma State Uni-
versity, Stillwater, Oklahoma, January, 1977-May, 1979.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association,
American Vocational Association, Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Delta
Kappa, Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron, American Association
of University Professors, American Association of University
Women, Oklahoma Home Economics Association.