

FACTORS INFLUENCING MONTANA STATE COLLEGE HOME
ECONOMICS GRADUATES FOR THE YEARS 1935
THROUGH 1955 TO ENTER, TO LEAVE, OR
TO REMAIN IN THE TEACHING
PROFESSION

BY

HELEN LORENA HOLLANDSWORTH

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the School for Advanced Graduate Studies of Michigan
State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Teacher Education
Home Economics Education

1959

Purpose

This study was undertaken to determine factors which seemed to influence home economics graduates from Montana State College to enter, to leave, or to remain in the teaching profession.

Methods

The total number (598) of Montana State College home economics graduates for the years 1935 through 1955 were surveyed by questionnaire. Data were obtained from 540, or 90.3 per cent, of the 598 possible respondents. Of the 540 graduates, 384, or 71.1 per cent, had completed student teaching, 308, or 57.0 per cent, had entered teaching, and fifty-eight, or 10.8 per cent, were teaching at the time of the survey.

Data were analyzed by use of the chi-square test and analysis of variance.

Conclusions

Objective factors common to the entire group were analyzed by chi-square to determine significant differences between those groups of graduates who had never taught, who had taught but were full time homemakers, who had taught but were employed in other work, and who were teaching. Factors which differentiated between these groups were: (1) college grade-point average, (2) income of husband, (3) marital status, (4) total number of children, (5) children under five years of age, (6) personal goals upon entering college, and (7) personal

goals at present. Factors which did not differentiate between the groups were: (1) age at graduation, (2) reasons for choosing teaching as a career, (3) time when graduate decided to teach, and (4) teachers in parental family.

Objective factors common only to those graduates with teaching experience were also analyzed by chi-square to determine significant differences between those graduates who had taught but were full time homemakers, had taught but were employed in other work, and who were teaching. Factors which differentiated between these groups were:

(1) personal goals upon entering teaching, (2) size of community, (3) equipment in home economics department, (4) courses completed beyond bachelor's degree, (5) participation in other professional activities, and (6) present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching. Factors which did not differentiate between the groups were: (1) school provision for operating expense, (2) quality of supervision by state home economics education supervisor, and (3) quality of supervision by the college home economics teacher education person.

Attitude factors were assigned scores which were combined into a total "satisfaction with teaching" score. Mean satisfaction scores were computed for graduates grouped into those (1) who graduated from 1935 through 1941, (2) 1942 through 1948, and (3) 1949 through 1955. The mean scores for each of these groups, when tested by analysis of variance, were found not to be significantly different. However, there was a significant difference in teaching satisfaction of the graduates who (1) had taught but were full time homemakers, (2) had

taught but were employed in other work, and (3) were teaching. The respondents who were teaching had the highest mean satisfaction score (73.0) while those who had taught but were full time homemakers or employed in other work had mean satisfaction scores of 69.4 and 65.0. The mean satisfaction score for the total group of 308 respondents was 69.5.

FACTORS INFLUENCING MONTANA STATE COLLEGE HOME
ECONOMICS GRADUATES FOR THE YEARS 1955
THROUGH 1955 TO ENTER, TO LEAVE, OR
TO REMAIN IN THE TEACHING
PROFESSION

BY

HELEN LORENA HOLLANDSWORTH

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the School for Advanced Graduate Studies of Michigan
State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Teacher Education
Home Economics Education

1959

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Irma Gross, Dr. Buford Stefflre, and Dr. Alice Thorpe, members of her Guidance Committee, for their interest and advice.

She is also greatly indebted to Montana State College administrators and graduates whose assistance made this study possible.

A deep debt of gratitude is due Dr. William Baten for his suggestions for statistical analysis, Dr. Bernard Corman for his helpful suggestions and careful reading of the manuscript, and Dr. Mary Lee Hurt for her enduring patience and understanding which made the completion of this study possible.

Thanks is also expressed to friends and family for their constant support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	1
Need for Study	4
Statement of Problem	9
Overview of the Study	9
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	11
Personal Factors	22
Year in School That Decision Was Made to Enter Teaching .	23
Chief Reason Influencing Choice of Teaching As a Career .	24
Dates of Graduation and/or Age at Graduation	25
College Grade-Point Average	28
Adequacy of Training in Subject Matter and/or Methods . .	29
Professional Adequacy	30
Educational Philosophy	32
Courses Completed Beyond the Bachelor's Degree	33
Other Types of Professional Activities	34
Personal Goals Upon Entering College	35
Personal Goals Upon Entering Teaching	36
Immediate Personal Occupational Goals	36
Reasons for Teaching	37
Opinions on the Worth of Junior and Senior High	
School Home Economics	38
Availability of Alternative Occupations	38
Home Factors	39
Other Teachers in Family	39
Attitude of Family Toward Teaching as a Career	40
Chances for Marriage	41
Marital Status and Home Responsibilities	41
Present Attitude of Husband Toward Teaching	44
Husband's Present Income	45
Community Factors	46
Size of Community	46
Cultural Opportunities	48
Living Arrangements	48
Status of Teaching in the Community	49
Restrictions on Personal Life	52

CHAPTER	PAGE
School Factors	53
Relationships with Administrators	53
Supervision by State and/or College Home Economics Education Staff	56
Relationships with Non-Administrative School Personnel	57
Attitude of Students	58
Creativity	60
Financial Opportunities	62
Teaching Load	64
Equipment and Operating Expense	66
Summary	68
III. HYPOTHESES	70
Hypothesis I	70
Hypothesis II	71
Hypothesis III	71
Hypothesis IV	72
IV. GATHERING DATA	73
Development of Questionnaire	73
Description of Population	75
Administration of Questionnaire	76
Summary	79
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA	80
Occupational Histories of Home Economics Graduates	80
Objective Factors Common to Total Population	90
Grade in School When Decision Was Made to Become a Teacher	91
Chief Reason Influencing Choice of Teaching as a Profession	93
Age at Graduation	96
College Grade-Point Average	97
Teachers in Parental Family	98
Marital Status	99
Income of Husband	100
Total Number of Children	102
Total Number of Children Under Five	104
Personal Goals Upon Entering College	105
Personal Goals at Present	106

CHAPTER	PAGE
Satisfaction in Teaching	108
Objective Factors Common to Those Who Have Taught	121
Personal Goals Upon Entering Teaching	122
Size of Community	123
Equipment in Home Economics Department	124
School Provision for Operating Expense	125
Courses Completed Beyond Bachelor's Degree	126
Other Types of Professional Activities	127
Present Attitude of Husband Toward Wife's Teaching	128
Supervision of State Home Economics Supervisor	130
Supervision of College Home Economics Teacher Education Person	131
Summary	132
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	135
Conclusions	135
Occupational Histories	135
Hypothesis I	137
Hypothesis II	137
Hypothesis III	138
Hypothesis IV	139
Implications	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
APPENDIX	150
Table XXXVI: Sources of Dissatisfaction Ranked by Difference in Means for the Fifteen Most Satisfied Teachers and the Fifteen Least Satisfied Teachers in a Group of Fifty Randomly Selected Questionnaires	151
Cover Letters and Questionnaire	152

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Home Economics Graduates in the Response and Non-Response Groups by Years of Graduation	77
II. Home Economics Graduates in the Response and Non-Response Groups in Three Grade-Point Average Categories	78
III. Home Economics Graduates in the Response and Non-Response Groups in two Marital Status Categories	78
IV. Classification of Montana Home Economics Graduates by Time of Graduation and Teaching Status	81
V. Employment Experience of Home Economics Graduates Since Graduation	83
VI. Number of Times Home Economics Graduates Had Left Gainful Employment	84
VII. Number of Times Home Economics Graduates Had Left Teaching	85
VIII. Per Cent of Possible Teaching Time During Which Home Economics Graduates Have Actually Taught	86
IX. Completion of Student Teaching as Reported by Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Experiences	88
X. Present Occupations of Graduates Grouped According to Teaching Experience	89
XI. Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status and Time of Making Decision to Teach	92
XII. Reasons for Choosing Teaching As a Career as Expressed by Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	94
XIII. Miscellaneous Reasons for Becoming Teachers Given by Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	95

TABLE	PAGE
XIV. Age at Graduation of Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	96
XV. College Grade-Point Average of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	97
XVI. Teachers in the Parental Family of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	99
XVII. Marital Status of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	100
XVIII. Income of Husbands of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	101
XIX. Total Number of Children of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	103
XX. Total Number of Children Under Five of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	104
XXI. Personal Goals Upon Entering College Indicated by Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	105
XXII. Present Personal Goals of Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	107
XXIII. Home Economics Graduates Grouped by Years of Graduation With the Mean Satisfaction Score and Standard Deviation for Each Group	110
XXIV. Analysis of Variance Testing Mean Satisfaction Scores of Graduates for Years 1935-41, 1942-48, and 1949-55	111
XXV. Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status With the Mean Satisfaction Score and Standard Deviation for Each Group	112
XXVI. Analysis of Variance Testing Mean Satisfaction Scores of Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	113
XXVII. Personal Goals of Home Economics Graduates Upon Entering Teaching in Relation to Teaching Status	122

TABLE

PAGE

XXVIII.	Population of Community as Reported by Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	123
XXIX.	Equipment in Home Economics Departments as Rated by Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status . .	124
XXX.	Home Economics Graduates' Ratings of Adequacy of School Provision for Operating Expense in Relation to Teaching Status	125
XXXI.	Courses Completed Beyond Bachelor's Degree by Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	126
XXXII.	Participation of Home Economics Graduates in Professional Activities Other Than Course Work in Relation to Teaching Status	128
XXXIII.	Husband's Attitude Toward Wife's Teaching as Rated by Home Economics Graduates Grouped in Relation to Teaching Status	129
XXXIV.	Quality of Supervision by State Home Economics Supervisor as Reported by Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	130
XXXV.	Quality of Supervision by College Home Economics Teacher Education Person Reported by Home Economics Graduates in Relation to Teaching Status	132
XXXVI.	Sources of Dissatisfaction Ranked by Difference in Means for the Fifteen Most Satisfied Teachers and the Fifteen Least Satisfied Teachers in a Group of Fifty Randomly Selected Questionnaires	151

CHAPTER I

ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

The United States has long been dedicated to the principle of a fair educational opportunity for each child. Because of high birth rates in the 1940 decade, and for other reasons, increased enrollments in both the elementary and secondary schools are making a fair educational opportunity increasingly difficult to achieve. The swelling enrollments have made staffing of schools one of the most critical problems in education.

The shortage of qualified teachers, which became acute during World War II, has remained during the post war years. In the fall of 1957, the Research Division of the National Education Association estimated a shortage of 120,000 elementary and high school teachers.¹ The continuing character of shortage of teachers was further emphasized in the Occupational Outlook Handbook:

In order to staff the new classrooms that must be provided for the rising numbers of students, tens of thousands of additional teachers will be needed annually. Moreover, still greater numbers will be required, particularly in elementary and high schools, to replace those who leave the profession. Although precise information is not available on the number leaving the field each year, it is conservatively estimated that at least eight percent of the elementary and five percent of the high school teachers leave teaching annually.²

¹National Education Association, Research Division, "The 1957 Teacher Supply and Demand Reports," The Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (March, 1957), p. 33.

²Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veteran's Administration. U. S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1957. Bulletin No. 1215, p. 57.

Several factors have contributed to the continuing shortage of teachers. (1) During the war years, teachers began to leave school rooms to go into industrial jobs connected with the war effort for both patriotic and financial reasons. The financial attraction of other employment has continued to draw teachers from the profession. (2) Technological developments have created new jobs for which many teachers are well qualified. Teachers, especially women teachers, have probably never been faced with so many alternatives in job selection. Teaching is now only one of many careers open to the college graduate whose undergraduate training was in professional education. (3) The increased numbers of children are flooding the schools at a time when the number of youth who are reaching adulthood is decreasing. The lowered birthrate during the depression years reduced the potential supply of new teachers during the ten years, 1945-55, at the rate of 100,000 per year.³

There are doubtless many additional factors affecting the supply of teachers but the discussion thus far is perhaps sufficient to point out that staffing the nation's schools is a problem which for the foreseeable period ahead must receive increased attention. It is not a problem of numbers alone. Mere increased numbers of teachers will not, in itself, solve the basic problem since the requirement of a fair educational opportunity demands concern for the quality as well as quantity of teachers. The quality of education provided for the

³National Education Association, op. cit., p. 18.

nation's youth can be no better than the quality of school personnel.

The quality of education provided in our schools is, however, directly affected by the persisting shortage of teachers. For not only has it become difficult in many areas to obtain teachers, but the turnover problem has increased as well. Increased turnover has been shown to have an important effect on the quality of teaching. Thus, Army, who studied the problem in the home economics area said:

The importance of reducing teacher turnover was shown by the fact that in each of the schools where students showed high achievement in the tests administered in the spring of 1947, the same teachers had been in the schools for three or more years, or there had been only one change during that period.⁴

One answer to the problem of staffing our schools and reducing turnover is that of replacing women with men.⁵ It is true that women leave the teaching profession in large numbers for marriage and home responsibilities and recruiting more men teachers would, no doubt, help to stabilize the profession. It, however, seems impossible at the present time to recruit men in sufficient numbers to solve the teacher shortage. The teacher shortage reflects a similar personnel problem in many sectors of our economy and the National Manpower Council has indicated that women are an essential part of our manpower resources.⁶ Women are not only accepted in the labor force today but

⁴Clara Brown Army, The Effectiveness of the High School Program in Home Economics--A Report of a Five-Year Study of Twenty Minnesota Schools, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952), p. 47.

⁵Howard Guion Andrus, "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary School Teachers in New York State Central Schools for the Year 1943-49" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1951), p. 226.

⁶National Manpower Council, Womanpower, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), p. 3.

are deemed necessary in providing many of the educational, health, and social services as well as in producing and distributing goods. Moreover, in our nation's history women have long played a major role in education. Of the nation's 1.1 million teachers reported in the 1950 census only twenty-five per cent were men.⁷ Although the trend in the proportion of men teachers is upward the rate of change is too slow to have any appreciable effect on the shortage in the period ahead. It seems clear that women will continue to play a vital and major part in the staffing of our educational institutions.

The substitution of women teachers by men teachers in large numbers seems impractical. A more realistic step toward solving the problem of staffing the nation's schools would seem to involve making more effective use of womanpower. If womanpower is to be used effectively in educating the nation's children, a better understanding of women teachers is needed. Especially we need to know the answers to such questions as the following: At which points in their lives do they teach? Why do they teach? Why do they leave teaching? Why do they re-enter teaching, if they do?

NEED FOR STUDY

Home economics departments at the elementary, secondary, and college levels are staffed almost entirely by women. Increased knowledge of women workers, therefore, is more urgently needed in this

⁷Ibid., p. 60.

area than in many of the other teaching fields, and should, in addition, provide information applicable to the problems of women in other branches of the teaching profession. Home economics teachers seem especially appropriate for study since the turnover rate is so high among this group. Andrus pointed out that home economics was the only teaching field which appeared consistently among areas having the highest turnovers.⁸ Re-enforcing Andrus's conclusion, a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported as follows:

The shortage of home economists in the high school teaching field is especially critical. One-third to one-fourth of all secondary teaching positions become vacant yearly, and it is estimated that as many as 5,000 home economics graduates are needed annually for replacement purposes. In addition, teachers are needed in schools that are expanding their home economics departments or are installing such departments for the first time. Additional teachers are needed also to take care of expanding enrollments in secondary schools. Since 1950, the number of college graduates with home economics majors who have prepared to teach has increased only slightly, from 2,856 to 3,124; moreover, some of the home economics graduates who prepare to teach do not, in fact, become classroom teachers.⁹

This general shortage of home economics teachers was emphasized by the following discussion of data collected in the Central Region of the United States in 1949:

... one out of every five girls prepared to teach homemaking did not take a teaching job (two-thirds of these girls gave marriage as their reason for not teaching).... Although there was some variation by states, it was found that approximately 30

⁸Andrus, op. cit., pp. 106-107.

⁹Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veteran's Administration, op. cit., p. 177.

per cent of the homemaking teachers taught less than two years and another 30 per cent less than four years.¹⁰

In a related finding Army reported that in an investigation covering a period of five years that only 7 to 28 per cent of the home economics teachers remained in the groups of Minnesota schools being studied.¹¹

A typical problem of staffing elementary and high school home economics departments was found in Montana. The Montana State Supervisor of Home Economics Education supplied the following pertinent information for the years 1953-54 through 1957-58: (a) Eighteen homemaking departments opened and remained open; eleven opened for one year only; three for two years only; one for three years only; one for four years only; and three opened and closed intermittently (total thirty-seven while thirteen other departments closed permanently. (b) Of the 126 home economics departments operating continuously during these five years, only twenty-two had no teacher change, eighteen had one change, twenty-nine had two changes, thirty-one had three changes, eighteen had four changes, and eight had five changes. (c) Of the 386 teachers employed during the five years, 197 taught one year only, ninety taught two years, thirty-nine taught three years, twenty-six taught four years, and thirty-four taught the full five years. (d) Thirty-four teachers married and continued to teach during this five

¹⁰Beulah I. Coon, "Trends in Home Economics Enrollments," Journal of Home Economics, XLIV (May, 1952), p. 337.

¹¹Army, loc. cit.

year period while eighty women with families came back to the teaching profession.¹²

The turnover described above needs to be explained if womanpower is to be used effectively in the teaching profession. It is generally assumed that vocational satisfaction results in workers remaining in that vocation. In home economics, the relationship of job satisfaction and teacher supply has not been systematically explored. While studies have been made to determine satisfactions and dissatisfactions of teachers of home economics, these have not been followed by studies to determine if these dissatisfactions do actually cause teachers to leave their positions.

Definite benefits would result from studies determining what factors, including job satisfaction, may be useful in predicting whether or not a teacher will enter or remain in the profession. Knowledge of such factors should: (1) help in the selection of teacher education students, (2) suggest to administrators, school board members, and communities positive steps that might be taken to correct situations which cause teacher dissatisfaction and turnover, (3) make possible the development of programs to encourage qualified women teachers to enter or re-enter the teaching profession, and (4) help to educate women more effectively for the dual role of homemaker and teacher.

Since the present study emphasizes especially an exploration

¹²Flora Martin, State Supervisor of Home Economics Education, Department of Vocational Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana. Personal interview.

of factors which influence home economics graduates to enter, to remain in, or to leave the teaching profession, the third of the above possible benefits will be further developed here. There are many qualified home economics teachers who either have never entered the profession or have left. In fact, Laxson reported that more than one-third of the 2,762 home economics education majors who graduated from 1947-50 did not take a teaching job.¹³ Home economics education graduates were necessarily included in the following discussion by the Research Division of the National Education Association:

(a) That the general population contains some tens of thousands of college graduates who can fully meet the standard requirements for the teaching certificate without further effort on their part; (b) personal circumstances in every case have deterred each of these individuals from entering or continuing in teaching; (c) only a change in the personal situation of the individual is likely to reshape his occupational choice; (d) since the individual did not choose to remain in teaching, although he is qualified to do so, it is not likely that teaching will now attract him unless the remuneration and general conditions now have a stronger pull than heretofore.¹⁴

If this potential supply of home economics teachers in the general population is to be utilized, additional knowledge of factors which would influence them to teach must be made available. If an individual has made a decision not to enter or to leave teaching, it seems unlikely that he will reverse that decision unless some of the factors considered in the original decision are known and changed.

¹³Mary Laxson, "A Look at the Homemaking Teacher Supply," Journal of Home Economics, XLV (May, 1953), pp. 308-310.

¹⁴National Education Association, op. cit., p. 23.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

This study sought to determine factors influencing home economists to enter, to remain in, or to leave the teaching profession. An intensive study of home economists trained by Montana State College was made, but the analysis should have implications for the more general problem of teacher retention. Specifically, the following questions were investigated:

- (1) What factors are associated with the decisions of Montana State College home economics graduates to enter, to remain in, or to leave teaching?¹⁵
- (2) How is satisfaction with teaching related to decisions of Montana State College home economics graduates to remain in or to leave teaching?
- (3) What specific factors are associated with teaching satisfaction?

Specific hypotheses to provide answers to these general inquiries are set forth in Chapter III. Chapter II develops the rationale upon which these hypotheses are based.

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The present chapter presented the problem and the need for the

¹⁵Home economics graduates as used in this study refer to those people completing the undergraduate professional curriculum in home economics to earn a Bachelor of Science Degree.

study. Chapter II will review the literature from a selected bibliography concerning teacher turnover and satisfaction as related to personal, home, community, and school factors. Chapter III will formulate the specific hypotheses tested and Chapter IV will detail methods and procedures by which data were obtained to test these hypotheses. Chapter V will report detailed analyses of the data obtained and Chapter VI will present conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Chapter I presented the need for determining factors which affect teacher retention and/or satisfaction and stated the problem. The present chapter reviews research pertinent to the probable reasons for the current lack of qualified teachers and will develop a rationale to serve as a basis for further study of these factors.

Even though the present study was limited to women, studies concerning the reasons for retention and/or satisfaction of men teachers were included in this analysis. The importance for employment of sex differences was clear cut and well established on certain factors such as marriage and child rearing, but these differences were not conclusive in relation to the majority of the factors considered in the present study. Men and women differed somewhat on many factors, but these differences were relative rather than absolute. For example, many studies showed that salary was more important to men than to women, but it was also a factor of some importance to women. Therefore, studies concerning both men and women were included in this review.

It is common knowledge that women teachers are an unstable group in terms of turnover rate and actual withdrawal from the profession. Since womanpower must be utilized effectively to staff the nation's schools, reasons for the high rates of turnover and withdrawal must be sought. It seems reasonable to assume that people may change jobs because of (1) objective factors concerning the person, the home,

the community, or the work situation, and/or (2) the attitudes which one holds concerning these same categories. Any study dealing with factors influencing job changes and withdrawals will need to consider both objective and attitude factors.

Objective factors are considered here as those for which actual factual information is obtainable. For example, in studying the role of salary in teacher retention, two types of data could be secured. First, one could collect objective data on the actual salaries received. One could also secure attitude data on the ways in which these salaries are perceived. To one person \$5,000 might seem very adequate as an income while to another it would seem only a pittance. In the case of women leaving teaching, objective factors such as actual family responsibilities seem to be the reasons most frequently given for withdrawal while moving to a better job seems to be an accepted reason for turnover. Less frequently mentioned, but probably definitely affecting the decisions of women teachers to leave or remain in teaching, are the attitudinal factors involved in job satisfaction. Data on objective factors are relatively easy to collect, to tabulate, and to understand. It will be necessary to analyze further, however, the factors of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction was defined by Hoppock as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job."¹

¹Robert Hoppock, Job Satisfaction (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1935), p. 47.

Hoppock recognized that there is probably no single variable of job satisfaction which operates independent of the other satisfactions in one's life. He recognized that factors such as social status, health, and family relationships may be as important as the job itself.²

Moreover, the degree of job satisfaction probably varies from day to day or even within the same day. And very often overt satisfaction may express a rationalization of a situation which cannot be changed. Admitting these difficulties and fluctuations, Hoppock defended the construct as worthy of study as a generalized trait:

A person may never be wholly satisfied. And yet there are persons in the world who are contented enough to remain in one job year after year, making no particular effort to change; while others are so unhappy that they move from job to job, worry over their discontent, seek the help of friends in effecting readjustments, and in various other ways manifest a state of unrest.³

If one accepts Hoppock's definition of job satisfaction, then one will also have to accept the fact that the total and enduring satisfaction one receives from one's job results as much from the attitudes one develops about the various components making up that job as from the actual circumstances of the job. Krech and Crutchfield said:

A human psychological existence without beliefs is virtually inconceivable, for it would be an existence without continuity. One of the major roles that beliefs play in the individual's personality is in providing structure and continuity for his psychological world. Beliefs can be seen as the building blocks

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Ibid.

of his world; and for all practical purposes, the pattern of his beliefs and attitudes may be taken as equivalent to the pattern of his psychological world. The continuity from one psychological situation to the next is given primarily by the enduring pattern of his beliefs and attitudes (among which are the very important beliefs and attitudes that he holds about himself). In the absence of such enduring structures, the individual would be a "new" individual in each situation; his behavior would tend to be organized only in terms of the immediate pattern of concomitant stimuli and his momentary needs.⁴

Industry first recognized the importance of attitudes in job satisfaction to both employees and employers and has been extremely active in conducting job satisfaction research. McGregor and Arsenberg studied attitudes toward management among a group of research engineers in an electrical manufacturing company. They found that:

The important common attitudes of the group toward company policy and toward management were found to be directly associated with conflicts arising out of inconsistencies between the two groups of factors listed above. These attitudes included: (1) the demand for greater participation in management, (2) resentment of increased restrictions upon the freedom of action of the engineer which were normal accompaniments of the development of the company, and (3) criticisms symptomatic of the need for greater consistency and predictability with respect to the behavior of the management group.⁵

Tiffin supported the theory that attitudes are important in job satisfaction. He also made the point that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for an individual to understand clearly his own attitudes and why he holds them:

⁴ David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.), p. 153.

⁵ Douglas McGregor and Conrad Arsenberg, "The Genesis of Attitudes Toward Management," Abstracted in Psychological Bulletin, XXXVII (July, 1940), p. 434.

Many employees are themselves unaware of what is needed to make them satisfied with their jobs. This does not mean that the employees are unintelligent or that they have any special disability to analyze their true motives. It simply illustrates a well-established principle of normal human behavior, namely, that it is difficult for anyone to identify in clear and unmistakable terms the forces that underlie his feelings and actions. Everyone has observed the employee who, under one supervisor, continually sulks on the job because "the company doesn't pay him what he is worth," and, under another supervisor, works in a contented and industrious manner for exactly the same wage. It is not unusual to watch a man's attitude shift from one of chronic discontent to one of complete satisfaction following a shift from a job of low status to one of higher in this intangible quality even though the change in jobs involved no appreciable increase in wages.⁶

Brayfield, Wells and Strate attempted to find interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. Of interest in this study was the finding of no statistically significant relationships between job satisfaction and general satisfaction among the female employees. An attempt was made to explain this finding with the hypothesis that work was a less important factor in the lives of these women than in the lives of the men. The following peripheral evidence was offered as support:

The women were somewhat more likely than were the men to say that their job did not give them a chance to work off their emotions, that it was not exciting, that it was nothing more than a way of making a living, and that they did not have to work for a living. Also they tended to be somewhat more certain that they were doing as well in their jobs as their family expected, and that their family would not like for them to change jobs; they were more satisfied with the prestige which their jobs gave them with their friends.⁷

⁶Joseph Tiffin, Industrial Psychology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943), p. 314.

⁷Arthur Brayfield, Richard V. Wells, and Marvin W. Strate, "Interrelationships Among Measures of Job Satisfaction and General Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (August, 1957), p. 204.

In contrast, a study of the dissatisfactions in work as reported by 122 male youth showed a rather wide range of sources of dissatisfaction. Forty-four per cent disliked the nature of the work, 24 per cent attributed dissatisfaction to deficiencies in their personality and social attitudes, 9 per cent each mentioned lack of education, uncongenial work conditions, no opportunity for promotion, and 5 per cent mentioned monotony of tasks, long hours and insufficient salary.⁸

The above discussion has attempted to point out that job satisfaction results from a variety of circumstances and that attitudes toward these circumstances are probably as important as the actual situations. Hoppock discussed the importance of studying job satisfaction:

Whether or not one finds his employment sufficiently satisfactory to continue in it, either permanently or until he has prepared himself for greater responsibilities, is a matter of importance to employer and employee. To state the problem is no less significant: Subject any group of normal persons to intolerable working conditions and revolt is inevitable; first in strikes; if they fail, in riots; finally, if necessary, in political or social revolution. Recognition of this fact has been one of the principal justifications of occupational education, guidance, and personnel work in secondary school, college, and industry; and some idea as to the extent of dissatisfaction is basic to intelligent consideration of many questions in these and other fields.⁹

Job satisfaction seems basic if an individual is going to perform efficiently and happily in his position. It is not meant that each worker should reach a state of complete satisfaction since this might

⁸ Goodwin Watson and Jerome M. Seidman, "Dissatisfactions in Work," Journal of Social Psychology, XIII (February, 1941), p. 186.

⁹ Hoppock, loc. cit.

result in being content with things as they are. Progress is probably made at times because of the dissatisfaction experienced by workers. The desirable situation may well be one where some dissatisfaction is experienced but not to a degree that is so intense and painful that both the individual and society may be injured.

Probably industry has made the most progress in studying and understanding job satisfaction. Education has been slower to recognize that teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction may be one of the determinants of the quality of education and actually of the supply of teachers. With the recognition of the importance of job satisfaction for teachers has come attempts to study satisfaction in teaching. Many of these studies supported the theory that job satisfaction is an important factor in the decisions made by teachers to leave or to remain in the teaching profession. There was also support for the idea that much of the turnover within the profession resulted from dissatisfaction. The following discussion of research supports the theory that job satisfaction as we have defined it above is an important and pertinent factor in teacher retention.

Derthick reported that "working conditions" and "dissatisfactions with the teaching profession" were rated second and third in importance as reasons why teachers left the profession. Items included in "working conditions" were factors in the teaching environment such as crowded classrooms, inadequate facilities, insufficient teaching materials, extra duties, heavy schedules, night work, pressures of overwork, lack of communication with others, and low morale. Included

under "dissatisfaction with the teaching profession" were reasons such as routine and monotony of teaching, lack of prestige, and disappointment with conduct and training of fellow teachers.¹⁰ In the study, Factors Affecting the Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers, the data offered further support for the relationship of job satisfaction to decisions of teachers to remain in or leave the profession:

Of the 971 teachers, 65 per cent planned to teach the following year, 27 per cent were uncertain, and 8 per cent had decided to leave the profession. The mean job satisfaction scores for the three groups were 52.47, 45.80 and 45.39 respectively. Teachers expecting to teach next year tended to have significantly higher general job satisfaction scores than those not expecting to teach. Sources of irritation must have prevailed about equally for those who were uncertain and for those who were leaving the profession. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that many of these teachers would remain in teaching if conditions were such as to make them sufficiently satisfied with the job....

This study confirms the belief that teacher satisfaction is influenced by a variety of factors.¹¹

Moreover, Pepper, in a study of 201 ex-teachers, reported that their dislikes for teaching were very similar to their reasons given for leaving teaching.¹²

However, Andrus showed that the evidence was not conclusive

¹⁰ Lawrence Derthick, Jr., "Factors Involved in Teachers Leaving the Education Profession" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1957), pp. 137, 36.

¹¹ American Vocational Association, Inc., Committee on Research and Publications, Factors Affecting The Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers, AVA Research Bulletin, No. 3 (Washington: The American Vocational Association, 1948), p. 4.

¹² James M. Pepper, "Factors Involved in the Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Michigan" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne University, 1954), p. 113.

regarding the importance of teaching satisfaction as a factor in teacher withdrawal. He reported that 23 per cent of the teachers he studied indicated they were moving to better positions, 42.3 per cent resigned because of dissatisfaction and 48.5 per cent were leaving the profession. Only 12.9 per cent were dismissed. He further stated that two-thirds of the group who moved to better positions were also dissatisfied with their previous positions. It was significant that few of the teachers resigning because of dissatisfaction actually withdrew from the profession. Andrus indicated that causes for withdrawal must be associated with teachers' personal lives outside the profession. He also concluded that "regardless of whether the causes of dissatisfaction were actually true, that if the teacher sincerely believed these causes to be operative then they were, in effect, actually operative from the teacher's viewpoint."¹³ Dillon also concluded that the data did not form conclusive evidence that sources of dissatisfaction were causative agents in the exodus from the teaching profession. It was found, however, that some teachers were experiencing disappointment in every area covered in the study.¹⁴ Knox, too, concluded that teacher turnover in contrast to withdrawal from teaching was influenced

¹³ Howard Guion Andrus, "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary-School Teachers in New York State Central Schools for the Year 1948-49" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1951), pp. 157-158.

¹⁴ Marvin H. Dillon, "Appraisals by Teachers and Former Teachers of Some Sources of Dissatisfaction in Secondary Teaching" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1955), p. 95.

by job satisfaction, and this finding supported the conclusion of Andrus in the study reported above.¹⁵

In a study involving home economics teachers, Paolucci reported:

The beginning teachers in this group were generally satisfied with teaching. All of the teachers indicated that they liked teaching. Twenty of the twenty-four indicated that they felt satisfied with teaching most of the time; four stated that they felt satisfied with teaching about half of the time. Thirteen of the group indicated that they did not know of any job for which they were qualified that would induce them to leave teaching. Eleven of the twenty-four said that they were not eager to leave teaching but would do so if they could get a better job. Seventeen said that they liked teaching about as well as most people like their jobs; while seven said that they liked teaching better than most people like their jobs.¹⁶

Even though the twenty-four home economics teachers in the above study were satisfied, eleven reported that they would leave teaching for a better job. In contrast, Haas discussed persistence of home economics graduates in vocational roles:

The findings indicate clear evidence that favorableness of attitude toward a vocation and presence in the vocation are directly related. For example, those individuals whose current vocation is primarily homemaking have a higher mean score on the homemaking attitude scale than on the high school teaching scale . . . the mean differences in attitude scores for these two groups of individuals are significant at the two per cent level of confidence.¹⁷

¹⁵Carl Warner Knox, "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Recent Graduates of The University of Illinois Now Engaged in School Teaching and Administration" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1953) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XIII, p. 1043.

¹⁶Beatrice Paolucci, "Decision-Making in Relation to Management in Classes of Home Economics by Beginning Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956), p. 45.

¹⁷Mary Helen Haas, "A Study of Certain Factors Related to the Vocational Activity of Home Economics-Education Graduates" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957), p. 131.

Haas further discussed the variables which she believed were related to the choice of vocational role made by the home economics graduate:

The theory tested in this study suggests that the choice between two alternate vocations for these home economics education graduates will be determined by several variables: attitude toward each vocation, the commitments one has to the vocation now being performed, the perceived adequacy of the income provided by the current role, and the vocational satisfaction experienced by the person in her present occupation.... These variables are thought to explain, at least in part, whether or not a homemaker will change to high school home economics teaching and whether a high school home economics teacher is likely to shift to homemaking.¹⁸

O'Donnell emphasized the importance of considering the satisfaction of the home economics teacher when she said:

In a day when there is such a shortage of home economics teachers and when the supply of prospective teachers is limited, the problem of professional morale and job satisfaction has strategic importance for program development, for recruitment and for continued service of all professional leaders in home economics education, whether they are employed at the secondary, college level and/or in supervision.¹⁹

Investigators generally seemed to be in agreement that job satisfaction does not come from any one source. Manning's study indicated that job satisfaction was not dependent upon salary alone but rather upon one's reaction to the over-all job and its location.²⁰

¹⁸Ibid., p. 132.

¹⁹Beatrice Olson O'Donnell, "Discrepancies Between Beliefs of Leaders in Homemaking Education in Michigan and Practices in Local Homemaking Programs" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State College, 1954), p. 221.

²⁰Walton Manning, "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of Selected Teachers in Favored Urban and Less Favored Rural Teaching Positions" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1954) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XIV, p. 1586.

Kline, in a study of satisfactions and annoyances in teaching, also concluded that there was no one possible source of satisfaction or annoyance in teaching and that possible sources of annoyance arose more out of what teachers thought was expected of them. Satisfactions and annoyances grew from both situations and persons.²¹

We may conclude from the above discussion that both objective factors, the situation as it actually exists, and attitude factors, the situation as it is perceived by the teacher, may be determinants in teacher turnover and withdrawal. In the remainder of this chapter, factors, both objective and attitude, will be discussed in relation to teacher retention and/or satisfaction. This discussion will be organized under four main categories: (1) personal factors, (2) home factors, (3) community factors, and (4) school factors.

PERSONAL FACTORS

The personal factors category will include: (a) year in school that decision was made to enter teaching, (b) chief reason influencing choice of teaching as a career, (c) dates of graduation and/or age at graduation, (d) college grade-point average, (e) adequacy of training in subject matter and/or teaching methods, (f) professional adequacy, (g) educational philosophy, (h) courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree, (i) other types of professional activities, (j) personal goals

²¹Frances Florence Kline, "Satisfactions and Annoyances in Teaching," Journal of Experimental Education, XVIII (December, 1949), pp. 88-89.

upon entering college, (r) personal goals upon entering teaching, (1) immediate personal occupational goals, (m) reasons for teaching, (n) opinions of worth of junior and senior high school home economics, and (o) availability of alternative occupations. These factors will be discussed in the order listed.

Year In School That Decision Was Made To Enter Teaching

Only two studies included in this review attempted to relate time of career choice to either teacher retention or satisfaction. A third study investigated decisions to enroll in home economics but not in teaching specifically. Of the 210 ex-teachers surveyed by Pepper, three-fourths of the men teachers and two-thirds of all teachers stated that they received their information about teaching during their college careers. Relatively few said they received assistance during or before high school years.²² Knox found that the most satisfied group of teachers chose educational work earlier than the least satisfied group.²³ Wright and Corbin reported that over 50 per cent of the home economics students included in their study made their final decision to enroll in college during the senior year in high school, 14 per cent during the junior year, and about 20 per cent after graduation from high school.²⁴

²²Pepper, op. cit., p. 21.

²³Knox, loc. cit.

²⁴Elizabeth Hansen Wright and Florence Corbin, "Factors in Choice of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, XLIV (April, 1952), p. 265.

Although the data were inconclusive they seemed to indicate a relationship between time of occupational choice and persistency in that choice. It seemed reasonable that a person who made an occupational choice early would have an opportunity to test his decision. Thus, if he was a potential drop-out, he might drop out early in the training period. This factor definitely seemed worthy of further investigation.

Chief Reason Influencing Choice Of Teaching As A Career

Each person is faced, at some point in his life, with the necessity of choosing a vocational role. An intelligent decision in this respect might well be a factor in later persistence in the chosen role. Knowledge of whom or what influenced home economics graduates to choose teaching as a career in relation to their persistence and/or satisfaction in teaching might be very useful both in recruiting and retaining teachers. Only a few studies have investigated this factor and only one related it to withdrawal from teaching.

Irland reported that both current majors in and drop-outs from the home economics education curriculum indicated that both parents and homemaking teachers had been inspirations for majoring in home economics.²⁵ Wright and Corbin, although they attempted to find reasons for enrolling in home economics with no mention of teaching, supported Irland with the finding that mothers ranked first and home-

²⁵Marquita L. Irland, "An Analysis of the Home Economics Teacher Education Program in Three Michigan Colleges" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne University, 1956), p. 88.

making teachers ranked second.²⁶ Paolucci, in a study of twenty-four beginning home economics teachers, reported very different reasons for choosing teaching. Sixteen gave enjoyment of the subject matter taught in home economics as the reason for choosing teaching, five said they liked to work with people in helping them become better family members, and three said that teaching combined easily with marriage.²⁷ Pepper, in a study of ex-teachers, found that although low salary was the top reason for leaving teaching very few said that they became teachers for financial reasons. Over half of the ex-teachers reported entering teaching because they enjoyed working with children and other people.²⁸

The research reviewed was tangential and inconclusive regarding the importance of this factor. The theory arguing for its inclusion in the present study was that a rational decision made upon a sound basis would seem to lead both to persistence and satisfaction with that decision.

Dates of Graduation And/Or Age At Graduation

There appeared to be conflicting evidence with regard to the importance of age and employment status. Clark, in comparing a group of teachers who left and a group of teachers who remained in the field

²⁶Wright and Corbin, loc. cit.

²⁷Paolucci, op. cit., p. 44.

²⁸Pepper, op. cit., p. 110.

of vocational agriculture, found that ages at the time of matriculation and graduation were statistically significant. Those teachers who were older at matriculation and graduation tended to remain in the teaching profession.²⁹ Clark's findings are supported by several other studies. For example, Hill found that youth was a strong factor in the decisions of teachers to leave the profession permanently.³⁰ In a study of first-year teachers, the Research Division of the National Education Association found that up to age forty, the older a person was when he began to teach, the more likely it was that he was satisfied. After the age of forty, the likelihood of finding teaching satisfaction decreased sharply.³¹ LaBue, in a study of female students, reported that those women who persisted in preparing for teaching were older than those who did not complete training.³² Lehman found a slightly different relationship between age and the

²⁹ Raymond McCallum Clark, "Factors Associated With Decisions of Michigan Teachers to Remain in or to Leave the Field of Teaching Vocational Agriculture" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1950), p. 75.

³⁰ Wayne Walter Hill, "Factors Contributing to the Problem of Teachers in the Secondary Schools of Maryland Leaving the Profession from 1950 to 1955" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 76.

³¹ National Education Association, Research Division, "First-Year Teachers in 1954-55," National Education Research Bulletin, XXXIV (February, 1956), p. 39.

³² Anthony Charles LaBue, "An Analysis of Some Factors Associated With Persistence of Interest in Teaching as a Vocational Choice" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1954), p. 166.

employment of married home economics women. She stated that:

The graduates showing the highest employment rate were those of the five years immediately preceding the study and those of twenty to thirty years earlier. In each case at least a third of the married women reporting from these classes were employed. The early years of marriage before the children began to arrive and the later years when the children had grown up were, logically enough, the times of highest employment.³³

It does seem logical, considering the life cycle of women, that time for child bearing and rearing will be taken during the middle of their possible working years. It also follows that many women will work until the first pregnancy and again when children leave home. Other women will not have established their own homes at the time of graduation so will necessarily work for some period of time following graduation. In contrast to the above studies, Graetz reported that age at graduation was not a significant factor in the retention of men,³⁴ and Dillon concluded that age was not related to dissatisfaction of either male teachers or former teachers.³⁵

The available evidence on the relation of age to job turnover was thus conflicting, but it seems safe to conclude that there was some relationship between age and the employment of women in the

³³Ruth T. Lehman, "The Employment Status of a Group of Home Economics Alumnae," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXII (October, 1953), p. 172.

³⁴Ralph Clarence Graetz, "Factors Affecting the Retention of Men in the Teaching Profession--A Study of Milwaukee State Teachers College Male Graduates From 1932-1946" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1952), p. 139.

³⁵Dillon, op. cit., p. 99.

teaching profession. The nature of this relationship was further investigated in the present study.

College Grade-Point Average

Little evidence was found in literature relating college grade-point average to either teacher retention or satisfaction. Thus, Clark investigated this factor in relation to retention of vocational agriculture teachers, but found that it was not significant.³⁶ Similarly, a study by Quick reported that the grade-point average did not differentiate between teaching and non-teaching industrial arts graduates.³⁷ Nor did grade-point average prove to be a significant factor in the retention of the men teachers studied by Graetz.³⁸

Rooks, however, found that among University of Georgia graduates, both men and women, those who had never taught had a significantly lower college grade-point average than those who were then teaching.³⁹ Since this study included women, it would seem to provide some evidence that college grade-point average might be related to the decisions of

³⁶Clark, op. cit., p. 59.

³⁷Otho James Quick, "Teaching and Non-Teaching Baccalaureate Degree Graduates With Industrial Arts Majors: A Comparative Study of Former Students of Eastern Illinois State College Aimed at Improved Counseling and Related Aspects of Preparation: Thirteen Items on Record, Types of Teaching and Non-Teaching Positions, Present Status, Causes of Separation, and Professional Attitudes" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Minnesota, 1954), p. 94.

³⁸Graetz, loc. cit.

³⁹Ila Rooks, "Teaching Satisfaction in Relation to Intelligence, Interest, and Grade-Point Average of Selected University of Georgia Graduates" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Georgia, 1957), p. 130.

women to enter teaching.

Adequacy Of Training In Subject Matter And/Or Teaching Methods

Warren reported that 99 per cent of the satisfied teachers as compared to only 33 per cent of the dissatisfied teachers felt that college gave a life-like preparation for problems met in teaching.⁴⁰

O'Donnell suggested in another study, that one reason for discrepancies between beliefs of leaders and practices in local homemaking departments could be that the pre-service education program failed to provide suitable and/or sufficiently effective learning experiences for prospective homemaking teachers. She stated that:

It is possible that the objectives, content, values, and procedures in college home economics courses and related courses in the college program may not support sufficiently and/or be in conflict with certain of the objectives, values and procedures at the secondary level and thus may have had some unfavorable effects on homemaking at the secondary level.⁴¹

Teacher-training programs were cited by Suggs as one of the four major areas which could prevent or solve persistent problems of teachers.⁴²

Several other investigators also reported problems and weaknesses in college training with the implication that more realistic training

⁴⁰Merle F. Warren, "Factors Related to Job Satisfaction of White Elementary School Teachers in Louisiana" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1953), p. 127.

⁴¹O'Donnell, op. cit., p. 214.

⁴²Mary Frances Suggs, "Persistent Problems of Teachers" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1955) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 504.

programs should be offered to young people during their college careers.^{43,44,45,46} In support of the above studies, Paolucci reported that beginning home economics teachers wished that they had received more information or help in making decisions in: (1) understanding and handling discipline problems; (2) planning and organizing their work; (3) knowing where to go for information; (4) better understanding administrative policies of schools; and (5) understanding junior high home economics work.⁴⁷

It should be noted that the decision to include this factor in the present study was supported by all of the studies reviewed. Adequacy of training both in subject matter and teaching methods seemed to be related to both teacher retention and satisfaction.

Professional Adequacy

Closely allied to adequacy of training is an individual's perception of himself as adequate or inadequate in his chosen vocational role, and his perception of the status of his special teaching field. Research tended to support the theory that this factor is related to persistence in teaching. Clark found that vocational agriculture

⁴³Andrus, op. cit., p. 145.

⁴⁴Pepper, op. cit., p. 80.

⁴⁵Irland, op. cit., p. 65.

⁴⁶Graetz, loc. cit.

⁴⁷Paolucci, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

teachers who ranked their own departments high tended to remain in teaching while those who had little esteem left the profession.⁴⁸

Of the beginning teachers studied by Schwarz, 74.3 per cent reported problems of self-adjustment which included feelings of inadequacy and conflict in personal-professional roles.⁴⁹

When comparing best satisfied teachers with least satisfied teachers, Hoppock, too, found that feelings of success and interest in work were related to job satisfaction.⁵⁰ Similarly, one hundred per cent of the satisfied teachers in Warren's study found their work interesting and only 11.6 per cent reported more satisfaction received from avocational activities than from their work. Of the dissatisfied teachers, 91 per cent found their work interesting but 33.6 per cent reported that avocational activities gave more satisfaction than their work.⁵¹ In another study, O'Donnell suggested that one reason for discrepancies between beliefs of leaders and actual programs might be that college women in home economics education were too immature and/or too inexperienced to profit from the learning experiences which were provided, at the time they were included in the program.⁵² O'Donnell's suggestion received support

⁴⁸ Clark, op. cit., p. 109.

⁴⁹ Terry E. Schwarz, "A Study of Beginning Teachers--Problems Encountered and Services Sought" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 535.

⁵⁰ Hoppock, op. cit., p. 22.

⁵¹ Warren, op. cit., pp. 115, 118.

⁵² O'Donnell, loc. cit.

from the beginning home economics teachers in Paolucci's study who indicated that the factors of:

(1) disapproval, (2) inefficiency, (3) inequality, (4) lack of achievement, (5) lack of success, and (6) uncertainty seemed to be related to dissatisfaction in decision-making relative to management in classes of home economics.⁵³

Each study reviewed showed the importance of feelings of professional adequacy in teaching satisfaction and/or retention. Thus, this factor was included in the present study.

Educational Philosophy

Two studies indicated that educational philosophy might be a significant factor in the job satisfaction of teachers. Crosby found that the opportunity to get experience, to use college education and to work toward vocational aims all were significant factors in the job satisfaction index of Hunter College women.⁵⁴ Doyle, in a very different type of study, found that teachers tended to define their professional role in a much narrower way than did administrators, school board members, and parents. He concluded that "it would appear that the teachers were operating with the old traditional stereotype thoroughly in mind and that they held expectations for others which were mirrored by such a stereotype."⁵⁵

⁵³Paolucci, op. cit., p. 140.

⁵⁴Marion J. Crosby, "Personality Adjustment, Academic Achievement and Job Satisfaction" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1950), p. 57.

⁵⁵Louis Andrew Doyle, "A Study of the Expectancies Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members and Parents Have of the Elementary Teachers' Roles" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956), p. 157.

It seems reasonable to assume that teachers who have a well defined philosophy of education and realize the place of their particular discipline in achieving educational goals will likely remain in the profession. Teachers who either do not have a sound philosophy of education or who are operating in situations not congenial to their philosophy of education may well question their purpose in teaching and eventually drop out of the profession. For these reasons, this factor was further investigated in the present study.

Courses Completed Beyond The Bachelor's Degree

Three studies including only men teachers showed a definite relationship between number of courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree and remaining in the teaching profession.^{56,57,58} However, evidence as to a relationship between this factor and satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teachers was conflicting. Dillon, in a study of teachers and ex-teachers, concluded that dissatisfaction was not related in any systematic fashion to the number of degrees held.⁵⁹ Other studies showed a definite relationship although they were not in agreement that this was either a positive or negative relationship. Kline reported that:

⁵⁶Clark, op. cit., p. 136.

⁵⁷Quick, loc. cit.

⁵⁸Graetz, op. cit., pp. 138-139.

⁵⁹Dillon, loc. cit.

Those with less than an M.A. degree were annoyed with more items in each category than those with less than the Ph.D. degree. This latter group found more items referring to the child annoying than any other area.⁶⁰

Sharma concluded that teachers with greater academic preparation tended to be less satisfied in regard to the quality of the professional leadership of their superintendent, the educational program of their school, the recognition of their efforts and achievements by the administration and by the community, and the salary they received.⁶¹ In direct contrast to this, the American Vocational Association study of satisfaction of home economics teachers showed an increase in satisfaction with advanced study. The conclusion was that:

Increase in satisfaction apparently either resulted from advanced study beyond the bachelor's degree or those who were more satisfied with teaching did graduate work.⁶²

Although there was some disagreement among research reports as to the role of graduate training, the evidence did indicate that a definite relationship might exist.

Other Types Of Professional Activities

Only one study reviewed related professional activities to either teacher retention or satisfaction. Clark reported that this

⁶⁰ Kline, op. cit., p. 88.

⁶¹ Chiranji L. Sharma, "Practices in Decision-Making as Related to Satisfaction in Teaching" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955), p. 84.

⁶² American Vocational Association, op. cit., p. 7.

factor was not significant in the retention of vocational agriculture teachers.⁶³ In spite of the one negative report, this factor was included in the present study. The importance of advanced study has been rather conclusively established. It follows, then, that other types of professional activities which lead either to improving the teacher or to up-grading the profession might also be important in teacher retention and/or satisfaction. It is also possible that on any factor women may differ from men. Since the one study cited included only men, and the present study includes only women, this factor was being investigated.

Personal Goals Upon Entering College

Students who have made an occupational choice before entering college may have more clear cut goals, and as a result, may gain more from their college training than those who enter college not knowing their vocational goals. This might well lead to both satisfaction and persistence in a vocation. This theory was supported by Graetz who reported that the intent of men to enter college specifically to prepare for teaching was a highly significant factor in their retention in the profession.⁶⁴ While the evidence was limited, it did justify further investigation.

⁶³Clark, op. cit., p. 135.

⁶⁴Graetz, op. cit., p. 137.

Personal Goals Upon Entering Teaching

Women are faced with the possibilities of homemaking, working, or combining the two. How a woman perceives her role will doubtless affect her decisions relative to working or not working. Thus, some women may go into teaching with the intention of teaching only until marriage. These women likely perceive themselves as being content and busy as full time homemakers. Homemaking, then, in reality is their career goal. Teaching is seen only as a stepping stone for earning a living until marriage. Other women may see themselves as teaching after marriage until the first child arrives. These women anticipate combining marriage and a career but not motherhood and a career. Their contribution to teaching, however, may be somewhat greater than the first group. Still other women may have long time goals in relation to a vocation. These women perceive themselves as being able to combine successfully marriage, motherhood, and working outside the home. They actually prepare, in some cases, for a dual role.

Although no research was found regarding this factor, it was included in the present study because of a belief that women who have long time goals in relation to teaching will be more likely to remain in the profession.

Immediate Personal Occupational Goals

One of the two items (out of thirty) found by Dillon to differentiate between present and former teachers was the respondent's feelings of his probable successful future in teaching.⁶⁵ Similarly,

⁶⁵Dillon, op. cit., p. 96.

Crosby reported that the opportunity for advancement was a significant factor in job satisfaction.⁶⁶ Some doubts of these statements might be raised by Warren who reported that 96 per cent of the satisfied elementary teachers planned to teach next year compared to 89 per cent of the dissatisfied group. While the difference in percentage was not great, the direction of the difference implied that this factor might have been related to teacher retention.⁶⁷ Thus, if a person saw a successful future in teaching and was working toward advancement, he more likely stayed in the profession.

Reasons For Teaching

Crosby concluded that the opportunity to work with people was a significant factor in the job satisfaction index that he derived for Hunter College women.⁶⁸ LaBue also found that students in a female group classified as "persistently interested in teaching" chose teaching as a career which would permit them to serve society.⁶⁹ In discussing answers to questions regarding reasons why men graduates had left or remained in teaching, Graetz reported:

It was pertinent that 131 men representing 48 per cent of the entire group gave the fact that they liked teaching as a reason for remaining in teaching. Adding responses such as, personal

⁶⁶Crosby, loc. cit.

⁶⁷Warren, op. cit., p. 127.

⁶⁸Crosby, loc. cit.

⁶⁹LaBue, loc. cit.

satisfaction and challenged by the work, it was found that 264 out of the 506 responses or 52 per cent of the total were in the "idealistic" category.⁷⁰

These studies indicated that a relationship might exist between the reasons given for teaching and the satisfactions received.

Opinions On The Worth Of Junior And Senior High School Home Economics

No research was found which considered the teacher's perception of the worth of her teaching field. It seemed logical, however, that the people who believed in the value of their vocational choice might stay in that vocation. This might be particularly important in teaching since it may well be that many people drift into teaching as a second or third choice occupation. It also seemed that if a home economics graduate believed that junior and senior high school home economics was valuable, that is, that these courses made a positive contribution to the well being of students, she might have been more likely to enter the teaching of it and might have been more satisfied with it.

Availability Of Alternative Occupations

The possibility of going into what appeared to be more promising work was a commonly studied factor in research on teacher retention. Such research studies approached the determination of the influence other positions had upon an individual's decision to enter, to remain in, or to leave teaching by either considering the desirability of

⁷⁰Graetz, op. cit., pp. 151-152.

alternative positions in relation to teaching or by exploring the undesirability of teaching. Whether an alternative occupation was perceived as definitely attractive or whether it was "the lesser of two evils" might be an important consideration. But this distinction was difficult, if not impossible, to make. In a discussion of this as a cause of teacher turnover, Charters stated:

"Better position" as a cause of turnover is meaningless. What teacher would give as the reason for changing jobs "worse position"?⁷¹

For these reasons, despite the prevalence of this factor in other discussions of teacher turnover, it was not dealt with separately in the present study.

HOME FACTORS

The relationship of home factors to teacher retention will be discussed in the following order: (1) other teachers in the family, (2) attitude of family toward teaching as a career, (3) chances for marriage, (4) marital status and home responsibilities, (5) present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching, and (6) husband's present income.

Other Teachers In Family

No research was found which attempted to relate the presence of other teachers in the family group to either persistence or satis-

⁷¹W. W. Charters, Jr., "What Causes Teacher Turnover?", School Review, LXIV (October, 1956), p. 296.

faction in teaching. But it seemed reasonable to assume that such a relationship might exist. It has been pointed out on page 24 that parents were influential in determining the choice of teaching as a career. It followed, then, that parents who were themselves teachers, or were closely associated with teachers in the family, might be even more aware of the desirability of teaching as a career for their children.

The reverse would also follow. Children who were closely related to teachers might more readily come to perceive themselves as teachers than children whose only contact with teachers was in school. The resulting earlier commitment to teaching might determine the benefit derived from the teacher preparation program and might lead to a greater degree of stability in teaching.

Attitude Of Family Toward Teaching As A Career

Whether or not the parents were themselves teachers, their attitude toward teaching might be important. Vocational agriculture teachers studied by Clark gave family attitudes as a reason for remaining in or leaving teaching. This factor differentiated between the two groups.⁷² Hoppock also reported a relationship between job satisfaction and family influence.⁷³ Likewise, Warren reported that 5 per cent of the dissatisfied teachers he studied as compared to

⁷²Clark, op. cit., p. 112.

⁷³Hoppock, loc. cit.

1 per cent of the satisfied were under pressure by their families to change professions.⁷⁴ As indicated by these three studies, there seemed to be a relationship between attitude of family and both teacher retention and satisfaction although the evidence was not conclusive. It did warrant the further investigation of this factor in the present study.

Chances For Marriage

Pepper reported that one-half of the women ex-teachers included in his study felt that the opportunities for marriage in teaching were less than would be possible in other vocational pursuits. An additional third of these women were not sure about the opportunities for marriage in teaching.⁷⁵

It was reasonable to assume that marriage was a goal of most women, and that this might be a factor in the retention and/or satisfaction of some women in teaching.

Marital Status And Home Responsibilities

The majority of women workers eventually withdraw, at least for a period of time, from their chosen field of work to marry and rear a family. Since teaching is a profession employing women, many withdrawals for these reasons can be expected. This expectation

⁷⁴Warren, op. cit., p. 124.

⁷⁵Pepper, op. cit., p. 114.

was confirmed by several studies which agreed that marriage and home responsibilities were major reasons for the withdrawal of women from the profession.^{76,77,78,79,80,81} The importance of marriage and home responsibilities as a factor in teacher turnover was further confirmed by Andrus. One-third of all the teachers he classified in a "withdrawal group" were women leaving to be married or who had been married during the school year and remained only to complete that year of teaching. Another 26.3 per cent of this "withdrawal group" were women leaving because of other related home conditions.⁸² Over half of the women ex-teachers included in a study by Pepper also indicated that they gave up teaching for homemaking duties, maternity reasons,

⁷⁶Hill, loc. cit.

⁷⁷Hyman Larry Reiner, "A Study of the Factors Which Have Caused Elementary School Teachers to Leave the Profession" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1957) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 253.

⁷⁸Schwarz, loc. cit.

⁷⁹James Lester Roth, "A Technique for Determining the Sources of Teacher Job Dissatisfactions" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 1026.

⁸⁰Issac Woodrow Scheffer, "A Study of the Persistency in the Teaching Profession of Secondary Education Graduates of Nine Wisconsin State Colleges" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 2394.

⁸¹Suggs, loc. cit.

⁸²Andrus, op. cit., p. 143.

or marriage.⁸³ Since home economics is taught almost entirely by women, and women are known to leave the profession for marriage and home responsibilities, Lehman's report on reasons for turnover in this field were hardly unexpected:

Most of these (Ohio State University) alumnae (92 per cent) reported that they had been at some time gainfully employed, the greater number of them starting to work before they had been out of college two years. Yet only 40 per cent were working at the time that they returned the questionnaire. This was clearly due to a change in marital status. Practically all of the 407 single women (90 per cent), for example, were working, most of them full time....

There was much evidence too, that the presence of children was an influencing factor. More than half of those who had no children were employed (58 per cent), and most of these at full-time work . . . Understandably enough, family size also definitely influenced the employment rate. A fourth of those with one child were working; only about one-sixth of those with more children.⁸⁴

While marriage seemed to be a major reason for withdrawal of women from the teaching profession, the evidence of its relationship to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in teaching was conflicting. The American Vocational Association study of factors affecting the satisfactions of home economics teachers indicated that satisfaction with teaching seemed to be independent of marital status. Irritants in teaching did not seem to be radically different for married, single, or widowed teachers.⁸⁵ Dissatisfactions of the group of men teachers and former teachers studied by Dillon were not found to be related to

⁸³Pepper, op. cit., p. 81.

⁸⁴Lehman, op. cit., pp. 170, 174.

⁸⁵American Vocational Association, op. cit., p. 4.

marital status.⁸⁶ Kline, however, in a study of satisfactions and annoyances in teaching, reported that the married respondents were annoyed with more items than the single respondents.⁸⁷ A slight difference between married and single women was found by Warren in a study of factors related to job satisfaction of white elementary teachers. Sixty-one per cent of his satisfied group were married while 56 per cent of the dissatisfied group were married. Of the single group of teachers, 11 per cent of the satisfied group were divorced or widowed while 14 per cent of the dissatisfied were divorced or widowed.⁸⁸

From these studies it seemed reasonable to expect that in the present research marriage and home responsibilities would be a withdrawal factor but probably would not be significant in the teaching satisfaction of home economics graduates.

Present Attitude Of Husband Toward Teaching

Nothing was found in the review of literature relating directly to the attitude of a woman teacher's husband toward teaching. But we would expect that harmony in the home and mutual respect for what each family member was doing would relate importantly to job satisfaction and persistence in jobs. Warren gave some support to this idea. He reported that 5 per cent of the dissatisfied teachers included in his

⁸⁶ Dillon, op. cit., p. 99.

⁸⁷ Kline, loc. cit.

⁸⁸ Warren, op. cit., p. 121.

study were under pressure by their families to change professions. Only 1 per cent of the satisfied teachers reported similar pressure.⁸⁹ To test the belief that the attitude of the husband does influence a woman's vocational future, this factor was included in the present study.

Husband's Present Income

That marriage and home responsibilities were the reasons many women leave teaching has been rather conclusively established. Yet many married women and even some with young children are presently teaching. Why do some women leave teaching when married while others continue in the teaching profession? Lehman, reporting a study of home economics alumnae, concluded:

There was some evidence that socio-economic status influenced the employment rate. Around half of all women whose husbands were in school, in military service, or in semi-skilled occupations--although the number involved here was small--were working. A third of those in clerical and kindred fields or in skilled trades also were employed. Only about a fifth of the wives of professional men, of men in the proprietor-official class, and of farmers were working....

Married alumnae . . . more commonly worked if their husbands' salaries were not in higher brackets.⁹⁰

It seemed logical that women would work if the family needs were not adequately met by the husband's income. Thus, this factor was further investigated in the present study.

⁸⁹Warren, op. cit., p. 124.

⁹⁰Lehman, op. cit., pp. 174, 70.

COMMUNITY FACTORS

A number of factors relating to the nature of the community in which the teacher works has been explored. These factors will be discussed in the following order: (1) size of community, (2) cultural opportunities, (3) living arrangements, (4) status of teaching in the community, and (5) restrictions on personal life.

Size Of Community

While the evidence was conflicting, it did seem to indicate that a relationship existed between teacher retention and the size of community in which the teacher worked. Manning found that the size of community most desired by prospective teachers was a city of 10,000 to 50,000 and the size least favored was 2500 or fewer.⁹¹ Manning was supported by Kline who reported that respondents with teaching experience in communities of less than 2500 were annoyed by many more items than were those with teaching experience in communities of any other size.⁹² Although Andrus reported no single outstanding cause for resignations, he did show that 27 per cent of the group studied resigned because of various community factors, chiefly size and lack of transportation. He also found that the highest percentage of turnover occurred among the smaller schools.⁹³ Likewise, Charters reported that

⁹¹Manning, loc. cit.

⁹²Kline, loc. cit.

⁹³Andrus, op. cit., p. 142.

the Bureau of Educational Research at the University of Illinois found that the larger high schools in the state had turnover rates of about 8 per cent annually while small schools with fewer than ten teachers had turnover rates of nearly 30 per cent.⁹⁴ Two studies of home economics graduates also indicated that this factor was worthy of consideration. Size of community was a significant factor in the job satisfaction scores of the 971 home economics teacher respondents in the American Vocational Association study.⁹⁵ Lehman, too, concluded that married home economics alumnae were most likely to be employed if they lived in middle sized or large cities.⁹⁶

Two studies, however, did not support the above findings. Warren did not find a relationship between community size and the job satisfaction of elementary teachers.⁹⁷ Graetz reported that the attraction of a metropolitan area was not a significant factor in the retention of men in teaching.⁹⁸ Since the majority of studies reviewed supported the theory that community size was related to both teacher retention and satisfaction, this factor was investigated.

⁹⁴ Charters, op. cit., p. 294.

⁹⁵ American Vocational Association, op. cit., p. 5.

⁹⁶ Lehman, op. cit., p. 176.

⁹⁷ Warren, op. cit., p. 96.

⁹⁸ Graetz, op. cit., p. 139.

Cultural Opportunities

Three studies definitely supported the theory that the presence or lack of cultural opportunities might be importantly related to teacher satisfaction. Andrus found that "few recreational and social outlets" was high on the list of criticisms of communities among dissatisfied teachers.⁹⁹ Similarly, Warren concluded that dissatisfaction occurred among the elementary teachers in his study when they were not provided with interesting and cultural opportunities.¹⁰⁰ Only one-third of the 210 ex-teachers studied by Pepper felt that teaching offered certain cultural advantages over other occupations. Two-fifths of them were not sure about the cultural opportunities offered by teaching.¹⁰¹ These studies were in agreement regarding the importance of cultural opportunities in the job satisfaction of teachers.

Living Arrangements

The Research Division of the National Education Association in a study of beginning teachers found that:

Almost one-half (48.4 per cent) said their living arrangements were "very satisfactory"; 21.2 per cent said "good but not exceptional"; 18.4 per cent said "satisfactory"; 9.8 per cent said "just fair" and 2.2 per cent said "very unsatisfactory." It is apparent . . . that 12 in 100 beginning teachers in urban school systems are living under conditions that leave room for considerable improvement.¹⁰²

⁹⁹Andrus, op. cit., p. 182.

¹⁰⁰Warren, op. cit., p. 97.

¹⁰¹Pepper, op. cit., p. 114.

¹⁰²National Education Association, op. cit., p. 25.

The Home Economics Research Committee of the American Vocational Association reported that the kind of living arrangements teachers had were related to their job satisfaction:

It will be seen that those who, in general, were most satisfied with their teaching job lived with their families; teachers who lived alone were better satisfied than those who roomed and boarded with others, did light housekeeping or had some "other" arrangement; and teachers who roomed in one place and boarded in another were least satisfied. All of these differences were significant.¹⁰³

Pepper supported the findings of the above studies. Only one-third of the ex-teachers included in his study reported considerable community interest in helping them find suitable housing. Two-fifths reported mild community interest while one-fifth of the teachers believed their communities were indifferent to their housing problem. Only one-fifth of all the ex-teachers included in the study said they owned their own homes.¹⁰⁴

The above three studies investigated living arrangements and were in agreement as to the importance of this factor in relation to both teacher retention and satisfaction.

Status Of Teaching In The Community

In his study of teacher job satisfaction, Knox explored the perceived prestige value of teaching. Teachers who were most satisfied tended to perceive their community status as being high; those dissatisfied

¹⁰³American Vocational Association, op. cit., p. 6.

¹⁰⁴Pepper, loc. cit.

felt their status position was low.¹⁰⁵ Roth also included a category on status in developing a technique for determining sources of teacher job dissatisfaction.¹⁰⁶ In a related study, Dillon found that lack of understanding and appreciation of teachers and teaching problems shown by the city's citizens ranked third in importance as a source of teacher dissatisfaction.¹⁰⁷

It was difficult to know whether a perception of prestige value was a cause or an effect of dissatisfaction with teaching. In discussing this point, Hoppock, while reporting that social status tended to be viewed more favorably among the satisfied teachers, said:

The determining factor, it seems to us, is most likely to be a synthesis of statuses--the status of the individual within his occupation and the status of the occupation in the community--combining to determine the relative status of the individual in the social and economic group with which he identifies himself.¹⁰⁸

Acceptance into the community was another aspect of community status considered by the National Education Association in a study of beginning teachers:

The per cent of respondents feeling accepted was significantly lower in small communities than in large communities, also, the proportion of respondents feeling they were ignored by their communities was over three times as large in small communities as in large communities.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵Knox, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁶Roth, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁷Dillon, op. cit., p. 58.

¹⁰⁸Hoppock, op. cit., p. 35.

¹⁰⁹National Education Association, op. cit., pp. 26, 27.

Warren emphasized the importance of good community relationships when he reported that dissatisfaction occurred when teachers were not received as members of the community.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Schwarz, in a study of beginning teachers, reported that relationship problems with parents and citizens were mentioned by the majority of respondents.¹¹¹ Doyle's data seemed to support the idea that parents perceived a teacher's job as somewhat comparable to a production job in industry, with its specified hours of employment and with the freedom accorded workers in their non-working hours.¹¹² Relationships with another group, the school board, ranked sixth in Derthick's study of reasons women teachers left the profession.¹¹³ The importance of community attitudes in teacher satisfaction and/or retention was further pointed out in two other studies.^{114,115} These were supported by Suggs who concluded that prevention or solution of teacher problems appeared to be dependent upon four factors, one of which was community attitudes and resources.¹¹⁶ Warren also reported that teacher dissatisfaction occurred when teachers

¹¹⁰ Warren, op. cit., p. 97.

¹¹¹ Schwarz, loc. cit.

¹¹² Doyle, op. cit., p. 158.

¹¹³ Derthick, op. cit., p. 69.

¹¹⁴ E. C. Hunter, "Attitudes and Professional Relationships of Teachers' Study of Teacher Morale," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (June, 1955), p. 351.

¹¹⁵ Graetz, loc. cit.

¹¹⁶ Suggs, loc. cit.

felt that they did not have the cooperation of community members or they were not given adequate appreciation for their efforts.¹¹⁷

Similarly, Pepper found that slightly over two-fifths of all the ex-teachers indicated that they felt they belonged to the community in which they taught while about one-third did not feel secure in the community situation. Another one-fifth felt secure only part of the time. Only one-half of all the ex-teachers expressed positive feeling about the community.¹¹⁸

The studies reviewed here presented rather conclusive evidence that the status the community attached to teaching was related both to retention and satisfaction of teachers. Several of the factors included in the present study attempted to develop further evidence on the importance of status considerations.

Restrictions On Personal Life

While there is some evidence of a relaxation during recent decades, community restrictions on the personal lives of teachers may still be a factor in teacher satisfaction and/or retention. This was suggested by the National Education Association:

Worth noting is the fact that 17 times as many teachers in school systems containing 2500 to 4999 people, as in systems containing 500,000 or more people reported serious restrictions on their personal lives; over twice as many reported some restrictions.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷Warren, loc. cit.

¹¹⁸Pepper, op. cit., p. 150.

¹¹⁹National Education Association, op. cit., p. 38.

According to Warren, dissatisfied teachers thought that their activities were restricted by public criticism.¹²⁰ These two studies were supported by data furnished by Pepper. Three-fourths of the ex-teachers responding to his survey indicated that they felt teachers were more restricted socially than were members of other professions.¹²¹

SCHOOL FACTORS

School related factors will be discussed in the following order: (1) relationships with administrators, (2) supervision by state and/or college home economics education staff, (3) relationships with non-administrative school personnel, (4) attitude of students, (5) creativity, (6) financial opportunities, and (7) equipment and operating expense.

Relationships With Administrators

Knox reported that satisfied teachers perceived themselves as having qualified administrators, effective supervision, freedom to choose teaching methods, and fair consideration.¹²² Home economics teachers who participated in the American Vocational Association study reported increased satisfaction when supervised by local school administration.¹²³ Byrnes also concluded that "actions of the school

¹²⁰Warren, op. cit., p. 98.

¹²¹Pepper, op. cit., p. 148.

¹²²Knox, loc. cit.

¹²³American Vocational Association, op. cit., p. 12.

administrators" was one of the chief focal points of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among teachers. Teachers withdrawing from the profession were more critical of their supervision than were in-service people.¹²⁴ Similarly, Dillon found that the fourth most common source of dissatisfaction indicated by teachers and former teachers was lack of understanding and appreciation of teachers and teaching problems shown by administrators and supervisors.¹²⁵ Several other studies agreed that lack of helpful supervision was one of the professional reasons leading to the withdrawal of teachers. The whole problem of relationships with administrators was discussed by the National Education Association:

A serious conflict in philosophy or point of view between the beginning teacher and his principal greatly increases the possibility that the new teacher will be disappointed with teaching. Of those who said they had encountered no conflict in philosophy, only 5.6 percent said they liked teaching less than they thought they would. Of those who had encountered a serious conflict in philosophy, four times as large a proportion (23.4 percent) said they liked teaching less than they thought they would.¹²⁶

In another study of problems encountered by beginning teachers, Schwarz found that human relations problems with administrators were mentioned by 91.2 per cent of the participants.¹²⁷ That administrators may not

¹²⁴Arthur Francis Byrnes, "A Study of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfactions of Teachers in Selected Schools of Indiana" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1951) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, VI, p. 886.

¹²⁵Dillon, loc. cit.

¹²⁶National Education Association, op. cit., p. 39.

¹²⁷Schwarz, loc. cit.

always understand teachers and teachers' problems was suggested by Kline. High school teachers in his study felt that items in all four categories, namely; the child, the curriculum, the teacher-personnel relationships, and the physical plant were creating difficulties, while administrators considered only one item in the area of teacher-personnel relationships and one relating to the physical plant as annoying.¹²⁸

While the above studies showed the importance of administrator-teacher relationships, other studies dealt more specifically with supervisory practices. Warren's data revealed that administrative planning and supervision were factors associated with satisfaction.¹²⁹ Administrative practices and procedures was also one of the four major factors suggested by Suggs as important in the prevention or solution of persistent problems of teachers.¹³⁰ Moreover, Andrus reported that 55 per cent of the teachers who resigned indicated dissatisfaction with administrative policies in their schools. Major complaints were autocratic methods, failure to support teachers in disciplinary situations, and lack of organization and leadership.¹³¹ Dillon also discussed several items in this area which proved to be sources of dissatisfaction of the male teachers included in his survey. Some of these items in order of their importance were lack of support in student discipline,

¹²⁸ Kline, loc. cit.

¹²⁹ Warren, op. cit., p. 131.

¹³⁰ Suggs, loc. cit.

¹³¹ Andrus, op. cit., pp. 182, 222.

failure of the central administrative staff to determine and work toward sound educational objectives, lack of communication between classroom teachers and central administration, inadequate provisions for teachers to take part in planning policies affecting teacher welfare, inadequate provisions to protect teachers from being discharged unfairly, and insufficient supervision.¹³² Hunter, in another study of administrative practices, found that items dealing with recognition and reward for exceptional services and having work properly evaluated were sources of unfavorable attitudes and low morale for from 50 to 86 per cent of the teachers, but from 50 to 75 per cent of these same teachers showed favorable attitudes toward working conditions and attitudes toward administrative and supervisor assistance and cooperation.¹³³

The research reviewed presented conclusive evidence that relationships with administrator were definitely related both to satisfaction and retention of teachers.

Supervision By State And/Or College Home Economics Education Staff

In addition to local supervision, help to the teaching staff may be provided by state agencies or by college staffs. In a study made by the American Vocational Association the least satisfied teachers reported no such supervision. It was concluded that supervision from a state, assistant state, or district supervisor seemed to

¹³²Dillon, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

¹³³Hunter, op. cit., p. 350.

increase satisfaction.¹³⁴ Another group of home economics teachers studied by Vossbrink indicated that they desired more frequent visits and that supervisors should provide helpful suggestions.¹³⁵ These studies seemed to agree that non-local supervision might be important to teachers. This factor was included in the present study for further investigation.

Relationships With Non-Administrative School Personnel

A teacher's attitude about colleagues was one of the four major areas found by Suggs to be important in the prevention and/or solution of teacher problems.¹³⁶ Satisfaction with associates was also found to be a discriminating factor in the job satisfaction index devised by Crosby.¹³⁷ Similarly, Roth reported that poor faculty relations was one of the ten sources of teacher job dissatisfactions.¹³⁸ Difficulties in human relations with other teachers were mentioned frequently among the problems faced by the beginning teachers studied by Schwarz.¹³⁹ Kline concluded that 55 per cent of his checklist items referring to

¹³⁴American Vocational Association, loc. cit.

¹³⁵Meta W. Vossbrink, "An Analysis of the In-Service Education Program for Home Economics Teachers with Suggestions for Improving the Michigan Program" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1953), p. 284.

¹³⁶Suggs, loc. cit.

¹³⁷Crosby, loc. cit.

¹³⁸Roth, loc. cit.

¹³⁹Schwarz, loc. cit.

teacher-personnel relationships were possible loci of annoyance from the standpoint of what teachers wanted and what they thought was expected of them. Thirty-four per cent of the sources of satisfaction came from this category.¹⁴⁰ The satisfied teachers in Hoppock's study enjoyed better human relationships with associates than the dissatisfied ones. Congenial associates and pleasant personal contacts appeared in many cases to be almost as important as supervision in their effect upon job satisfaction.¹⁴¹ In agreement with this, Byrnes reported that in-service teachers felt they were accepted by the faculty to a greater degree than did teachers withdrawn from the profession.¹⁴²

The evidence seemed conclusive that relationships with non-administrative personnel was important to teacher satisfaction and retention.

Attitude Of Students

Clark found accomplishments of pupils significant in stated reasons for decisions of vocational agriculture teachers to leave or to remain in the profession.¹⁴³ Hill, likewise, found that professional reasons causing teachers to withdraw from the profession included attitudes of pupils towards scholarship.¹⁴⁴ Andrus reported that

¹⁴⁰Kline, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

¹⁴¹Hoppock, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

¹⁴²Byrnes, loc. cit.

¹⁴³Clark, op. cit., p. 112.

¹⁴⁴Hill, loc. cit.

slightly more than one-third of the group of teachers who had been dismissed were not re-hired because of poor discipline.¹⁴⁵ Several studies were in agreement with Andrus that discipline was a very important factor in teacher retention and/or satisfaction.^{146,147,148,149} Relationships with students were further discussed by Paolucci as follows:

Beginning teachers seemed to derive the greatest amount of satisfaction in relation to decision-making in classes of home economics if their pupils were achieving, were efficient, and gave evidence of approval and recognition, and seemed to conform.¹⁵⁰

The importance of these relationships was further emphasized by Schwarz who reported that human relations problems with children were mentioned by 19.2 per cent of the beginning teachers participating in his study.¹⁵¹ Moreover, the one hundred teacher respondents in Kline's study indicated that 82 per cent of the items referring to the child were possible loci of annoyance from the standpoint of what teachers wanted and what they thought was expected of them. Twelve per cent

¹⁴⁵Andrus, op. cit., p. 145, 182.

¹⁴⁶Byrnes, loc. cit.

¹⁴⁷Hill, loc. cit.

¹⁴⁸Pepper, op. cit., p. 110.

¹⁴⁹Graetz, loc. cit.

¹⁵⁰Paolucci, loc. cit.

¹⁵¹Schwarz, loc. cit.

of the possible sources of satisfaction referred to the child.¹⁵²
Likewise, Hunter reported that from 50 to 86 per cent of the teachers in his study reported unfavorable attitudes and low morale on items dealing with handling atypical pupils and school discipline.¹⁵³
Quick, in a study of teaching and non-teaching industrial arts graduates, drew a conclusion which rather fittingly summarizes this discussion:

The teaching group indicated by responses that they were well adjusted, had faith in pupils, were sympathetic and understanding of pupil relationships.

The non-teaching group indicated by responses that they felt insecure, were suspicious of pupil's behavior, and were either autocratic or did not know what behavior they wanted from pupils.¹⁵⁴

It was true that in contrast to the above studies Crosby found that satisfaction with students was not a significant factor in the job satisfaction index of Hunter College women.¹⁵⁵ The weight of the evidence, however, conclusively pointed to a definite relationship between attitude of students and teacher retention and satisfaction.

Creativity

Creativity as used here means the opportunity to use one's own ideas in experimentation, to share in decision-making, and to have a

¹⁵²Kline, op. cit., p. 88.

¹⁵³Hunter, op. cit., p. 361.

¹⁵⁴Quick, op. cit., p. 191.

¹⁵⁵Crosby, loc. cit.

part in policy making in the schools. That this might be a factor in teacher satisfaction seemed evident, and there was also support for this position. Sharma concluded that the satisfaction of teachers was directly related to the extent to which they participated in decision-making. Satisfaction was also related to the extent to which current practices in decision-making conformed to the practices considered desirable by the teachers.¹⁵⁶ Three of the sources of dissatisfaction in Dillon's study were concerned with planning and policy making, provisions for teachers to take part in curriculum planning and freedom for the teacher to plan his own work.¹⁵⁷ Similarly, Crosby reported that both variety in one's work and opportunity to take initiative were significant factors in the job satisfaction of Hunter College women.¹⁵⁸ A group of teachers, studied by Hunter, also showed favorable attitudes toward freedom to teach and to speak out on issues and participation in planning.¹⁵⁹

That many people recognized the importance of creativity was shown by Doyle who reported agreement among teachers, administrators, school board members, and parents that teachers should "play an active role in the development of school policies, should participate in developing a salary schedule, plan teacher's meetings, change the

¹⁵⁶ Sharma, loc. cit.

¹⁵⁷ Dillon, op. cit., p. 60.

¹⁵⁸ Crosby, loc. cit.

¹⁵⁹ Hunter, op. cit., p. 350.

program of studies and have a part in the selection of instructional materials."¹⁶⁰

Financial Opportunities

Finances were almost certain to be related to satisfaction in teaching especially if inadequate to provide the teacher with a reasonable standard of living. Research findings were not in agreement as to the importance of finances in either teacher satisfaction or retention, nor were studies in agreement relative to the importance of the actual financial rewards in comparison with the teacher's perception of the adequacy of those rewards.

In spite of disagreement about the role of actual finances in retention, the studies reviewed indicated that financial opportunity might be a factor in teacher satisfaction. While both Clark and Hoppock investigated the actual salaries paid teachers remaining in and leaving the profession and found them not significantly different, Clark found that the teachers who left gave salary as a reason.^{161,162} Hill, on the other hand, reported that low salaries were strong factors in teacher withdrawal from the profession.¹⁶³ Two studies agreed with Hill that salary was a significant factor in withdrawal; those by

¹⁶⁰ Doyle, op. cit., p. 159.

¹⁶¹ Hoppock, op. cit., p. 32.

¹⁶² Clark, loc. cit.

¹⁶³ Hill, loc. cit.

Derthick and by Graetz.^{164,165} It was true, however, that "economic conditions" as used by Derthick included not only low salaries but also unemployment during the summer, poor retirement or other fringe benefits, and lack of opportunity for advancement. It is important to note that while "economic conditions" was the number one reason when considering the whole sample, it was only fourth in importance when considering women.¹⁶⁶ Size of salary and salary increases were both recommended for study as factors in job satisfaction in the study made by the American Vocational Association.¹⁶⁷

A number of studies discussed the relative rather than the actual salaries of teachers. Sharma found that teachers with a higher salary tended to be more satisfied in regard to the salary they received and the welfare provisions than were those teachers receiving a lower salary.¹⁶⁸ A different approach was used by Dillon. He found that the source of dissatisfaction which ranked highest was the comparison of teaching salary with salaries in other professions requiring similar abilities and preparation. Sixteen former men teachers indicated better salaries as one of the conditions which might draw them back

¹⁶⁴ Derthick, op. cit., p. 127.

¹⁶⁵ Graetz, op. cit., p. 130.

¹⁶⁶ Derthick, op. cit., pp. 36, 39.

¹⁶⁷ American Vocational Association, op. cit., pp. 6, 7.

¹⁶⁸ Sharma, loc. cit.

into teaching.¹⁶⁹ Similarly, the dissatisfied teachers in Warren's study reported feeling that they received insufficient salary to travel, to save, and to get additional training.¹⁷⁰ Pepper, in the study of 210 ex-teachers, reported that nearly all of the ex-teachers indicated that they were receiving higher wages than those earned while teaching.¹⁷¹ Crosby, in his study of Hunter College women concluded that "apparently satisfaction with salary was slightly more important as a determinant of satisfaction than actual salary received."¹⁷² Haas further substantiated the importance of perceived adequacy of income. She reported, in a study of home economics graduates, that the perceived adequacy of income obtainable in various fields was related to vocational plans of homemakers. Haas suggested that if these homemakers really did make the changes they indicated, the perceived adequacy of income was directly related to actual persistence in a vocational role.¹⁷³

Teaching Load

Clark found that vocational agriculture teachers remaining in the profession taught a significantly greater number of vocational

¹⁶⁹Dillon, op. cit., pp. 58, 9.

¹⁷⁰Warren, op. cit., p. 94.

¹⁷¹Pepper, op. cit., p. 80.

¹⁷²Crosby, op. cit., p. 55.

¹⁷³Haas, op. cit., p. 138.

agriculture classes and had a significantly larger number of vocational agriculture students. Those teachers who left teaching had fewer vocational agriculture students and spent a significantly larger proportion of their time teaching classes in subjects unrelated to vocational agriculture.¹⁷⁴ The American Vocational Association study reported that those home economics teachers who:

. . . had experiences in teaching home economics only had a mean job satisfaction score (51.83), more than two points higher than those having had experiences in teaching home economics and other subjects (mean score 49.37), or those having had full-time employment in other work as well as teaching (mean score 49.17).

It was apparently not so much the actual size of load but the attitude toward load that was important in the satisfaction of the teacher.¹⁷⁵

Both of these studies indicated that teaching outside the field in which the teacher was prepared might lead to dissatisfaction and/or withdrawal.

The actual amount of work was also a source of dissatisfaction. Dillon found that the usual classroom load ranked fifth in importance in a list of thirty possible sources of teacher dissatisfaction.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, Warren concluded that satisfied teachers generally had loads which permitted them to plan and teach effectively while dissatisfied teachers felt they had to work too long on the job and that they were forced to hurry a great deal.¹⁷⁷ Crosby, too, found that the factor,

¹⁷⁴Clark, op. cit., p. 136.

¹⁷⁵American Vocational Association, op. cit., pp. 8, 12.

¹⁷⁶Dillon, op. cit., p. 58.

¹⁷⁷Warren, op. cit., p. 112.

hours of work, was significant in the job satisfaction of women, though he reported that the feeling of satisfaction with duties was perhaps an even more significant factor.¹⁷⁸ On items concerning teaching load, low morale and unfavorable attitudes were reported more than the average percentage of the teachers included in Hunter's study.¹⁷⁹

Andrus, in discussing load, reported that about one-fifth of the teachers who resigned felt that they had been responsible for far too many extra-curricular activities.¹⁸⁰ Similarly, over half of the ex-teachers studied by Pepper reported that they felt under pressure to sponsor extra-curricular activities during their teaching experiences. For these additional responsibilities very few ex-teachers reported that they received any additional compensation.¹⁸¹ Thus it seemed evident that load was a factor worthy of investigation.

Equipment And Operating Expense

The evidence found in the studies reviewed indicated that provisions for adequate equipment and operating expense were important factors in teachers' morale and satisfaction. Kline, in a study of satisfactions and annoyances in teaching, concluded that 87 per cent of the items referring to the physical plant were possible loci of

¹⁷⁸Crosby, op. cit., p. 57.

¹⁷⁹Hunter, op. cit., p. 351.

¹⁸⁰Andrus, op. cit., p. 182.

¹⁸¹Pepper, op. cit., p. 115.

annoyance from the standpoint of what teachers wanted and what they thought was expected of them. Only two per cent of the teachers referred to the physical plant as possible sources of satisfaction.¹⁸²

Similarly, Warren reported that 37 per cent of the satisfied elementary teachers had classrooms which they thought were adequately equipped for teaching, in contrast to 15.6 per cent of the dissatisfied.¹⁸³

Hunter supported the results of these studies with the conclusion that unfavorable attitude and low morale were evident regarding items dealing with adequacy of supplies and equipment.¹⁸⁴

Crosby also reported that environment was a significant factor in the job satisfaction of women.¹⁸⁵ Another study, by the American Vocational Association,

concluded:

Those teachers in departments equipped for teaching all phases of home economics had significantly higher mean job satisfaction scores than those who had less complete equipment, such as that for teaching foods and/or clothing only. Where a plan for improving the home economics department was being carried out or was soon to be carried out; job satisfaction scores in general were five points higher than in departments where there was no plan for improvement or where there was a plan but no improvement had been made. In addition, mean satisfaction scores were higher on school conditions when there was a definite amount set aside for operating expenses of the home economics department.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸² Kline, loc. cit.

¹⁸³ Warren, op. cit., p. 104.

¹⁸⁴ Hunter, loc. cit.

¹⁸⁵ Crosby, loc. cit.

¹⁸⁶ American Vocational Association, op. cit., pp. 10, 11.

All studies indicated a relationship between equipment and operating expense and teacher retention and satisfaction.

SUMMARY

This chapter reviewed factors which may be related to teacher satisfaction and/or retention under four main categories: (1) personal, (2) home, (3) community, and (4) school. Although one might criticize some of these research studies from the standpoint of sampling and/or method, relationships have been indicated between many factors and teaching satisfaction and retention.

The evidence did support earlier comments to the effect that how the respondent feels about a factor might be as, or even more, important than the actual item in teacher satisfaction and/or retention. Quick expressed this well:

Of all the items studied, it seemed that a graduate's reactions to opinion statements would promise a best clue as to whether he might later be classified into either the teaching or non-teaching groups. It is believed that a series of items which sample teaching attitudes could be keyed for teaching and non-teaching classifications. These would have to be validated by further study to determine the degree of their predictive value.¹⁸⁷

For these reasons, both objective and attitude factors were included in this review and serve as the bases for the hypotheses set forth in Chapter III. These factors are:

¹⁸⁷ Quick, op. cit., pp. 199-200.

A. Personal factors.

1. Year in school that decision was made to enter teaching.
2. Chief reason influencing choice of teaching as a career.
3. Dates of graduation and/or age at graduation.
4. College grade-point average.
5. Adequacy of training in subject matter and/or teaching methods.
6. Professional adequacy.
7. Educational philosophy.
8. Courses completed beyond the bachelors degree.
9. Other types of professional activities.
10. Personal goals upon entering college.
11. Personal goals upon entering teaching.
12. Immediate personal occupational goals.
13. Reasons for teaching.
14. Opinions of worth of junior and senior high school home economics.
15. Availability of alternative occupations.

B. Home factors.

1. Other teachers in the family.
2. Attitude of family toward teaching as a career.
3. Chances for marriage.
4. Marital status and home responsibilities.
5. Present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching.
6. Husband's present income.

C. Community factors.

1. Size of community.
2. Cultural opportunities.
3. Living arrangements.
4. Status of teaching in the community.
5. Restrictions on personal life.

D. School factors.

1. Relationships with administrators.
2. Supervision by state and/or college home economics education staff.
3. Relationships with non-administrative school personnel.
4. Attitude of students.
5. Creativity.
6. Financial opportunities.
7. Equipment and operating expense.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

Chapter I described the current teacher shortage and emphasized particularly the shortage of home economics teachers. Chapter II reviewed research studies indicating a relationship of objective and attitude factors in the areas of the person, the home, the community, and the school to teacher retention and/or satisfaction. As a result of this review, specific hypotheses were formulated to determine if differences on these variables actually do exist. The hypotheses are stated as null hypotheses. This assumes that the differences obtained between comparison groups are due to chance. If one rejects the null hypothesis, one necessarily accepts an alternate hypothesis that differences are due to something other than chance.

Hypothesis I¹

Groups of Montana State College home economics graduates (a) who have never taught, (b) who have taught but are now full time homemakers, (c) who have taught but are now gainfully employed in other work, and (d) who are now teaching home economics do not differ significantly on the following background factors:

¹ Data tested by hypothesis I were collected from the total number (540) of respondents.

1. Grade in school when decision was made to become a teacher.
2. Chief reason influencing choice of teaching as a profession.
3. Age at graduation.
4. College grade-point average.
5. Teachers in family.
6. Marital status.
7. Income of husband.
8. Total number of children.
9. Total number of children under five years of age.
10. Personal goals upon entering college.
11. Personal goals at present.

Hypothesis II²

There are no significant differences in "satisfaction with teaching" between Montana State College home economics graduates (a) for the period 1935 through 1941, (b) 1942 through 1948, and (c) 1949 through 1955.

Hypothesis III

There are no significant differences in "satisfaction with teaching" between Montana State College home economics graduates who (a) have taught but are now full time homemakers, (b) have taught but are now gainfully employed in other work, and (c) are now teaching.

²Data tested by hypotheses II, III, and IV were collected only from the 308 respondents who have taught.

Hypothesis IV

Groups of Montana State College home economics graduates who (a) have taught but are now full time homemakers, (b) have taught but are now gainfully employed in other work, and (c) who are now teaching do not differ significantly on the following factors:

1. Goals upon entering teaching.
2. Size of community.
3. School provision for equipment.
4. School provision for operating expense.
5. Courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree.
6. Other types of professional activities.
7. Present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching.
8. Supervision of state home economics supervisor.
9. Supervision of college home economics education person.

CHAPTER IV

GATHERING DATA

Chapter I presented the problem, its justifications and its limitations. Chapter II summarized selected studies related to (1) objective factors and (2) attitude factors associated with satisfaction and/or retention of teachers. Chapter III set forth the specific hypotheses investigated in the present study. This chapter describes (1) the development of the questionnaire, (2) the population studied, and (3) the administration of the questionnaire.

DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Educational literature was reviewed for factors which seemed to influence teacher satisfaction and/or decision to enter, to remain in, or to leave the teaching profession. Letters were also written to five state supervisors of home economics education in the western region of the United States requesting "unusual" reasons why home economics teachers had left the profession in their states. A list of reasons was compiled from these sources and a tentative draft of the questionnaire was developed.

This first draft of the questionnaire was administered to the members and staff of a research workshop in home economics education conducted at Michigan State University in the summer of 1957. A revised questionnaire was then completed and criticized by ten experienced homemaking teachers. From their suggestions, further revisions

of the questionnaire were made before conducting a formal pilot study.

For the pilot study, fifty Michigan State University home economics education graduates for the years 1942, 1947-48, and 1952 were randomly selected as representative of the graduation years to be included in the major study. Forty, or 80 per cent, of the fifty pilot questionnaires were returned during the fall of 1957. At this same time the revised questionnaire was also sent to five home economics teacher educators and supervisors for additional suggestions.¹ Using these suggestions and the results from the pilot study, a final revision of the questionnaire was made. The final form of the questionnaire with the cover letters used to solicit response may be found in appendix, pages 152-166.

One section of the questionnaire was developed into a scale composed of a series of items designed to obtain a rating of teacher satisfaction. The reliability of this scale was tested by correlation of the odd and even items for fifty questionnaires selected at random from the completed questionnaires included in the study. The correlation of the odd items on the satisfaction scale with the even items was .74. Application of the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula resulted

¹Dr. Gertrude Roskie, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana
Dr. May DuBois, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
Miss Isabella McQuesten, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
Miss Flora Martin, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana
Miss Betty Lou Hoffman, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana.

in a .85 correlation.²

The fifty questionnaires were further studied by comparing item means for the fifteen teachers with the highest and for the fifteen teachers with the lowest satisfaction scores. All but two items were found to be making a positive contribution to the discrimination represented by the total satisfaction score (Table XXXVI, appendix, page 151). The two items were indifferent, that is, they did not contribute to the total score either positively or negatively so the material was not rescored.

DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION

Montana State College administrators gave permission for a follow-up study of home economics graduates. The Registrar, the Alumni Association, and the Dean of the Division of Architecture and Applied Arts provided the names and addresses of all Montana State College home economics graduates for the years 1935 through 1955. The total number (598) of such graduates were surveyed.

The Registrar made the college grade-point average available for each graduate. All other data to be analyzed were secured by the questionnaire.

² Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953), p. 303.

ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

From February 6 to 9, 1958, questionnaires and self-addressed stamped envelopes were mailed to 598 Montana State College home economics graduates. Three hundred forty-three, or 57.4 per cent, of the 598 questionnaires were received before the first follow-up. On February 25, 1958, a personally written post card was sent to the non-respondents. An additional 127 questionnaires, or 21.2 per cent, of the total possible were received as a result of this first follow-up. On March 11, 1958, a hectographed letter written on the basis of a personal appeal, was mailed to each of the remaining non-respondents. By April 15, 1958, another 70, or 11.7 per cent, were returned. Since some of the questionnaires were incomplete, these were returned to the respondents with further instructions and another appeal for help. As a result of all of these efforts 540 usable returns, or 90.3 per cent, were made available. The small percentage of 9.7 per cent who did not respond can be attributed to several factors. The original list of addresses was not entirely correct. When questionnaires were returned unclaimed, letters requesting addresses were sent to parents, to a former Dean of the Division of Architecture and Applied Arts at Montana State College, and even to some of the graduates' former high schools. Many, but not all, addresses were obtained. Two per cent of the questionnaires were returned unclaimed and new addresses were not obtainable. No responses were received from 7.7 per cent of the total group.

One source of bias in any study may be the differences in the

characteristics of the response and non-response groups. In the present study, therefore, an attempt was made to determine if there were significant differences between the response and non-response groups on each of the following variables: (1) years of graduation, (2) grade-point average, and (3) marital status. These variables were tested for independence of the response and non-response classifications by the chi-square test.³ The results of the relevant comparisons appear in Tables I, II, and III.

TABLE I

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN THE RESPONSE AND
NON-RESPONSE GROUPS BY YEARS OF GRADUATION

Groups	Years of Graduation			Total
	1935-41	1942-48	1949-55	
	N	N	N	
Non-response	21	26	11	58
Response	159	193	188	540
Totals	180	219	199	598
$\chi^2 = 5.9$ d.f. = 2 ⁴ $\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$				

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was accepted.

³ Walker and Lev, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-108.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

TABLE II

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN THE RESPONSE AND NON-RESPONSE
GROUPS IN THREE GRADE-POINT AVERAGE CATEGORIES

Groups	Grade-Point Average			Total
	1.0-1.2*	1.3-1.8	1.9-3.0	
	N	N	N	N
Non-response	12	23	14	49**
Response	73	263	204	540
Totals	85	286	218	589

* 1 = Grade C 2 = Grade B 3 = Grade A

** Grade-point averages were not received for total non-response group.

$\chi^2 = 4.8$ d.f. = 2 $\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was accepted.

TABLE III

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN THE RESPONSE AND NON-RESPONSE
GROUPS IN TWO MARITAL STATUS CATEGORIES

Groups	Marital Status		Total
	Single, Widowed and Divorced	Married	
	N	N	N
Non-response	11	47	58
Response	65	475	540
Totals	76	522	598

$\chi^2 = 2.5$ d.f. = 1 $\chi^2_{.05} = 3.8$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was accepted.

The response group showed a slightly greater proportion of recent graduates, a slightly higher grade-point average, and a slightly lower proportion of single, widowed, or divorced women. But none of these differences between the non-response and response groups proved to be statistically significant and it can, therefore, be assumed that with respect to these important background variables the response group is representative of the total number of graduates for the period 1935 through 1955.

SUMMARY

After a careful review of literature and suggestions of five state supervisors of home economics education, a questionnaire was constructed which included factors thought to be related to teacher retention and satisfaction. One section of the questionnaire was composed of a series of items designed to contribute to a total satisfaction score. Correlation of the odd and even items on fifty randomly selected questionnaires and corrected by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula was .85. A formal pilot study was conducted using fifty Michigan State University home economics education graduates.

Data were then collected by questionnaire from 540, or 90.3 per cent, of the total number of Montana State College home economics graduates during the period of February 6 to April 15th, 1958. Tests for significant difference of the response and non-response groups were conducted on the variables of (1) years of graduation, (2) college grade-point average, and (3) marital status. No significant differences were found.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The present chapter describes the characteristics of the Montana State College home economics graduates in terms of their occupational histories since leaving school, and an analysis of data related to the four hypotheses developed in Chapter III.

OCCUPATIONAL HISTORIES OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES

Five hundred forty-two, or 90.6 per cent, of the 598 home economics graduates returned the questionnaire, two of which were received too late to be included in the analysis. Consequently, this study is based on completed questionnaires from 540, or 90.3 per cent, of the Montana State College home economics graduates for the years 1935 through 1955. Table IV classified the respondents by years of graduation and by their status in relation to teaching.

Of the 540 returns, 159, or 29.4 per cent, were received from the graduates of the period 1935-41; 193, or 35.8 per cent, from graduates of the period 1942-48; and 188, or 34.8 per cent, from graduates of the period 1949-55. Recent graduates replied in slightly greater numbers.

The proportion of all home economics graduates entering teaching has steadily declined through the period of the study. Evidence of this trend may be seen in Table IV by inspecting the percentages for the "never taught" group. The trend may reflect the shift toward

earlier marriage during and following World War II. Although the proportion of those entering teaching has steadily declined, the 1942-48 graduates had fewer actually teaching than the other two groups. Eleven, or 5.7 per cent, of the 1942-48 graduates were teaching compared with twenty-two, or 13.3 per cent, of the 1935-41 group and twenty-five, or 13.3 per cent, of the 1949-55 graduates. The low figure for the 1942-48 graduates may be explained by the fact that these women were probably in that period of family life which had heaviest home responsibilities.

TABLE IV
CLASSIFICATION OF MONTANA HOME ECONOMICS
GRADUATES BY TIME OF GRADUATION
AND TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Graduation Dates						Total	
	1935-41		1941-48		1949-55			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never taught	42	26.4	90	46.6	100	53.2	232	43.0
Taught but now full time home- makers	75	47.2	79	40.9	58	30.8	212	39.3
Taught but now in other work	20	12.6	13	6.8	5	2.7	38	7.0
Home economics teaching	22	13.8	11	5.7	25	13.3	58	10.7
Totals	159	100.0	193	100.0	188	100.0	540	100.0

The proportion of home economics graduates who had taught but are now in other work has also steadily declined through the period covered by the study. The element of time might be involved since the older graduates have had more time in which to shift to other work. Many of the older graduates might have left teaching for other employment during the war or to have families. In some cases, a teaching position might not have been available to them if they decided to return to teaching. In other cases, they might have remained out of teaching by choice. It seemed significant that even among the younger graduates some were still leaving their field of professional training to do other work for which, presumably, they had not been trained.

In order to show that home economics graduates, even those qualified for teaching, had not contributed as much as possible to the teaching profession, Table V shows the employment experience of home economics graduates since graduation. It is important to note that while 308, or 57.0 per cent, of the 540 respondents had made some contribution to teaching, only 148, or 27.4 per cent, had spent all of their working time in teaching.

Further examination of Table V showed that only seventy-two, or 13.3 per cent, of the 540 respondents had never been gainfully employed since graduation. Another thirty-four, or 6.3 per cent, worked but had never held a home economics position. This made a total of 106, or 19.6 per cent, of the 540 respondents who had never held a home economics position.

TABLE V
EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE OF HOME ECONOMICS
GRADUATES SINCE GRADUATION

Groups	Taught but not full time home- makers		Taught but now in other work		Home economics teaching		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Never worked	72	31.0						72	13.3	
Non-home economics only	34	14.7						34	6.3	
H. Ec. other than teaching	126	54.3						126	23.3	
Teaching and non-H. Ec.			50	23.6	18	47.4	11	19.0	79	14.6
Teaching and other H. Ec.			36	17.0	9	23.7	10	17.2	55	10.2
Teaching, other H. Ec. and non-H. Ec.			9	4.2	11	29.0	6	10.3	26	4.8
Teaching only			117	55.2			31	53.5	148	27.4
Totals	232		212		38		58		540	

It may be significant that eleven, or 29 per cent, of those who had taught but were in other work had been employed, not only in teaching, but in non-home economics positions and in home economics positions other than teaching. Only six, or 10.3 per cent, of the fifty-eight persons who were now teachers had held such a variety of positions. These two figures might indicate a group of graduates who were unstable in terms of employment.

Another way of discussing stability of employment is by taking note of the number of times a graduate has been in and out of the work situation. Table VI presents the number of times 464 home economics graduates had left gainful employment. A few had never left employment, the majority had left only once and never returned, but some had been in and out of employment many times.

TABLE VI
NUMBER OF TIMES HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
HAD LEFT GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

Groups	0		1		2		3		4 or more		Tot- al
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Never taught	28	17.5	97	60.6	30	18.8	4	2.5	1	0.6	160
Taught but now full time home- makers	-	-	146	70.2	51	24.5	9	4.3	2	1.0	208
Taught but now in other work	11	28.9	10	26.3	11	29.0	5	13.2	1	2.6	38
Home economics teaching	28	48.3	16	27.6	12	20.7	2	3.4			58
Totals	67	14.4	269	58.0	104	22.4	20	4.3	4	.8	464

Of the 464 respondents who completed the section of the questionnaire on work experience, only sixty-seven, or 14.4 per cent, had worked continuously since graduation. Two hundred sixty-nine, or 58.0 per cent, left gainful employment only once while 104, or 22.4 per cent, left twice. This meant that only twenty-four, or 5.1 per cent, of the graduates with work experience had been in and out of work as many as

three or more times. Apparently the total graduate group were quite stable in their vocational choices.

In order to compare the stability of the teaching group to that of the whole group, Table VII was prepared to show the number of times the 308 home economics teachers had left teaching. The majority of this group left teaching once and never returned. This group represents the large numbers of qualified teachers available in communities if their services could be secured.

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF TIMES HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
HAD LEFT TEACHING

Groups	Never left		1		2		3		4		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	-	-	176	83.0	30	14.1	5	2.4	1	.5	212
Taught but now in other work	-	-	25	65.8	12	31.6	1	2.6	-	-	38
Home economics teaching	25	43.1	19	32.8	11	19.0	2	3.4	1	1.7	58
Totals	25	8.1	220	71.4	53	17.2	8	2.6	2	.7	308

Twenty-five, or 43.1 per cent, of the fifty-eight respondents presently teaching had taught continuously since entering the profession. This group represented only 8.1 per cent of the 308 respondents who had taught. Two hundred twenty, or 71.4 per cent, of the 308 respondents

left teaching once, and 176, or 57.1 per cent, never returned. Only ten, or 3.3 per cent, had been in and out of teaching three or more times. As a group then, the 308 persons with teaching experience had not been in and out of teaching as frequently as one might expect. It is important to note that of the thirty-eight teachers who were in other work, twenty-five, or 65.8 per cent, had left teaching only once. Apparently their decisions to leave teaching were permanent ones.

Still another way of determining stability in teaching is the amount of service an individual has given to her chosen profession. The various groups were compared as to this contribution. The total number of years a graduate actually taught was divided by the total number of years since graduation. Table VIII presents the distribution of graduates according to the percentage of the possible time the graduates had actually taught.

TABLE VIII

PER CENT OF POSSIBLE TEACHING TIME DURING WHICH
HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES HAD ACTUALLY TAUGHT

Groups	1-19%		20-39%		40-59%		60-79%		80-100%		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	111	52.4	72	34.0	16	7.5	10	4.7	3	1.4	212
Taught but now in other work	24	63.2	10	26.3	2	5.3	1	2.6	1	2.6	38
Home economics teaching	2	3.4	17	29.3	9	15.5	7	12.1	23	39.7	58
Totals	137	44.5	99	32.1	27	8.8	18	5.8	27	8.8	308

Only twenty-seven, or 8.8 per cent, of the 308 respondents had taught more than 80 per cent of the time since they graduated while 137, or 44.5 per cent, had taught less than 20 per cent of the time. It might be significant that 52.4 per cent of those who were full-time homemakers and 63.2 per cent of those employed in non-teaching positions compared to only 3.4 per cent of those teaching had taught less than 20 per cent of the time since their graduation. The reverse was also true. For these same groups, the percentages who had taught more than 80 per cent of the time were respectively 1.4, 2.6, and 39.7. These facts might indicate that women who are going to drop out of the teaching profession do so early in their working career.

Both the terms teacher and "qualified teacher" have been used in this discussion. In the present study, graduates who completed student teaching will be called "qualified home economics teachers." Table IX shows the number and percentage of home economics graduates in each employment category who had completed student teaching.

Three hundred eighty-four, or 71.1 per cent, of the 540 respondents had completed student teaching. Ninety-five, or 24.7 per cent, of the 384 graduates who completed student teaching had never taught; two hundred, or 52.1 per cent, had taught but were now full time homemakers; and thirty-five, or 9.1 per cent, had taught but were now employed in other work. Only fifty-four, or 14.1 per cent, were now teaching.

TABLE IX

COMPLETION OF STUDENT TEACHING AS REPORTED BY HOME ECONOMICS
GRADUATES GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Groups	No Response		No student teaching		Undergraduate student teaching		Graduate student teaching		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Never taught	4	1.7	133	57.3	92	39.7	3	1.3	232
Taught but now full time homemakers	5	2.4	7	3.3	195	92.0	5	2.4	212
Taught but now in other work	1	2.6	2	5.3	33	86.9	2	5.3	38
Home economics teaching	2	3.4	2	3.4	51	88.0	3	5.2	58
Totals	12	2.2	144	26.7	371	68.7	13	2.4	540

Only thirteen graduates completed student teaching as graduate students. Apparently if people do not prepare for teaching as undergraduates, there is little chance that they will come into the profession. However, it might also be noted that nine of the 144 graduates who did not complete student teaching had held teaching positions and two were holding teaching positions at the time of the survey.

A further analysis of the present occupational status of all the home economics graduates responding to the questionnaire appeal is presented in Table X.

TABLE X
PRESENT OCCUPATIONS OF GRADUATES GROUPED
ACCORDING TO TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Groups	Never taught		Have taught		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full time homemakers	183	78.8	212	68.9	395	73.1
Employed in non-home economics positions	18	7.7	22	7.1	40	7.4
Employed in home economics position other than teaching	31	13.5	16	5.2	47	8.7
Home economics teaching	-	-	58	18.8	58	10.8
Totals	232	100.0	308	100.0	540	100.0

Table X shows that only 145, or 26.9 per cent, of the 540 graduates were gainfully employed. Of this group, fifty-eight, or 40 per cent of those working, were teaching home economics; forty-seven, or 32.4 per cent, were working in home economics positions other than teaching; and forty, or 27.6 per cent, were employed in non-home economics positions.

It may be important that 78.8 per cent of the graduates without teaching experience were full time homemakers as compared to 68.9 per cent of those who had taught. Also slightly more of the group

without teaching experience (7.7 per cent) were working in non-home economics positions as compared with the group who had taught (7.1 per cent).

Study of the occupational histories of the graduates shows (1) a group of graduates who had taught but were full time homemakers (these graduates will be referred to as ex-teachers in homemaking in the remainder of the study), (2) a group who had taught but were gainfully employed in a non-home economics teaching position (these graduates will be referred to as ex-teachers in other work), and (3) a group who were teaching home economics (these graduates will be referred to as teachers). Interpretation of data related to factors which might have influenced these Montana State College home economics graduates to enter, to remain in, or to leave the teaching profession will now be presented.

OBJECTIVE FACTORS COMMON TO TOTAL POPULATION

The following section will describe the data related to the factors tested by hypothesis I. It seems desirable to restate hypothesis I in order to clarify the organization of this presentation.

Groups of Montana State College home economics graduates (1) who have never taught, (2) who have taught but are now full time homemakers, (3) who have taught but are now gainfully employed in other work, and (4) who are now teaching home economics¹ do not differ

¹The teaching of home economics refers to formal classroom teaching at the junior high school, senior high school, or college levels. It is recognized that women working in extension and other forms of adult education are teaching but this study is limited to the school situation.

significantly on the following background factors:

1. Grade in school when decision was made to become a teacher.
2. Chief reason influencing choice of teaching as a profession.
3. Age at graduation.
4. College grade-point average.
5. Teachers in family.
6. Marital status.
7. Income of husband.
8. Total number of children.
9. Total number of children under five years of age.
10. Personal goals upon entering college.
11. Personal goals at present.

Each factor included in hypothesis I was analyzed by use of the chi-square test. In every case a five per cent level of confidence was employed. This meant that if a chi-square which would be expected to occur by chance with a probability of 1 in 20 was obtained, the null hypothesis was rejected and the factor was considered as having significance in differentiating between those graduates who (1) had never taught, (2) had taught but were full time homemakers, (3) who had taught but were gainfully employed in other work and (4) who were teaching.

Grade In School When Decision Was Made To Become A Teacher

The graduates were grouped into those who made a decision to become a teacher before high school graduation, after high school and/or

in the early part of their college training, and after the second year of college. Examination of Table XI shows that 403 home economics graduates had at some point in their lives made the decision to teach. It is important to note that one hundred of the graduates who decided at some time to teach did not enter the profession.

TABLE XI

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING
STATUS AND TIME OF MAKING DECISION TO TEACH

Groups	Grades one through 12	After high school through second year in college	Third year in college or after	Total
	N	N	N	N
Never taught	29	43	28	100
Taught but now full time homemakers	48	76	84	208
Taught but now in other work	9	12	16	37
Home economics teaching	14	20	24	58
Totals	100	151	152	403*

*Only 403 respondents reported making a decision to teach.

$$x^2 = 5.7 \quad \text{d.f.} = 6 \quad x^2_{.05} = 11.1$$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in the distribution was accepted. In spite of the fact that the grade at which the decision to teach was made did not differentiate between groups remaining in and leaving the profession, it might be important to educators that 24.8 per cent of the group responding to this item on the questionnaire decided to become teachers before they were graduated from high school.

Chief Reason Influencing Choice Of Teaching As A Profession

Respondents were asked to check from among a list of several reasons the one which was most influential in their selecting teaching as a career. This item was devised in an attempt to identify the roles of people who were influential in the decisions these graduates made in relation to the choice of a teaching career. Forty of the graduates wrote in some employment reason under "other" and did not check a person, however. Employment reasons included such answers as "during the depression one could be more sure of a job" and "teaching combines well with marriage." Many of these graduates seemed to confuse "home economics person" with "counselor" so these two categories were finally grouped together. "Family" and "friends" also proved difficult to differentiate, so these were combined to form a single category. Table XII analyzes these three reasons which were most frequently checked.

The hypothesis of no significant differences in the distribution was accepted. Actually, on this item thirty-five, or 6.5 per cent, of the 540 respondents did not respond, 143, or 26 per cent, said they never decided to teach, and fifty-six, or 10.3 per cent, said nothing in particular influenced them to teach. While this item did not differentiate between groups with respect to later career histories, it might interest educators that a home economics person or counselor was the influential person checked by 157, or 29.1 per cent, of the respondents. But it was evident from the present analysis that these three types of reasons for choosing teaching as a career were not

significantly related to teacher retention.

TABLE XII

REASONS FOR CHOOSING TEACHING AS A CAREER AS EXPRESSED
BY HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Family and friends	Home economics person or counselor	For reasons of employment	Total
	N	N	N	N
Never taught	30	38	11	79
Taught but now full time homemakers	58	82	18	158
Taught but now in other work	7	16	5	28
Home economics teaching	14	21	6	41
Totals	109	157	40	306*

*Only 306 respondents listed one of these three reasons for choosing teaching.

$$x^2 = 2.4 \quad d.f. = 6 \quad x^2_{.05} = 12.6$$

The reasons that graduates wrote, other than those grouped under "employment reasons" above, were not shown in Table XII. Table XIII presents these after they have been grouped into appropriate categories. One of these categories, "idealistic reasons," included such things as teacher shortage and interest in young people. Another reason, "stepping stone," included those people who were definitely using teaching as a means to secure another position and also included eight people who said they could not get into an area of their first choice.

TABLE XIII

MISCELLANEOUS REASONS FOR BECOMING TEACHERS GIVEN BY GRADUATES
GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Always wanted to teach	Interest in subject matter	Stepping stone	Training for home- making	Idealistic reasons	Total
	N	N	N	N	N	N
Never taught	0	2	5	4	2	13
Taught but now full time homemakers	4	2	17	6	5	34
Taught but now in other work	0	0	2	1	1	4
Home economics teaching	2	3	4	1	4	14
Totals	6	7	28	12	12	65*

*Only 65 respondents wrote in reasons classified in the above categories.

It was worth noting that twenty-eight, or 43.1 per cent, of the sixty-five reasons written in by graduates had to do with using teaching as a stepping stone to another position or with going into it only because they could not get into the area of their first choice. This latter reason might be partially explained by the fact that home economics extension used to require teaching experience as one of the qualifications for the position of home demonstration agent.

One graduate discussed the limited opportunity for specialization in other areas of home economics:

I have always felt that it was a mistake for the Home Economics Department of M. S. C. to emphasize, almost to the exclusion of all other fields, the teaching careers. In the 8-9 years I have

been back in ----- it has been hard to reconcile this big high school having the small, inadequate, and unimportant home economics department that it has. It is my belief that encouraging interest in the wide field of home economics with its many, many careers would bring more girls into home economics in high school and college, and this in turn would interest a greater number in teaching.

This might indicate a need for evaluating counseling procedures and the number of home economics majors offered at Montana State College. In any case, it should be noted that only four graduates in this "stepping stone" group had remained in teaching.

Age At Graduation

In Table XIV, the respondents were grouped into those less than twenty-three and those twenty-three years and older at graduation. This division provided a test of the importance of age to one's later teaching history.

TABLE XIV

AGE AT GRADUATION OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Less than 23	23 years or older	Total
	N	N	N
Never taught	171	42	213
Taught but now full time homemakers	161	38	199
Taught but now in other work	27	9	36
Home economics teaching	35	14	49
Totals	394	103	497*

*Only 497 respondents answered the question relative to age.
 $\chi^2 = 2.7$ d.f. = 3 $\chi^2_{.05} = 7.8$

The null hypothesis was accepted. It would appear that "maturity" as an undergraduate, at least when this was defined in terms of chronological age, as not a significant determinant of teacher retention.

College Grade-Point Average

The distribution of groups of home economics graduates by three different grade-point average categories and by teaching status is presented in Table XV. The grades ranged from 1.0 (Grade C) to 3.0 (Grade A). In order to have sufficient numbers for chi-square analysis the grades were grouped into three categories: (1) 1-1.2, (2) 1.3-1.8, and (3) 1.9-3.0.

TABLE XV

COLLEGE GRADE-POINT AVERAGE OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	1-1.2*	1.3-1.8	1.9-3.0	Total
	N	N	N	N
Never taught	23	119	90	232
Taught but now full time homemakers	38	104	70	212
Taught but now in other work	5	21	12	38
Home economics teaching	7	19	32	58
Totals	73	263	204	540

*1 = Grade C

2 = Grade B

3 = Grade A

 $\chi^2 = 15.9$

d.f. = 6

 $\chi^2_{.05} = 12.6$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in the distribution was rejected. Examination of the cells which contributed to the significant chi-square showed that more teachers than one would expect had high grade-point averages; in fact, 55.1 per cent of them were in the 1.9-3.0 category. This was in comparison with 38.8 per cent of those who never taught and 33.0 per cent of the ex-teachers. In the lowest grade-point category, the percentages of these same groups were respectively 12.0, 10.0, and 17.2. The ex-teachers had the lowest grade-point averages while the teachers had the highest. Of the group who had never taught, more were in the middle category (1.3-1.8) than one would expect and fewer in both the high and low categories.

This significant chi-square indicated that college grade-point average might be related to entry and/or remaining in the teaching profession.

Teachers In Parental Family

A slightly higher percentage (72.4) of those teaching had teachers in either their immediate or secondary families than of those who either left teaching (63.0) or those who had never taught (58.8). These differences were not, however, significant, and it can not be concluded that having teachers in the parental family was related to either teacher entry or retention. Table XVI presents the distribution of the responses of home economics graduates on this item.

TABLE XVI

TEACHERS IN THE PARENTAL FAMILY OF HOME ECONOMICS
GRADUATES IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	No teachers in family	Teachers in secondary family	Teachers in immediate family	Total
	N	N	N	N
Never taught	95	37	99	231
Taught but now full time homemakers	80	27	104	211
Taught but now in other work	10	8	20	38
Home economics teaching	16	9	33	58
Totals	201	81	256	538*

*Only 538 respondents completed the section of the questionnaire on teachers in the family.

$$\chi^2 = 7.9$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 6$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 12.6$$

The null hypothesis was accepted.

Marital Status

Examination of Table XVII shows a significant difference in distribution between groups of home economics graduates according to marital status. The ex-teachers in homemaking were combined with the ex-teachers in other work in this particular analysis since there were only four single, widowed, or divorced women in the ex-teacher homemaking group.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. The single, divorced or widowed teaching group made the greatest contribution to the significant chi-square. Twenty-one,

or 36.2 per cent, of the fifty-eight teachers were single, divorced or widowed compared with seventeen, or 6.8 per cent, of the 250 ex-teachers and twenty-seven, or 11.6 per cent, of the 232 respondents who had never taught. Marital status seemed definitely related to teacher retention.

TABLE XVII

MARITAL STATUS OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Single, divorced or widowed	Married	Total
	N	N	N
Never taught	27	205	232
Taught and left	17	233	250
Teaching home economics	21	37	58
Totals	65	475	540

$$\chi^2 = 38.6$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 2$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$$

Income Of Husband

All married respondents who answered the question concerning husband's income (368) were grouped into those whose husbands, at the time the data were obtained, received \$6,000 and above per year and those whose husbands received less than \$6,000. Thus, a "high" and a "low" income group were defined.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in the distribution was rejected. Study of the observed and expected numbers shows that

the husbands of the graduates who were gainfully employed tended to have smaller incomes than did the husbands of the ex-teachers in homemaking. Only 34.0 per cent of the employed graduates compared with 73.9 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking had husbands earning \$6,000 or more per year. Although there were a few employed women in the group which had never taught, 68.8 per cent had husbands in the high income group. There was little difference between the teachers and the ex-teachers in other work. Apparently the majority of these women worked when the husband's income fell below a certain point.

TABLE XVIII

INCOME OF HUSBANDS OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Below \$6,000	\$6,000 and above	Total
	N	N	N
Never taught	47	104	151
Taught but now full time homemakers	42	119	161
Taught but now in other work	15	8	23
Home economics teaching	22	11	33
Totals	126	242	368*

*Only 368 respondents reported husband's income.

$$\chi^2 = 30.6 \quad \text{d.f.} = 3 \quad \chi^2_{.05} = 7.8$$

Additional information on the importance of the income of the husband was obtained by answers to the questions, "What conditions might now influence you to teach home economics?" and "What conditions might now influence you to return to teaching?" Financial need was mentioned

by 289 individuals as a factor which would influence them to enter or return to teaching. This need was usually stated in terms of husband's possible death or disability or the wish to help provide college education for children. Seven of the teachers who had remained in teaching continuously listed financial need as a reason for remaining in the profession.

It was clear that the husband's income was related to decisions of graduates to enter, to leave, or to remain in teaching.

Total Number Of Children

In order to determine the influence that the total number of children had upon the decisions of graduates to teach or not to teach, graduates were sorted into categories ranging from a group with no children to a group with three or more. These data are presented in Table XIX. Only ninety-five, or 17.6 per cent, of the 540 had no children while 223, or 41.3 per cent, had three or more children.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in the distribution was rejected. Analysis of Table XIX shows that only fourteen, or 6.6 per cent, of the 212 ex-teachers in homemaking were childless compared with forty-one, or 17.7 per cent, of the 232 graduates who had never taught, and twenty-four, or 41.4 per cent, of the fifty-eight now teaching. The reverse of this is also true. One hundred four, or 49 per cent, of the ex-teachers had three or more children, compared with 106, or 45.7 per cent, of those who never taught, and ten, or 17.7 per cent, of the fifty-eight now teaching. Of the ex-teachers in

other work and the present teachers, fewer than would be expected worked after they had one child.

In addition to the statistical evidence that total number of children was related to teacher retention, answers were written in response to the question, "If your reasons for leaving teaching have not been covered in the above items, will you please list them." One hundred eight graduates listed such things as pregnancy, caring for children, and spending more time with children. Sixty-one of these same graduates indicated that as their children became older, they would again be interested in teaching.

TABLE XIX

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	0	1	2	3 or more	Total
	N	N	N	N	N
Never taught	41	27	58	106	232
Taught but now full time homemakers	14	22	72	104	212
Taught but now in other work	16	10	7	5	38
Home economics teaching	24	11	13	10	58
Totals	95	70	150	225	540

$$\chi^2 = 78.4$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 9$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 16.9$$

Total Number Of Children Under Five

The number of children under five years of age also seemed to be a factor significantly related to the retention of women teachers. Table XX presents the numbers of home economics graduates in the various employment categories with children under five years of age.

TABLE XX

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE
OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	None	One or more	Total
	N	N	N
Never taught	82	150	232
Taught but now full time homemakers	78	134	212
Taught but now in other work	31	7	38
Home economics teaching	39	19	58
Totals	230	310	540
$\chi^2 = 46.4$ d.f. = 3 $\chi^2_{.05} = 7.8$			

The null hypothesis was rejected. Analysis of Table XX showed that 35.3 per cent of the group who had never taught and 36.8 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking had no children. This was compared with 81.6 per cent of the ex-teachers in other work and 67.2 per cent of those who were teaching. It seemed clear that the presence of children under five was significantly related to entering and remaining in the teaching field.

Personal Goals Upon Entering College

Home economics graduates grouped in relation to teaching status differed significantly on the factor, personal goals upon entering college. Table XXI indicates the goals of 538 Montana State College home economics graduates in relation to teaching.

TABLE XXI

PERSONAL GOALS UPON ENTERING COLLEGE INDICATED BY
HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Did not want to teach	Mildly interested in teaching	Attended college to become a teacher	Total
	N	N	N	N
Never taught	122	76	33	231
Taught but now full time homemakers	51	88	73	212
Taught but now in other work	6	18	14	38
Home economics teaching	13	24	20	57
Totals	192	206	140	538*

*Only 538 respondents reported personal goals upon entering college.

$$\chi^2 = 58.5 \quad \text{d.f.} = 6 \quad \chi^2_{.05} = 12.6$$

The null hypothesis was rejected. Analysis of Table XXI showed that 34.8 per cent of all those graduates who had taught or were teaching attended college to become a teacher. This was in comparison with 14.3 per cent of those who had never taught. The reverse was also true. Of those graduates who had taught, 22.8 per cent did not want

to teach when they entered college compared to 52.8 per cent of those who had never taught. It seemed safe to say that this factor was definitely related to entering teaching.

The three groups who had taught did not differ appreciably on this factor so it was doubtful that it could be related to teacher retention.

It seemed important that of the 140 graduates who attended college specifically to become teachers, only twenty, or 14.3 per cent, were teaching, thirty-three, or 23.6 per cent, had never entered the teaching profession, and 10 per cent had taught but were in other lines of work.

Personal Goals At Present

The factor, personal goals at present, also differentiated between the groups of home economics graduates who had never taught, ex-teachers in homemaking, ex-teachers in other work, and teachers. Table XXII divides the graduates into two groups, those who did and those who did not want to teach.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. The most noticeable difference in goals was between the teachers and ex-teachers in other work. Of the teachers, 77.6 per cent wanted to teach but of the ex-teachers in other work only 23.7 per cent had any desire to teach. There also seemed to be a significant difference between the 307 respondents who had taught or were teaching and the 232 who had never taught. One hundred fifty-

nine, or 51.5 per cent, of the group who had taught wanted to teach as compared to eighty-six, or 37.1 per cent, of those who had never taught.

Of particular importance was the potential number of "qualified teachers" who indicated an interest in teaching. Of the 540 respondents, there were 200 who wanted to teach, and at least 114 of these were qualified.

TABLE XXII
PRESENT PERSONAL GOALS OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Did not want to teach	Wanted to teach	Total
	N	N	N
Never taught	146	86	232
Taught but now full time homemakers	106	105	211
Taught but now in other work	29	9	38
Home economics teaching	13	45	58
Totals	294	245	539*

*539 of the 540 respondents indicated present goals.

$$\chi^2 = 39.6$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 3$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 7.8$$

SATISFACTION IN TEACHING

One section of the questionnaire used in the present study was devoted to attitude items believed to contribute to job satisfaction. Since all of these items appeared to be measuring a common generalized factor, a total satisfaction score was determined for each individual by a method tested by Likert and Murphy.² This consisted of assigning a value of one to the extreme of the attitude continuum on the unfavorable side and increasing the value of each alternative by one point. Thus, if there were four alternatives, the alternative to the extreme on the favorable side would receive a value of four. After assigning a numerical value to each alternative of each statement that was used, an individual's score was obtained by adding the numbers corresponding to the alternative that was checked. It was true that items with different numbers of alternatives received different weights but in discussing this method, Likert and Murphy concluded:

It is evident therefore that the additional effort required to weight the alternative values is unwarranted, since the simpler method yields results as satisfactory as that obtained from either the sigma method or the "weighted" method.³

It was recognized that the scale used in the present study elicited feelings about a person, factor or situation. It was an

² Roslow R. Likert and G. Murphy, "A Simple and Reliable Method of Scoring the Thurstone Attitude Scales," Journal of Social Psychology, V (May, 1934), pp. 228-38.

³ Ibid., p. 237.

attempt to quantify feelings. McNemar discussed this method:

A number of critics of psychological measurement in general, and attitude measurement in particular, have rightly claimed that such is not measurement in the true sense because nothing is known concerning the equality of units in the scales. At first thought, this criticism might seem quite disturbing, but actually it only means that certain limitations of these so-called scales must be kept in mind. If we have A scoring 4, B scoring 6, and C scoring 8, it simply cannot be said with any certainty that A and B differ as much as C and B or that C possesses twice as much attitude as A. What can be said is that B's value differs from that of C in the same direction A's value differed from B's, a statement that assumes a single continuum is involved.⁴

The factors on which attitude questions were formulated and which were combined to make up the total satisfaction score are listed below. These factors were selected as the result of library research and suggestions from state supervisors in home economics education. They are listed in the order in which they appeared on the questionnaire:

1. Adequacy of training in subject matter.
2. Adequacy of training in teaching methods.
3. Professional adequacy.
4. Educational philosophy.
5. Chances for marriage.
6. Financial opportunities.
7. Living arrangements.
8. Cultural opportunities.
9. Creativity.
10. Attitude of teachers other than home economics.
11. Attitude of administrator(s).
12. Prestige in the community.
13. Attitude of students.
14. Attitude of parental family toward home economics teaching.
15. Attitude of friends toward home economics teaching.
16. Relationships with students.

⁴Quinn McNemar, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (July, 1946), p. 294.

17. Relationships in the community where you are teaching or did teach.
18. Relationships with school personnel.
19. Restrictions on personal life.
20. Attitude of community toward teachers.
21. Supervision of principal and/or superintendent.
22. Worth of junior and senior high school home economics.
23. Load.
24. Reasons for teaching.

The Montana State College home economics graduates who had taught were divided into three groups by years of graduation: (1) 1935 through 1941, (2) 1942 through 1948, and (3) 1949 through 1955. Hypothesis II assumed there were no differences in teaching satisfaction for these groups. The number, the mean satisfaction score and the standard deviation are recorded for each group in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED BY YEARS OF GRADUATION
WITH THE MEAN SATISFACTION SCORE AND STANDARD
DEVIATION FOR EACH GROUP

Groups	N	Mean satisfaction score	s.d.
1935-41	117	69.4	8.2
1942-48	103	68.9	7.9
1949-55	88	70.5	7.4

The first test of the data was to determine if it were reasonable to assume that the variances within the several groups to be analyzed were significantly different. Such a test is necessary because one of the assumptions upon which analysis of variance is based is that the variances of the cells are homogenous. The

variances were tested by the F test.⁵ The test of variances for the groups divided by years of graduation resulted in an F of 1.1.

$F_{.05} = 1.42$. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant difference in variance within groups was accepted.

To test if these small differences in mean scores could have been expected by chance, the mean scores presented in Table XXIII were tested by analysis of variance as summarized in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTING MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES OF GRADUATES FOR YEARS 1935-41, 1942-48, AND 1949-55

Sources of variation	DF	SS	MSq	F
Total	307	19390.5		
Years of graduation	2	114.6	57.3	.9
Error	305	19276.0	63.2	

$$F = .9$$

$$F_{.05} = 3.0$$

The null hypothesis of no significant difference in teaching satisfaction on the variable of years of graduation was accepted. Apparently the satisfactions and irritants in teaching did not differ appreciably for graduates of different ages. This conclusion was surprising as there was a tendency to believe that teaching conditions had improved and that teacher training had also improved. Evidently the socio-economics conditions of the country have had no effect

⁵Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953), p. 192.

upon teaching satisfaction, as expressed in the attitudes included in this particular scale.

Next the home economics graduates were grouped into three categories in relation to teaching status: (1) those who had taught but were full time homemakers, (2) those who had taught but were employed in other work, and (3) those presently teaching. Hypothesis III assumed there were no differences in teaching satisfaction between these groups. The number in each category, mean satisfaction scores, and standard deviations are shown for these groups in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING
STATUS WITH THE MEAN SATISFACTION SCORE AND STANDARD
DEVIATION FOR EACH GROUP

Groups	N	Mean satisfaction score	s.d.
Taught but now full time homemakers	212	69.4	7.7
Taught but now in other work	38	65.0	8.0
Home economics teaching	58	73.0	6.9

The test of variances of the groupings in relation to teaching status resulted in an F of 1.2. $F_{.05} = 1.59$. The hypothesis of no significant difference in variance within groups was accepted.

The differences in these mean scores were tested by analysis of variance to determine if they were due to chance. This analysis of variance test appears in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TESTING MEAN SATISFACTION SCORES OF
GRADUATES GROUPED IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Source of Variation	DF	SS	Msq	F
Total	307	19390.5		
Teaching status	2	1374.8	687.4	11.6
Error	305	18015.7	59.1	

$$F = 11.6$$

$$F_{.05} = 3.0$$

The null hypothesis of no difference in teaching satisfaction mean scores of those groups (1) who had taught but were full time homemakers, (2) who had taught but were employed in other work, and those presently teaching was rejected. The obtained F showed that these three groups could not be assumed to come from the same population with respect to teaching satisfaction. A further test was needed to determine how these averages differed from each other and if each was actually different from the other two. The method used was to determine a theoretical average as described by Snedecor.⁶ By using this theoretical average, the standard error of the mean was computed

⁶ George W. Snedecor, Statistical Methods, (Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1956), pp. 268-69.

and the means were tested by a method described by Duncan.⁷ By applying Duncan's test, it was found that at the five per cent level of confidence each mean was significantly different from the other two. Thus, it could be concluded that current teachers tended to be more satisfied than were ex-teachers in homemaking, who in turn, were more satisfied than were ex-teachers in other lines of work.

Further support was given to the results of this analysis by answers to the question, "What factors in addition to those covered in the questionnaire influenced you to leave teaching?" One hundred ten respondents wrote in answers having to do with child bearing. The next highest category had to do with aspects of the teaching situation. Ninety-eight persons wrote answers such as the following:

I switched to primary because I prefer the age group and because of inadequate home economics training.

I left teaching because the schools would not hire married women. However, if a job change had not been possible I would have left teaching the second time because of poor administration.

If I should again have to enter a profession I would choose teaching but would first enter a school where methods of teaching were paramount--subject matter I knew but methods and handling young people were foreign.

Being married and having our home in the community made a much more open and friendly attitude of people toward me--especially since people knew my husband who was a very active business man in town. We were included in the community activities--when other faculty members frequently were not--especially single teachers.

⁷David B. Duncan, "Multiple Range and Multiple F Tests," Bio-metrics, II (March, 1955), pp. 1-41.

Disliked teaching and not qualified to teach subjects other than home economics.

Became discouraged because teaching situation was too difficult for a beginning teacher.

Lack of prestige and working conditions. School personnel and their attitude toward home economics.

Not a sufficient salary and no raise.

Lack of discipline.

Own personal inadequacies. Felt I was a poor teacher.

Definite overload of work--such as teaching seven subjects, cooking hot lunches, etc.

Hated it.

Did not care for it.

Work required after school hours.

Either I wasn't adequately prepared or wasn't a "born" teacher. I have enjoyed other home economics work so much more. I felt that I wasn't doing as much as I could or should have.

The first community in which I taught was not conducive to good teaching practices. Frankly, I was disappointed in teaching and wanted a greater challenge.

In answer to the question, "What influenced you to remain in teaching if not adequately covered in the questionnaire?", those respondents who were teaching wrote such things as:

This is a most desirable community, is stable and is comfortable to live in the year around.

Own property and feel reasonably secure in my present position.

Satisfactions such as working with Future Homemakers of America, etc.

Have strong group of teachers who are continuously working for improvement.

Like contact with youth.

Have a very adequate budget.

Felt that no other work combines as easily with homemaking and having children because of hours, vacations, and contact with schools when children are of school age.

Those who had left teaching at one time and later returned to the profession were asked to explain why they had returned if they felt their reasons were not adequately covered in the questionnaire. In these replies financial need led the list. Other replies covered reasons such as the following:

Boredom with so-called social activities in small community.

More creative than bowling, bridge and luncheons.

Needed something to challenge my thinking.

Greater contribution to society in teaching than in business.

Felt responsibility to teaching because of my education.

Enjoy teaching and have a desire to teach.

Salaries have increased.

Desirable location.

Found that I enjoyed teaching and it offered a five day week and three month vacation. I took a \$2200 cut in salary to return to teaching.

The group of teachers who had been in teaching continuously were asked to list dissatisfactions if they felt they had not been covered adequately by the questionnaire. Following are some of the responses:

Too heavy schedule causes inadequate preparation.

Need more fair division of supervision of extra-curricular activities.

Home economics teachers and students are exploited in that they are required to run catering service (food for everything).

When students fail in other courses, they are put in home economics. Students are from low socio-economic levels and often have low ability; but worse, have little or no intellectual curiosity.

Student attitudes toward school work--indifference with emphasis on avoiding as much work as possible.

Poor administration.

No recognition for work.

Rather too tightly bound by time schedule--life regulated by "bells" and 55 minute periods.

Feel girls belong to FHA for reasons other than the objectives of the organization. Perhaps the time has come to truly evaluate FHA.

Anxiety over tenure, teacher's retirement and social security.

The group who had left teaching never to return were asked what might influence them to return to teaching. One hundred thirty-six said that financial need resulting from death or disability of husband or increased family need would influence them to return. Seventy-one said that a changed family situation such as children leaving home would enable them to return. But fifty-three gave answers which included factors in the teaching satisfaction scale, such as:

Improved salaries.

Change in the attitude that home economics is for low ability only.

A principal who believes that home economics is worth-while.

Changes in regulations regarding discipline.

Am older and more secure.

A growing concept of education.

Enjoy teaching.

Compared with other work, I like teaching best.

Feeling of responsibility to use my training.

Interest in young people.

Twenty-four, or 9.5 per cent, of the 210 ex-teachers said that nothing could influence them to return to teaching; if they worked it would be in other employment.

Some of the graduates included letters with their questionnaires. Following are some quotations from these letters which definitely support the findings relative to teaching satisfaction:

Some schools are realizing now that teachers must be paid an adequate salary (some still don't). Despite my 4 years of college training, in Home Economics I was paid \$90.00 per month at the time I quit. I got a job in an office just as typist (poor one, too) for \$120.00. In 1939 a difference of \$30.00 was a lot. Right now teachers in our small high school in ----- make no more than the bank in ----- pays high school graduates as general office clerks.

Next--you are spied upon and watched constantly in smaller communities. This is especially true of the younger, single teachers. Since the war this, too, has changed in some places but not enough. Everyone knows everything you do and sometimes the wrong interpretations are put upon those actions.

You do not have enough contact with persons of your own age group, especially if you are fairly young. There may be one or two other young teachers and otherwise your social life is limited to student homes and church socials....

Your questionnaire has a question on chances of marriage. They are poor in smaller communities. Most young men of ambition leave and those who stay are just a little leary of Teacher! As you see by my answers I have been married twice but I did not meet either husband as a school teacher.⁸

Next comes poor living conditions. I lived in a house without electricity, running water or bath room the first year I taught. Much of this has changed in rural areas but even ----- has a housing situation and they have been unable to hire a new superintendent because there is no place for him and his family to live. The one who is there won't stay for the same reason.

Now comes one of the biggest reasons of all--insecurity. What other job has as many bosses? You aren't accountable only to your superintendent but to the school board and also to the whole community.... I've heard teachers cussed and discussed over a bridge table and more than once have seen a teacher fired shortly after the Wednesday afternoon bridge session finished hashing her over! It isn't fair.

Another graduate wrote:

Actually my change in jobs after that first year of teaching at ----- college was purely happenstance.... The job paid more than I could get in a high school teaching job and since I had a daughter to support and many debts to pay (not only from college but my husband's long illness) I decided that I could not afford to turn the job down.

I enjoyed my year of teaching at ----- college and had a personal interest in everyone of my students. I can truly say the same for my year at ----- University. Here again I would have stayed on in teaching but ----- was slow in offering me the second contract (my first was on a substitute basis) and not being sure that it would be forthcoming I proceeded to negotiate with ----- . Of course here again salary and retirement benefits played a part. I was teaching at ----- University for about half the salary I got at ----- . I know this sounds as if "money" is the primary objective with me. Really that is not the case. It is important I will admit but there are other considerations. I have gotten a great deal of professional satisfaction out of my work with ----- .

⁸ This respondent's first husband was killed in action during World War II.

Still another graduate said:

I should have taken commercial in college, but my own decision was made against it because I had difficulty with shorthand in high school and was afraid of it in college. However, a counselor in college would have reasoned it out with me that I probably would have made a better showing with shorthand in college than trying to fight through chemistry and the other sciences like I did. There was no counselor either at college or at home.

Another condition which affected my teaching career was the fact that I could not and would not play politics. In college, it didn't matter what your experiences were, but WHO you were. In teaching, a 3-5 man school board selected their teachers more by political influence than by abilities, qualifications, etc. That teacher's contract was renewed only if she did as the board wanted her to do, which was the way the individual board members ruled the community....

Then another factor which must be considered in my own case was that I did not have the physical endurance to keep up with a teaching career. My first year of teaching I had 7 full periods a day plus a high school girls' gym class during noon hour plus the planning of meals and supervision of school lunch. I was Junior class sponsor and also had to chaperone school groups frequently.

Still another graduate wrote:

It seems to me there are too many theoretical subjects in teaching curriculums and not enough of practical psychology, getting along with others, and emphasizing outside interests.

Salaries are not enough.... A fair teacher with an M.S. degree and 5 years experience in all probability will be paid the same as an excellent teacher with the same degree and experience. I see no reward for personal achievement or abilities.

And another:

I happen to be one of those people who should never have entered this particular field in the first place....

With the present vocational guidance, testing, etc., that is done, I feel there is far greater chance of round pegs being fitted for round holes than there was at that time.

Teaching satisfaction, as measured by the attitude scale used in the present study, was definitely related to teacher retention. This conclusion was supported both by the statistical evidence and by the statements of the graduates. As a result of the evidence presented in this section, hypothesis II was accepted and hypothesis III was rejected.

OBJECTIVE FACTORS COMMON TO THOSE WHO HAVE TAUGHT

Hypothesis IV is restated since this section describes data related to it. Groups of Montana State College home economics graduates who (1) have taught but are now full time homemakers, (2) who have taught but are now gainfully employed in other work, and (3) who are now teaching do not differ significantly on the following factors:

1. Goals upon entering teaching.
2. Size of community.
3. School provision for equipment.
4. School provision for operating expense.
5. Courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree.
6. Other types of professional activities.
7. Present attitude of husband toward teaching.
8. Supervision of state home economics supervisor.
9. Supervision of college home economics education person.

Each factor included in hypothesis IV is tested by the chi-square.

Personal Goals Upon Entering Teaching

The home economics graduates who had taught but were full time homemakers were combined with those who had taught but were in other work to form one group. Two graduates did not respond to this item so the total number responding was 306. The personal goals of these graduates were placed on a continuum from the goal of teaching only one or two years to a long time goal in relation to teaching. This information is listed in Table XXVII.

TABLE XXVII

PERSONAL GOALS OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES UPON ENTERING
TEACHING IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Teach one or two years	Teach until married	Teach until first pregnancy	Long time teaching goal	Total
Taught but left	79	129	22	19	249
Home economics teaching	15	23	5	14	57
Totals	94	152	27	33	306*

*Only 306 of the 308 respondents who had taught indicated present goals.

$$\chi^2 = 14.0$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 3$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 7.8$$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. Analysis of Table XXVII revealed that more teachers (24.6 per cent) than ex-teachers (7.6 per cent) had long time plans for teaching when they entered the profession. The reverse was also true. Fewer current teachers (26.3 per cent) than ex-teachers (31.7 per cent) intended to teach just one or two years. Ninety graduates, or 30.7

per cent, of the 306 respondents indicated that they entered teaching with intentions of teaching only a short time. Personal goals upon entering teaching seemed to be a factor related to teacher retention.

Size Of Community

Since Montana is largely a rural state, the communities in which graduates taught were grouped into those of less than 1000, 1000-9999, and 10,000 and over. The numbers of home economics graduates in these categories are presented in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

POPULATION OF COMMUNITY AS REPORTED BY HOME ECONOMICS
GRADUATES IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Less than 1000	1000- 9999	10,000 and over	Total
	N	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	74	84	53	211
Taught but now in other work	13	18	7	38
Home economics teaching	12	16	30	58
Totals	99	118	90	307*

*Only 307 of the 308 respondents indicated size of community.

$$\chi^2 = 18.4$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 4$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 9.5$$

The null hypothesis was rejected. Table XXVIII showed that 51.7 per cent of the teachers were teaching in communities of 10,000 and over while only 25.1 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking and 18.4 per cent of the ex-teachers in other work had taught in communities

as large as this. Only 20.7 per cent of the teachers reported teaching in communities of less than 1000 while 35.1 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking and 34.2 per cent of the ex-teachers in other work reported having taught in small communities. Apparently either the size of the community in which the teaching was done was a factor related to teacher retention or opportunities to return to and remain in teaching were greater in the larger communities.

Equipment In Home Economics Department

In order to determine the relationship between adequacy of equipment in home economics departments and teacher retention, home economics graduates were grouped into those who thought the equipment was adequate for teaching all areas of homemaking and those who thought that it was inadequate. Table XXIX shows how home economics graduates rated the equipment in the departments in which they taught.

TABLE XXIX
EQUIPMENT IN HOME ECONOMICS DEPARTMENTS AS RATED BY
HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN RELATION TO
TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Inadequate for teaching all areas of homemaking	Adequate for teaching all areas of homemaking	Total
	N	N	N
Have taught but now full time homemakers	121	91	212
Have taught but now in other work	23	15	38
Home economics teaching	22	36	58
Totals	166	142	308

$$\chi^2 = 7.5$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 2$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. Table XXIX showed that 57.0 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking and 60.5 per cent of the ex-teachers in other work compared to 39.6 per cent of the teachers thought the equipment in the homemaking department was inadequate for teaching all areas of homemaking. Feelings about the adequacy of equipment seem definitely related to teacher retention.

School Provision For Operating Expense

Home economics graduates who reported no funds for operating expense were grouped with those who reported some funds available but amount not known by the teacher. Another grouping included those graduates who reported a definite amount of funds known by the teacher. Table XXX presents data relative to graduates' ratings of adequacy of school provision for operating expense.

TABLE XXX

HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES' RATINGS OF ADEQUACY OF
SCHOOL PROVISION FOR OPERATING EXPENSE IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	None or no amount known by teachers	Definite amount of funds known by teacher	Total
	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	149	61	210
Taught but now in other work	24	14	38
Home economics teaching	31	27	58
Totals	204	102	306*

*Only 306 of the 308 possible respondents completed this item.

$$X^2 = 5.1$$

$$d.f. = 2$$

$$X^2_{.05} = 6.0$$

The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant difference on this factor between teachers and ex-teachers. It did seem significant, however, that only 102, or 33.3 per cent, of the 306 respondents to this item reported having known that a definite amount of funds was assigned to the home economics department.

Courses Completed Beyond Bachelor's Degree

In order to investigate the relationship of courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree and teacher retention, graduates were divided into those who had either taken no additional courses or only those required for certification and those who had taken more courses than required for certification. Table XXXI shows this distribution.

TABLE XXXI

COURSES COMPLETED BEYOND BACHELOR'S DEGREE BY
HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN RELATION TO
TEACHING STATUS

Groups	None or only those required for certification	More courses than required for certification	Total
	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	163	49	212
Taught but now in other work	21	17	38
Home economics teaching	31	27	58
Totals	215	93	308
$\chi^2 = 16.8$ d.f. = 2 $\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$			

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. Table XXXI showed that ninety-three, or 30.2 per cent, of

the 308 respondents had taken courses beyond those required for certification. A slightly higher percentage of the current teachers (46.5) were included in this group than of the ex-teachers in other work (44.7). A higher percentage of both the current teachers and ex-teachers in other work had taken courses beyond those required for certification than of the ex-teachers in homemaking (23.1).

It might be argued that home economics education graduates took courses beyond those required for certification because they stayed in teaching rather than that the courses were a factor in teacher retention. This was a possible interpretation. In any event, however, the two factors were related.

Other Types Of Professional Activities

The extent of participation of home economics graduates in professional activities other than advanced study is presented in Table XXXII. This factor definitely differentiated between the teachers and ex-teachers.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. Only 22.8 per cent of the teachers failed to participate in some professional activities beyond the local level as compared with 48.6 per cent of the ex-teachers. A higher percentage (47.3) of the teachers participated at local, regional, state, and national levels while a lower percentage (29.5) of the ex-teachers reported these activities. It seemed worth noting that almost half, 43.7 per cent, of the 304 respondents to this item reported either no

professional activity or activity at the local level only.

TABLE XXXII

PARTICIPATION OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN PROFESSIONAL
ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN COURSE WORK IN RELATION
TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	None or local	Regional and/ or state only	Local, regional, state and national	Total
	N	N	N	N
Have taught but now full time homemakers	103	45	61	209
Have taught but now in other work	17	9	12	38
Home economics teaching	13	17	27	57
Totals	133	71	100	304*

*Only 304 respondents completed the item on participation in professional activities.

$$x^2 = 13.2 \quad d.f. = 4 \quad x^2_{.05} = 9.5$$

Present Attitude Of Husband Toward Wife's Teaching

In order to determine the influence a husband's attitude might have upon his wife's teaching, home economics graduates were asked to rate their husbands' attitudes toward their wives' teaching. These ratings were grouped into those opposed and those favorable and are indicated in Table XXXIII.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was rejected. Further analysis of Table XXXIII showed that only 34.5 per cent of the ex-teachers in homemaking had husbands who were favorable to their wives' teaching. This might be compared with 54.2 per

cent of the ex-teachers in other work and 72.1 per cent of the teachers. It might be concluded that this was a factor in teacher retention. It was also significant that only 42.4 per cent of the husbands of these 262 home economics graduates were favorable to wives' teaching.

TABLE XXXIII

HUSBAND'S ATTITUDE TOWARD WIFE'S TEACHING AS RATED BY
HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES GROUPED IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Husband opposed	Husband Favorable	Total
	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	131	69	200
Taught but now in other work	11	13	24
Home economics teaching	9	29	38
Totals	151	111	262*

*Only 262 graduates completed this item.

$$\chi^2 = 44.4 \quad \text{d.f.} = 2 \quad \chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$$

The conclusion that attitude of husband toward wife's teaching, as rated by the home economics graduates, was related to teachers retention was supported by answers to the question of what might influence the graduates to enter or return to teaching. Several graduates said consent of their husbands would be necessary. One graduate gave as her reason for leaving teaching:

My husband is unfavorable towards teaching; not teaching itself but what happens to teachers. For example, I had charge of the marketing and menu planning for the senior class banquet. The other two senior sponsors did not appear so had to take over supervising students in preparing the banquet, setting tables, etc. It was this way the two years I taught.

Supervision Of State Home Economics Supervisor

Supervision of the state home economics supervisor was originally intended to be a part of the attitude scale in the present study. Since only 201 respondents reported this type of supervision, it was not possible to include it. It is, therefore, discussed here although in reality it deals with attitudes. The ratings of quality of supervision were divided into "poor" and "good" and are reported in Table XXXIV.

TABLE XXXIV

QUALITY OF SUPERVISION BY STATE HOME ECONOMICS SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES
IN RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Poor supervision	Good supervision	Total
	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers	29	115	144
Taught but now in other work	13	14	27
Home economics teaching	9	21	30
Totals	51	150	201*

*Only 201 respondents reported supervision by state supervisor.

$$\chi^2 = 4.8$$

$$d.f. = 2$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 6.0$$

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was accepted. Supervision by state supervisor did not differentiate between teachers and ex-teachers. It was important that only 201, or 65.2 per cent, of the 308 graduates who had taught reported supervision by the state supervisor. However, of the 201 graduates, one hundred fifty, or 74.6 per cent reported a desirable quality of supervision. Another fact worth noting was that 50.0 per cent of the ex-teachers in other work reported poor supervision as compared with 30 per cent of the teachers.

Supervision Of College Home Economics Teacher Education Person

Supervision by a college home economics teacher education person was also a factor originally intended as a part of the attitude scale used in the present study. It was taken out of the score when only 165, or 53.5 per cent, of the 308 graduates who had taught reported this type of supervision. The replies were divided into those reporting a poor quality of supervision and those reporting a good quality. The distribution of these replies is presented in Table XXXV.

The hypothesis of no significant difference in distribution was accepted. Although this factor did not differentiate between teachers and ex-teachers, it seemed worth noting that 135, or 81.8 per cent, of the 165 respondents reported a good quality of supervision by the college home economics teacher education person.

TABLE XXXV

QUALITY OF SUPERVISION BY COLLEGE HOME ECONOMICS TEACHER EDUCATION
PERSON REPORTED BY HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES IN
RELATION TO TEACHING STATUS

Groups	Poor supervision	Good supervision	Total
	N	N	N
Taught but now full time homemakers or employed in other work	25	117	142
Home economics teaching	5	18	23
Totals	30	135	165*

*Only 165 graduates reported this type of supervision.

$$\chi^2 = .2$$

$$\text{d.f.} = 1$$

$$\chi^2_{.05} = 3.8$$

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the analysis of data related to the occupational histories of home economics graduates and to the four hypotheses.

The population consisted of the total number (598) of Montana State College home economics graduates for the years 1935 through 1955. Usable replies to the questionnaires were received from 540 including 395 full time homemakers, forty employed in non-home economics positions, and 105 employed in home economics positions. The 303 graduates who had teaching experience included 212 ex-teachers in homemaking, thirty-eight ex-teachers in other work, and fifty-eight teachers. The data used in the analysis of occupational histories and to test hypothesis I

included the total number (540) respondents while those used to test hypotheses II, III, and IV included only the 303 respondents who had taught.

Hypothesis I with respect to the following factors was rejected: (1) college grade-point average, (2) income of husband, (3) marital status, (4) total number of children, (5) total number of children under five, (6) personal goals upon entering college, and (7) personal goals at present. These factors differentiated at the five per cent level of confidence between groups who had never taught, had taught but were full time homemakers, had taught but were in other work, and were teaching home economics.

Hypothesis I was accepted for the following factors: (1) age at graduation, (2) chief reasons influencing choice of teaching as a profession, (3) grade in school when decision was made to become a teacher, and (4) teachers in the family. These factors did not differentiate between the groups studied.

Hypothesis II, that there is no significant difference in "satisfaction with teaching" between Montana State College home economics graduates (1) for the period 1935 through 1941, (b) 1942 through 1948, and (c) 1949 through 1955, was accepted.

Hypothesis III, that there is no significant difference in "satisfaction with teaching" between Montana State College home economics graduates who (1) had taught but were full time homemakers, (2) had taught but were gainfully employed in other work, and (3) were teaching,

was rejected. Each of these groups differed significantly from the others, with the group who had taught but were now in other work having the lowest mean satisfaction score, and the teacher group having the highest mean satisfaction score.

Hypothesis IV was rejected in relation to the following factors: (1) goals upon entering teaching, (2) size of community, (3) school provision for equipment, (4) courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree, (5) other types of professional activities, and (6) present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching. These factors differentiated at the five per cent level of confidence between the groups who had taught but were full time homemakers, who had taught but were in other work, and who were teaching.

Hypothesis IV was accepted in relation to the following factors: (1) school provision for operating expense, (2) quality of supervision of state home economics supervisor, (3) quality of supervision of college home economics teacher education person. These factors did not differentiate between the groups being studied.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was undertaken to determine factors which influenced Montana State College home economics graduates to enter, to leave, or to remain in the teaching profession. The total number (598) of graduates for the years 1935 through 1955 were included in the study.

CONCLUSIONS

Occupational Histories

Questionnaires were sent to the total number of Montana State College graduates for the period 1935 through 1955. Five hundred forty, or 90.3 per cent, of the 598 home economics graduates returned the questionnaire in usable condition and in time to be included in this study. A slightly higher percentage of the returns came from recent graduates and fewer of the recent graduates had teaching experience.

Of the 540 respondents, 395, or 73.1 per cent, were full time homemakers; forty, or 7.4 per cent, were employed in non-home economics positions; and 105, or 19.5 per cent, were employed in home economics positions. Of the 105 respondents in home economics positions, fifty-eight, or 55.2 per cent, were in teaching. However, the fifty-eight in home economics teaching represented only 10.8 per cent of the total number of respondents.

Seventy-two, or 13.3 per cent, of the 540 respondents had never

worked; thirty-four, or 6.3 per cent, had worked but in non-home economics positions only. These two categories combined almost equaled the 148, or 27.4 per cent whose only employment had been in teaching. The remaining 53 per cent had worked, some in a variety of positions.

The majority (384, or 71.1 per cent) of the 540 graduates completed student teaching either at an undergraduate or graduate level. Ninety-five of these home economics education graduates reported no teaching experience. This means that only 24.7 per cent of these home economics education graduates had failed to make some contribution to the teaching field.

Only sixty-seven, or 14.4 per cent, of the 464 graduates responding to the item on work history reported working continuously since graduation. Two hundred sixty-nine, or 58 per cent, reported having left gainful employment only once while 128, or 27.5 per cent, had left gainful employment two or more times.

Of the 308 respondents who had taught, only twenty-five, or 8.1 per cent had never left teaching. Two hundred twenty, or 71.4 per cent, had left teaching only once while sixty-three, or 20.5 per cent, had left teaching two or more times. Two hundred thirty six, or 76.6 per cent, of the 308 respondents had taught less than 40 per cent of the time since they graduated. Although the majority of these graduates in home economics education have made a contribution to the teaching profession, it has, in many cases, been a small one.

Hypothesis I

To test hypothesis I data were gathered to determine factors which seemed to influence graduates to enter, to leave, or to remain in the teaching profession. For this test, graduates were divided into: (1) those who had never taught, (2) those who had taught but were full time homemakers, (3) those who had taught but were employed in other work, and (4) those who were teaching. Factors which differentiated between these groups and therefore might have had some influence in a graduate's decision to enter, to remain in, or to leave teaching were:

1. College grade-point average
2. Income of husband
3. Marital status
4. Total number of children
5. Total number of children under five
6. Personal goals upon entering college
7. Personal goals at present

The factors listed below did not differentiate between the groups and, therefore, could not be associated with the decisions of Montana State College home economics graduates to enter, to remain in, or to leave teaching:

1. Age at graduation
2. Chief reason influencing choice of teaching as a profession
3. Grade in school when decision was made to become a teacher
4. Teachers in family

Hypothesis II

The testing of hypothesis II was to determine if "satisfaction with teaching" were related to three periods grouped according to years

of graduation. The 308 who had taught were divided into those who graduated: (1) during the period 1935 through 1941, (2) during the period 1942 through 1948, and (3) during the period 1949 through 1955. There were no significant differences in the teaching satisfaction mean scores of graduates for these three periods. This indicated that neither age nor current conditions affected the "satisfaction with teaching" reported by these Montana State College home economics graduates.

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III was rejected. There was a significant difference in "satisfaction with teaching" reported by graduates when analyzed according to teaching status. The teaching satisfaction score for each graduate was computed by adding scores for the following series of items:

1. Adequacy of training in subject matter
2. Adequacy of training in teaching methods
3. Professional adequacy
4. Educational philosophy
5. Chances for marriage
6. Financial opportunities
7. Living arrangements
8. Cultural opportunities
9. Creativity
10. Attitude of teachers other than home economics
11. Attitude of administrator
12. Prestige in the community
13. Attitude of students
14. Attitude of your parental family toward home economics teaching
15. Attitude of friends toward home economics teaching
16. Relationships with students
17. Relationships in the community
18. Relationships with school personnel

19. Restrictions in personal life
20. Attitude of community toward teachers
21. Supervision of principal and/or superintendent
22. Worth of junior and senior high school home economics
23. Load
24. Reasons for teaching

The respondents who were teaching had the highest mean satisfaction score (73.0) while those who had taught but were full time homemakers or were employed in other work had mean satisfaction scores of 69.4 and 65.0 respectively. The mean satisfaction score for the total group of 308 respondents was 69.5.

Hypothesis IV

The testing of hypothesis IV was a further attempt to identify differences in the groups of graduates who had taught but were full time homemakers, who had taught but were in other work, and who were teaching. Factors which differentiated between these groups and might be said to influence graduates' decisions to remain in or leave teaching were:

1. Personal goals upon entering teaching
2. Size of community
3. School provision for equipment
4. Courses completed beyond the bachelor's degree
5. Participation in other professional activities
6. Present attitude of husband toward wife's teaching

The factors listed below were not significantly different for these groups and, therefore, could not be related to the retention of these Montana State College home economics graduates in the teaching profession:

1. School provision for operating expense
2. Quality of supervision by state home economics supervisor
3. Quality of supervision of the college home economics teacher education person

IMPLICATIONS

Based upon the conclusions summarized in the above section, the following implications would seem to be worthy of consideration.

1. The counseling program for home economics students at Montana State College may need to be evaluated and improved, particularly in relation to the following:
 - a. There may be a need to help students consider both interest and aptitude in selecting a suitable home economics major.
 - b. Students with a particular interest in teaching (or some other major) may need help with personal and/or professional problems if they are to maintain that interest.
 - c. Home economics teachers and counselors at all levels need to recognize that they are influential in the vocational choices of young people and prepare for and accept this responsibility.
 - d. Both college counselors and students at Montana State College might be given the information that home economics graduates with high grade-point averages are the ones who tend to remain in teaching.
 - e. There may be a need to determine criteria for selection of students who major in the teaching profession.
2. The curriculum in home economics at Montana State College may need to be carefully evaluated, particularly in regard to the following questions:
 - a. Are there adequate majors offered at Montana State College to meet the needs of the students enrolling and for trained personnel in the state?

- b. Would the enrollment increase with the addition of major fields in addition to those now offered?
 - c. Are students fully informed concerning choices of majors at a point in their college career when they have sufficient maturity and have achieved an adjustment which will enable them to make a wise selection?
 - d. Is the curriculum as presently offered meeting the real needs of students? One in every five Montana State College graduates had never held a home economics position; others had worked only a very small proportion of the time since graduation, and three in every four were full time homemakers. These facts might indicate that education for life and for homemaking, in addition to professional education, needs very serious consideration.
 - e. Is there provision for helping women prepare for the dual role of homemaker and professional woman? Do students receive help in making wise decisions as to when it is wise for a woman to work, and how a woman becomes qualified to enter or re-enter a profession after being out for a period of time?
 - f. Are courses which will help homemakers become qualified to enter or re-enter teaching being offered at a convenient time and place?
 - g. Are men being educated to accept the idea that women may assume dual responsibilities? In education, married women seem to be necessary if we are to staff the nation's schools, yet 57.6 per cent of the husbands of the home economics graduates in this study were opposed to their wives' teaching.
 - h. Is Montana State College seriously studying teacher needs in determining graduate offerings. Since the teachers who take graduate work, tend to stay in teaching, the courses they take seem extremely important.
3. Communities may need to become aware of the potential teacher supply available in their own localities and attempt to make use of this. One suggestion might be to provide part-time employment so that married women could more easily make a contribution to the teaching profession.

Since satisfactions and irritants in teaching seemed to be essentially the same for older and younger teachers, communities should probably not be hesitant to hire well qualified older women who are attempting to enter or re-enter the teaching profession.

Communities, particularly small communities, may need to study their situations in terms of teacher satisfaction to make them more appealing to teachers.

4. School administrators may need to study the school situation and administrative practices in an attempt to increase "satisfaction with teaching." For example, adequate equipment has been shown in the present study to be related to teacher retention. Every attempt might be made by the school to provide equipment adequate for teaching all areas of homemaking.

5. All leaders in home economics education in Montana need to find ways of helping teachers to participate in professional activities.

6. The home economics teacher education program needs to be continually evaluated in terms of course content and supervisory practices to insure adequate training on the pre-service and in-service levels.

7. Home economics education supervision by the state supervisory and/or college staff needs to be expanded to reach more teachers.

8. The curriculum in home economics at the elementary and secondary levels needs to be carefully evaluated. Comments such as the following suggested this:

As a dietitian I have taught student nurses, medical internes, and patients and enjoy the nutrition science. I would want nothing to do with home ec. on the elementary and secondary levels. In fact, I believe that part of the shortage of home economics majors can be attributed to two things: (1) The low status of home economics at these levels. (2) If I had had it as part of the curriculum off and on for 12 years, I'd want something else, too. (I note in a recent issue of the Home Economics Journal a glowing account of baking cookies in the first grade).

Another graduate wrote:

I have always felt that the home economics high school curriculum as well as the teacher could do with some constructive criticism. I think my criticism is not just of the one department but of the entire high school system....

And another commented:

Mr. ----- thinks that perhaps junior high home economics takes the edge off home economics at the high school level. I believe that I'm inclined to agree with him. It might mean a really strong high school program where students wouldn't always say "they'd already had that."

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS AND BULLETINS

American Vocational Association, Inc. Committee on Research and Publication, Factors Affecting the Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers, AVA Research Bulletin, No. 3, Washington: May, 1948. 96 pp.

Army, Clara Brown. The Effectiveness of the High School Program in Home Economics--A Report of a Five-Year Study of Twenty Minnesota Schools. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952. 319 pp.

Bureau of Labor Statistics in Cooperation with Veterans Administration, U. S. Department of Labor. Occupational Outlook Handbook. Bulletin No. 1215. 1957. 694 pp.

Hoppock, Robert. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1935. 303 pp.

Krech, David, and Richard S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948. 639 pp.

National Manpower Council. Womanpower. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. 371 pp.

Snedecor, George. Statistical Methods. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1956. 534 pp.

Tiffin, Joseph. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943. 386 pp.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev. Statistical Inference. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953. 508 pp.

B. PERIODICALS

Brayfield, Arthur H., Richard V. Wells, and Marvin W. Strate. "Interrelationships Among Measures of Job Satisfaction and General Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (August, 1957), pp. 201-5.

- Charters, W. W., Jr. "What Causes Teacher Turnover?", School Review, LXIV (October, 1956), pp. 294-9.
- Coon, Beulah I. "Trends in Home Economics Enrollment," Journal of Home Economics, XLIV (May, 1952), pp. 334-7.
- Duncan, David B. "Multiple Range and Multiple F Tests," Biometrics, XI (March, 1955), pp. 1-41.
- Hunter, E. C. "Attitudes and Professional Relationship of Teachers: A Study of Teacher Morale," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (June, 1955), pp. 343-52.
- Kline, Frances Florence. "Satisfactions and Annoyances in Teaching," Journal of Experimental Education, XVIII (December, 1949), pp. 77-89.
- Laxson, Mary. "A Look at the Homemaking Teacher Supply," Journal of Home Economics, XLV (May, 1953), pp. 308-10.
- Lehman, Ruth T. "The Employment Status of a Group of Home Economics Alumnae," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXII (October, 1953), pp. 169-76.
- Likert, R. Roslow, and G. Murphy. "A Simple and Reliable Method of Scoring the Thurstone Attitude Scales," Journal of Social Psychology, V (May, 1934), pp. 228-38.
- McGregor, Douglas and Conrad Arsensberg. "The Genesis of Attitudes Towards Management," Abstracted in Psychological Bulletin, XXXVII (July, 1940), pp. 433-4.
- McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (July, 1946), pp. 289-374.
- National Education Association, Research Division. "First-Year Teachers in 1954-55," Research Bulletin. National Education Association of the U. S., XXXIV (Washington: February, 1956), pp. 5-45.
- National Education Association, Research Division. "The 1957 Teacher Supply and Demand Reports," The Journal of Teacher Education, VIII (March, 1957), pp. 17-66.
- Watson, Goodwin and Jerome M. Seidman. "Dissatisfactions in Work," Journal of Social Psychology, XIII (February, 1941), pp. 183-6.
- Wright, Elizabeth Hansen and Florence Corbin. "Factors in Choice of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, XLIV (April, 1952), pp. 263-5.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Andrus, Howard Guion. "The Extent and Causes of Turnover Among Secondary-School Teachers in New York State Central Schools for the Year 1948-49." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1951. 274 pp.
- Byrnes, Arthur Francis. "A Study of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfactions of Teachers in Selected Schools of Indiana," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, New York University, 1951) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, VI, 885-887 pp.
- Clark, Raymond McCallum. "Factors Associated With Decisions of Michigan Teachers to Remain in or to Leave the Field of Teaching Vocational Agriculture." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1950. 202 pp.
- Crosby, Marion J. "Personality Adjustment, Academic Achievement and Job Satisfaction." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1950. 108 pp.
- Derthick, Lawrence G., Jr. "Factors Involved in Teachers Leaving the Education Profession." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1957. 201 pp.
- Dillon, Marvin W. "Appraisals by Teachers and Former Teachers of Some Sources of Dissatisfaction in Secondary Teaching." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1955. 112 pp.
- Doyle, Louis Andrew. "A Study of the Expectancies Which Elementary Teachers, Administrators, School Board Members and Parents Have of the Elementary Teachers' Roles." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956. 195 pp.
- Graetz, Ralph Clarence. "Factors Affecting the Retention of Men in the Teaching Profession--A Study of Milwaukee State Teachers College Male Graduates from 1932-46." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State College, 1952. 200 pp.
- Haas, Mary Helen. "A Study of Certain Factors Related to the Vocational Activity of Home Economics-Education Graduates." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957. 232 pp.
- Hill, Wayne Walter. "Factors Contributing to the Problems of Teachers in the Secondary Schools of Maryland Leaving the Profession from 1950 to 1955." (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 76.

- Irland, Marquite L. "An Analysis of the Home Economics Teacher Education Program in Three Michigan Colleges." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Wayne University, 1956. 121 pp.
- Knox, Carl Warner. "An Investigation of the Job Satisfaction of Recent Graduates of the University of Illinois Now Engaged in School Teaching and Administration," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1953) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XIII, p. 1043.
- LaBue, Anthony Charles. "An Analysis of Some Factors Associated with Persistence of Interest in Teaching as a Vocational Choice." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1954. 208 pp.
- Manning, Walton. "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of Selected Teachers in Favored Urban and Less Favored Rural Teaching Positions," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1954) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XIV, p. 1586.
- O'Donnell, Beatrice Olson. "Discrepancies Between Beliefs of Leaders in Homemaking Education in Michigan and Practices in Local Homemaking Programs." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State College, 1954. 392 pp.
- Paolucci, Beatrice. "Decision-making in Relation to Management in Classes of Home Economics by Beginning Teachers." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1956. 187 pp.
- Pepper, James N. "Factors Involved in the Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Michigan." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Wayne University, 1954. 185 pp.
- Quick, Otho James. "Teaching and Non-Teaching Baccalaureate Degree Graduates with Industrial Arts Majors: A Comparative Study of Former Students of Eastern Illinois State College Aimed at Improved Counseling and Related Aspects of Preparation: Thirteen Items on Record, Types of Teaching and Non-Teaching Position, Present Status, Causes of Separation, and Professional Attitudes." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1954. 249 pp.
- Reiner, Hyman Larry. "A Study of the Factors Which Have Caused Elementary School Teachers to Leave the Profession," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1957) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 253.
- Rooks, Ila. "Teaching Satisfaction in Relation to Intelligence, Interest, and Grade-Point Average of Selected University of Georgia Graduates." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1957. 180 pp.

- Roth, James Lester. "A Technique for Determining the Sources of Teacher Job Dissatisfactions," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 1826.
- Schaffer, Issac Woodrow. "A Study of the Persistency in the Teaching Profession of Secondary Education Graduates of Nine Wisconsin State Colleges," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 2394.
- Schwarz, E. Terry. "A Study of Beginning Teachers--Problems Encountered and Services Sought," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1956) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVII, p. 535.
- Sharma, Chiranjil L. "Practices in Decision-Making as Related to Satisfaction in Teaching." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955. 180 pp.
- Suggs, Mary Frances. "Persistent Problems of Teachers," (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1955) University Microfilm Dissertation Abstracts, XVI, p. 504.
- Vossbrink, Meta W. "An Analysis of the In-Service Education Program for Home Economics Teachers with Suggestions for Improving the Michigan Program." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1953. 293 pp.
- Warren, Merle F. "Factors Related to Job Satisfaction of White Elementary School Teachers in Louisiana." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1953. 155 pp.

A P P E N D I X

TABLE XXXVI

SOURCES OF DISSATISFACTION RANKED BY DIFFERENCE IN MEANS FOR THE
FIFTEEN MOST SATISFIED TEACHERS AND THE FIFTEEN
LEAST SATISFIED TEACHERS IN A GROUP OF
FIFTY RANDOMLY SELECTED QUESTIONNAIRES

Rank	Factor	Average mean of high group	Average mean of low group	Difference in mean
1	Supervision of principal and/or superintendent	4.93	2.46	2.47
2	Reason for teaching	4.00	1.66	2.34
3	Attitude of community toward teachers	4.00	2.73	1.27
4	Professional adequacy	3.60	2.40	1.20
5	Relationships in the community	4.00	2.86	1.14
6	Relationships with students	4.66	3.60	1.06
7	Attitude of students	2.93	2.06	.87
8	Attitude of administrator towards home economics	3.20	2.40	.80
9	Restrictions on personal life	2.53	1.80	.73
9	Worth of junior and senior high school home economics	2.86	2.13	.73
10	Load	2.66	2.00	.66
11	Adequacy of training in teaching methods	3.33	2.73	.60
11	Living arrangements	3.13	2.53	.60
11	Prestige in the community	2.80	2.20	.60
12	Relationships with school personnel	3.33	2.80	.53
12	Educational philosophy	3.73	3.20	.53
13	Attitude of friends toward home economics teaching	3.46	3.00	.46
14	Cultural opportunities	2.20	1.80	.40
14	Creativity	3.73	3.33	.40
15	Adequacy of training in subject matter	3.13	2.85	.28
16	Chances for marriage	1.93	1.66	.27
16	Attitude of teachers other than home economics	3.53	3.26	.27
17	Financial opportunities	2.06	2.06	.00
18	Attitude of parental family toward home economics teaching	2.80	2.80	.00

MONTANA STATE COLLEGE
Bozeman

January 23, 1958

Dear MSC Alumna:

This letter will come to you with a questionnaire from Helen Hollandsworth, who is studying for her doctor's degree at Michigan State University. We are proud of Helen as a graduate of our department and grateful for the sort of loyalty that made her want to do the study for her dissertation with MSC alums. We are anxiously waiting its completion because we think the results will be of real interest to us.

May I urge your cooperation in filling out and returning Helen's questionnaire promptly.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Gertrude Roskie

Gertrude Roskie
Professor of Home Economics
Education

618 Grove
East Lansing, Michigan
February 7, 1958

Dear Fellow Alumnae,

We have three things in common--Montana, home economics, and Montana State College. How about adding a fourth? I am a candidate for an advanced degree at Michigan State University and am now preparing to do my dissertation. Montana State College administrators have given me permission to do a follow-up study of their graduates and Dr. Gertrude Roskie has indicated that she believes that you will be willing to help me. Enclosed is a questionnaire which I sincerely hope you will complete for me.

I am planning to conduct a research study concerning the factors which influence home economics majors to enter, to leave or to remain in the teaching profession. I hope through this study to find if there are significant differences between the groups of people who never taught, who left teaching, who taught, left and returned, and those who have always taught. This means that names and personalities are not important. The enclosed questionnaire is coded for follow-up purposes as I have to obtain a good percentage of returns but your identity will in no way be disclosed or connected with the data. The value of this research to education, to home economics, to Montana State College, and to me depends upon your frank and honest answers.

It is important that you check each item. There is space at the end of the questionnaire in which to make comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to write for further explanation.

Your help at this point in my graduate work will be deeply appreciated. Some of you may have a little difficulty in remembering your teaching situations but please do the best you can. I will be grateful if you can return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope within two weeks.

Sincerely yours,

Helen L. Hollandsworth

A SURVEY OF HOME ECONOMICS GRADUATES

I. PERSONAL DATA

A. Marital Status: Single____Married____Date of marriage____
 Divorced or legally separated____Date of divorce or legal separation____
 Widowed____Date of death of husband____Remarriage____
 Date of remarriage_____

B. Children	Number	Age Range
	_____	0-5 years
	_____	6-10 years
	_____	11-15 years
	_____	Over 15 years

C. Date(s) of graduation: BS____MS____Doctoral____
 Age at graduation: BS____
 Completed student teaching: As an undergraduate____
 As a graduate____Never_____

D. What was the chief reason influencing you to become a home economics teacher? (Check one item only)

- ____ 1. Never wanted to become a home economics teacher
- ____ 2. No particular influence
- ____ 3. Family experience and/or influence
- ____ 4. Influence of counselor
- ____ 5. Influence of home economics teacher
- ____ 6. High School home economics experience
- ____ 7. 4-H Club experience
- ____ 8. Contact with home economics students
- ____ 9. Other influence (Explain)_____

E. Time in school when you definitely decided to become a home economics teacher. (Check one item only)

- ____ 1. Never decided to teach
- ____ 2. Grades 1-6
- ____ 3. Grades 7-10
- ____ 4. Grades 11-12
- ____ 5. After high school but before starting to college
- ____ 6. During 1st or 2nd year of college
- ____ 7. During 3rd or 4th year of college
- ____ 8. After college

F. Are there teachers in your family?

- ☐ 1. No teachers
- ☐ 2. Uncles, aunts and/or grandparents are teachers
- ☐ 3. Parents, brothers and/or sisters are teachers

G. Personal goals upon entering college. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Did not want to become a teacher of home economics
- ☐ 2. Was mildly interested in becoming a teacher of home economics
- ☐ 3. Attended college specifically to become a teacher of home economics

H. Personal goals upon entering teaching. Not to be answered by those who have never taught. (Those who have taught check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Wanted to teach one or two years only
- ☐ 2. Wanted to teach until married
- ☐ 3. Wanted to combine teaching and marriage continuously with limited time out of the profession for child bearing
- ☐ 4. Wanted to combine marriage and teaching only until first pregnancy
- ☐ 5. Wanted to combine marriage and teaching until first pregnancy and wanted to return to teaching after children left home

I. Personal goals at present. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Have never taught and have no desire to teach
- ☐ 2. Have never taught but have a desire to teach
- ☐ 3. Have left the teaching profession and have no desire to return
- ☐ 4. Have left the teaching profession but have a desire to return
- ☐ 5. Hope to leave the teaching profession soon
- ☐ 6. Hope to continue in my present teaching position
- ☐ 7. Hope to move to a better position in teaching at this level
- ☐ 8. Hope to advance to a higher level of teaching and/or supervision

J. Record of husband's income. Please estimate if husband is not on salary.

At time of your first job: _____
At time you left teaching: 1st time _____ 2nd time _____ Last time _____
At time you re-entered teaching: 1st time _____ 2nd time _____
Last time _____
Present: _____

K. List below every job you have held since completing your BS degree, together with related information indicated.

Dates employed. Begin with date of first job after graduation.		Classification of position such as Junior High School home economics teacher, home demonstration agent, and home service advisor.	Type of work you did such as the subjects taught in school, sales or public relations work in business.
From: Month and Year	To: Month and Year		

II. The next two items to be answered only by those who have NEVER TAUGHT home economics.

A. Will you please explain as completely as possible why you never entered the teaching profession.

B. What conditions might now influence you to teach home economics?

III. PROFESSIONAL DATA. (Those who have NEVER TAUGHT home economics do not answer the remainder of the questionnaire).

Directions: In the spaces on the left side of the page check those items which best describe your present (if teaching at the present time) or your last (if not teaching at present) home economics classroom teaching position. Please apply the statements to your last (if not teaching at present) teaching position even though the statements are written in present tense.

A. Size of community. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Population of less than 1000
- ☐ 2. Population of 1000 -- 1999
- ☐ 3. Population of 2000 -- 2999
- ☐ 4. Population of 3000 -- 9999
- ☐ 5. Population of 10,000 -- 49,999
- ☐ 6. Population of 50,000 and over

B. School provision for operating expenses. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. No funds are provided by the school
- ☐ 2. Funds are provided by school but no set amount is known by the teacher
- ☐ 3. Definite amount of school funds provided by the school and the amount is known by the teacher

C. Equipment in home economics department. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Inadequate equipment for teaching any area of home economics
- ☐ 2. Adequate equipment for teaching one or two areas of home economics
- ☐ 3. Adequate equipment for teaching almost all areas of home economics

D. Number of single class periods a week not scheduled to teach class or keep home room or study hall; that is, number of free periods and/or conference periods. Count double periods as two single periods.

- ☐ 1. None
- ☐ 2. One
- ☐ 3. Two
- ☐ 4. Three
- ☐ 5. Four
- ☐ 6. Five
- ☐ 7. Six and more

E. Average amount of time you spend on activities (include teaching and preparation time, IHA, home visitation, adult program, etc.) per week as part of your job whether you do the work at school, home, or elsewhere. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Under 30 hours
- ☐ 2. 30 - 35 hours
- ☐ 3. 36 - 40 hours
- ☐ 4. 41 - 45 hours
- ☐ 5. 46 - 50 hours
- ☐ 6. 51 - 55 hours
- ☐ 7. 56 - 60 hours
- ☐ 8. 61 - 65 hours
- ☐ 9. 65 hours and over

F. Courses completed beyond BS degree. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. None
- ☐ 2. Courses required for certification
- ☐ 3. Courses beyond that required for certification but have not completed a Master's degree
- ☐ 4. Master's degree
- ☐ 5. Courses beyond a Master's degree but have not completed a doctoral degree
- ☐ 6. Doctoral degree

G. Other types of Professional Activities. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Participate in no professional activities
- ☐ 2. Participate only in local professional activities
- ☐ 3. Participate in professional activities only at the regional and/or state levels (such as home economics teacher conference)
- ☐ 4. Participate in professional activities at local, regional and/or state levels
- ☐ 5. Participate in professional activities at local, regional and/or state and national levels

IV. ATTITUDES

Directions: In the spaces on the left, check those items which best describe your beliefs and/or feelings as they apply to your present home-economics classroom teaching position (if now teaching) or your last position (if not teaching at present).

A. Adequacy of training in subject matter. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Feel inadequately prepared in almost all areas of home economics
- ☐ 2. Feel adequately prepared in one or two areas of home economics
- ☐ 3. Feel adequately prepared in most areas of home economics
- ☐ 4. Feel adequately prepared in all areas of home economics

B. Adequacy of training in teaching methods. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Feel inadequate in planning and using most methods
- ☐ 2. Feel adequate in the use of general methods such as lecture but feel inadequate in planning and carrying out some special home economics laboratory lessons, discussions, demonstrations, and activities such as FHA and home experiences
- ☐ 3. Feel adequate in planning and using a variety of methods in classroom, laboratory and related activities
- ☐ 4. Feel adequate in planning, using and evaluating a variety of methods in classroom, laboratory, and related activities

C. Professional adequacy. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Feel insecure and unhappy in teaching
- ☐ 2. Feel fairly secure and happy in teaching
- ☐ 3. Feel secure and happy in teaching
- ☐ 4. Feel secure and happy in teaching and feel that a worthwhile contribution is made to society and young people

D. Educational philosophy. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Have no well defined beliefs about the purposes of education
- ☐ 2. Have some beliefs concerning the purposes of education but cannot see how to achieve them through home economics
- ☐ 3. Have some beliefs concerning the purposes of education and how to help achieve them through home economics
- ☐ 4. Have a well defined philosophy of education and the place of home economics in achieving these objectives

E. Chances for marriage. Please check your beliefs even though you may be married. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Believe that women teachers have few chances to meet suitable marriage partners
- ☐ 2. Believe that women teachers have as many chances to meet suitable marriage partners as women with comparable professional positions
- ☐ 3. Believe that women teachers have better chances to meet suitable marriage partners than women with comparable professional positions

F. Financial opportunities. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Cannot meet needs with the salary received for teaching
- ☐ 2. Can meet immediate needs with the salary received for teaching, but find it difficult to plan for travel, attending school and/or major things such as owning a home
- ☐ 3. Can meet immediate needs and budget for travel, further education and generally meet financial expectations on the salary received for teaching

G. Living arrangements. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Living arrangements are unsatisfactory
- ☐ 2. Living arrangements are fairly satisfactory
- ☐ 3. Living arrangements are satisfactory
- ☐ 4. Living arrangements are very satisfactory

H. Cultural opportunities. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. This teaching situation provides little opportunity for cultural and/or stimulating intellectual activities such as attending concerts and lectures
- ☐ 2. This teaching situation provides some opportunity for cultural and/or stimulating intellectual activities
- ☐ 3. This teaching situation provides much opportunity for cultural and/or stimulating intellectual activities

I. Creativity. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Home economics teaching seems dull and routine
- ☐ 2. Home economics teaching provides limited opportunities to use own ideas in developing the program and teaching methods
- ☐ 3. Home economics teaching provides opportunities for experimentation with teaching methods and program development
- ☐ 4. Home economics teaching provides opportunities for experimentation with teaching methods, program development and sharing problem-solving in the school as a whole

J. Attitude of teachers other than home economics. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Home economics is ignored by most teachers in the school
- ☐ 2. Home economics is viewed unfavorably by many of the teachers in the school
- ☐ 3. Home economics is viewed unfavorably by some, but is supported by some teachers in the school
- ☐ 4. Home economics is viewed favorably and is supported by most of the teachers in the school

K. Attitude of administrator(s). (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Home economics is considered largely a field for students of low socio-economic level and/or mental ability
- ☐ 2. Home economics is considered necessary for students of low socio-economic level and/or mental ability but is also considered suitable for all students
- ☐ 3. Home economics is considered a field having much to offer all girls
- ☐ 4. Home economics is considered a field having much to offer all students (boys as well as girls)

L. Prestige in the community. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Most community members seem to think of home economics as a "frill" rather than a necessary part of the school program
- ☐ 2. Most community members seem to accept home economics as a part of the school program but do not seem to understand that it is more than cooking and sewing
- ☐ 3. Most community members seem to understand home economics and generally support the program
- ☐ 4. Most community members seem to understand and see real value in home economics and strongly support the program

M. Attitude of students. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Home economics is considered largely a field for students of low socio-economic level and/or mental ability
- ☐ 2. Home economics is considered necessary for students of low socio-economic level and/or mental ability but is also considered suitable for all students
- ☐ 3. Home economics is considered a field having much to offer all girls
- ☐ 4. Home economics is considered a field having much to offer all students (boys as well as girls)

N. Attitude of your parental family toward home economics teaching. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Family has little respect for home economics teaching as a profession
- ☐ 2. Family respects home economics teaching but does not think there is any future in it
- ☐ 3. Family has respect for home economics teaching and feel it is a creditable profession for women
- ☐ 4. Family has great respect for home economics teaching and think that it is a worth-while profession for both men and women

O. Present attitude of husband toward teaching--answer only if married.
(Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Definitely opposed to wife's teaching
- ☐ 2. Fairly favorable to wife's teaching
- ☐ 3. Favorable to wife's teaching
- ☐ 4. Very favorable to wife's teaching

P. Attitude of friends toward home economics teaching. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Very unfavorable toward home economics teaching
- ☐ 2. Somewhat favorable toward home economics teaching
- ☐ 3. Favorable toward home economics teaching
- ☐ 4. Very favorable toward home economics teaching

Q. Relationships with students. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Students are hard to manage and working with them is not enjoyable
- ☐ 2. Students are hard to manage but working with them is enjoyable
- ☐ 3. Students are fairly cooperative but working with them is not enjoyable
- ☐ 4. Students are fairly cooperative and working with them is enjoyable
- ☐ 5. Students are cooperative and working with them is very enjoyable

R. Relationships in the community where you are teaching or did teach.
(Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Do not participate in community functions and do not feel a part of the community
- ☐ 2. Do not participate in community functions but feel a part of the community
- ☐ 3. Participate in some community functions but do not feel a part of the community
- ☐ 4. Participate in some community functions and feel a part of the community
- ☐ 5. Participate in many community functions and have a strong sense of belonging in this community

S. Relationships with school personnel. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Do not enjoy many staff members and have little contact with them
- ☐ 2. Enjoy some staff members but have few contacts with them other than professional
- ☐ 3. Enjoy some staff members and have both professional and social contacts with them
- ☐ 4. Enjoy many staff members and have both professional and social contacts with them

T. Restrictions in personal life. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Teachers are much more restricted in personal life than other professional workers
- ☐ 2. Teachers are somewhat more restricted in personal life than other professional workers
- ☐ 3. Teachers have about the same restrictions in personal life as other professional workers

U. Attitude of community toward teachers. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Most community members do not accept teachers and are critical of them
- ☐ 2. Most community members ignore teachers
- ☐ 3. Most community members accept teachers but make no attempt to include them as regular members
- ☐ 4. Teachers are well accepted and included in all community functions
- ☐ 5. Teachers are sought after as community members and leaders

V. Supervision of principal and/or superintendent. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Does no supervision and gives little support to teachers
- ☐ 2. Does no supervision but gives support to teachers
- ☐ 3. Directs much of the teachers' work from the main office and checks only to see that the teachers carry out office directives
- ☐ 4. Checks to see how things are going but gives no suggestions
- ☐ 5. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise
- ☐ 6. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise and always supports teachers

W. Supervision of state home economics supervisors. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Does not visit this school
- ☐ 2. Visits this school but does no supervision
- ☐ 3. Sends out directives and checks to see that the teachers carry them out
- ☐ 4. Checks to see how things are going but gives no suggestions
- ☐ 5. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise
- ☐ 6. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise and always supports teachers

X. Supervision of college home economics teacher education person. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Does not visit this school
- ☐ 2. Visits this school but does no supervision
- ☐ 3. Sends out directives and checks to see that the teacher carries them out
- ☐ 4. Checks to see how things are going but gives no suggestions
- ☐ 5. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise
- ☐ 6. Observes, gives good suggestions and/or praise and always supports teachers

Y. Worth of junior and senior high school home economics. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Not convinced that home economics education is worth-while for all students
- ☐ 2. Believe that home economics education can make a worth-while contribution to the lives of most individual students, families and to society
- ☐ 3. Believe that home economics should be an integral part of the school curriculum and of vital importance to individuals, families and society

Z. Load. (Check one item only)

- ☐ 1. Have such a heavy schedule of class and extra-class activities that you can not do many of the things which other teachers do
- ☐ 2. Teaching load is usually light enough to enable you to do most of the things other teachers in the school do
- ☐ 3. Have about the same teaching and extra-class load as other teachers in the school

AA. Reasons for teaching. (Rank these items in order of importance. That is, 1 for the most important, 2 for the next important, etc.)

- _____ 1. Teach for financial reasons
- _____ 2. Teach because teaching is the only work for which you feel qualified
- _____ 3. Teach because it is the only work that you can get in the community
- _____ 4. Teach because you enjoy it
- _____ 5. Teach because you feel responsibility toward young people and society

V. Only those who have TAUGHT BUT LEFT AND NOT RETURNED answer the next two items.

A. If your reasons for leaving teaching have not been covered in the above items, will you please list them?

B. What conditions might now influence you to return to teaching?

VI. Only those who have TAUGHT BUT LEFT AND RETURNED answer the next two items.

A. If your reasons for leaving teaching have not been covered in the above items, will you please list them.

B. What conditions influenced you to return to teaching?

VII. Only those who have STAYED IN TEACHING CONTINUOUSLY answer the next two items.

A. Will you explain any reasons for remaining in teaching that have not been covered in the above items?

B. If you feel dissatisfaction(s) with teaching which have not been shown in the above items, please list.

~~OCT 16 1960~~

~~AUG 4 1961~~

~~JUN 3 1962~~

~~JUL 10 1962~~

~~AUG 24 1962~~

~~AUG 12 1963~~

~~APR 20 1963~~

~~MAY 22 1963~~

~~DEC - 6 1965~~

~~DEC 10 1965~~

~~JUN 8 1967~~

~~JUN 2 1967~~

~~MAY 20 1967~~

~~OCT 19 1968~~

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03085 4396