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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This study examines the relationship between training and job satisfaction. The concepts of training and job satisfaction have been widely studied with only an occasional reference to a connection between the two constructs.

The benefits and effectiveness of training are widely discussed in current business literature. Many journals, both academic and popular, contribute to the concepts of training. Examples of popular journals include Training, Industrial and Commercial Training, Learning & Training Innovations, and Training & Management Development Methods; and examples of academic journals include Human Resource Development Quarterly, International Journal of Training and Development, Journal of Instructional Psychology, Performance Improvement Quarterly, and Workforce Education Forum. This is not an exhaustive listing of journals related to training and development. For the purpose of this study, the term continuing professional education (CPE) relates to both the concepts of training and development.

Training and professional development are major investments in today’s working environments. According to the American Society for Training & Development (ASTD) 2002-2003 State of the Industry Report, companies spent, on average, $826 per employee for professional development during the year 2002. This equated to 1.9% of businesses’ payrolls dedicated to professional development (Thompson, 2003). Galvin, Johnson, and Johnson (2004) stated that the top 100 training companies in the year 2003 spent $6.6 billion on training. Additionally, the Council of Hotel and Restaurant Trainers (CHART) reported that its membership spent $182,000 per year on equipment, supplies, software, hardware, videos, and outside training materials for its individual companies. The overall amount spent during 2003 for
CHART members totaled $17.8 million for training materials (Berta, 2004). As can be seen by the amount of money spent by these organizations, training is an important facet in today’s business environment and one that is worth further study.

Beyond the monetary investment that organizations have provided for the professional development of their employees, it is important to understand the benefits gained both by the organization and by the employee participating in professional development. Some benefits held in common by employees and organizations include increased job productivity, increased number of certified employees, increased competency, better motivation (Guest, Conway, & Dewe, 2004), higher retention (Numerof, Abrams, & Ott, 2004), and improved job satisfaction (Bukowitz, Williams, & Mactas, 2004). The types of training commonly offered to employees include new employee orientation, in-house training, continuing education experiences (Spears & Parker, 2002), mentoring programs, and on-the-job or off-the-job training (Guest et al., 2004).

Job satisfaction is a concept that also has been widely researched, both academically and professionally. This is due to the importance of job satisfaction in the work environment and its connections to employment issues such as surviving downsizing (Amundson, Borgen, Jordan, & Erlebach, 2004); improving job performance, higher retention, lower turnover (Blood, Swavely Ridenour, Thomas, Dean-Qualls, & Scheffiner Hammer, 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Lopopolo, 2002; Spears & Parker, 2002); and even life satisfaction (P. C. Smith, 1992). The importance and complexity of these linkages and their influences on the work environment continue to demand further investigation into the many facets and diverse relationships associated with job satisfaction.

Researchers can examine job satisfaction from the perspective of factors that affect it such as supervision, pay, and co-workers or job satisfaction can examined from the perspective
of factors that it influences such as job performance, retention, and turnover. This study examines the relationship between the perceived benefits of employees’ continuing professional development (training) and job satisfaction.

Need for the Study

This study supplements the existing job satisfaction literature by considering the relationship between managers and professional employees’ perceived reasons for pursuing CPE and job satisfaction. The population used for this study is information technology (IT) professionals in higher education. Information technology professionals have not been widely represented as a population in the existing research literature with IT professionals in higher education having less representation. Therefore, this study is useful to both IT non-management employees and IT managers in higher education as these individual’s attempt to determine the best options for continuing professional education. Additionally, this research will support the need for training and CPE as it extends the linkage of improved job satisfaction to the reasons for pursuing continuing professional development activities.

With IT professionals being among of the fastest growing labor categories identified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004-2005), institutions of higher education have more difficulty attracting and retaining these employees. According to BLS,

Computer systems analysts, database administrators, and computer scientists are expected to be among the fastest growing occupations through 2012. Employment of these computer specialists is expected to grow much faster than the average for all occupations as organizations continue to adopt and integrate increasingly sophisticated technologies. (p. 4)

Barron (1999) noted that "training is also leveraging effectively to keep top-flight technical talent from jumping ship in face of aggressive recruiting tactics and lucrative signing bonuses" (p. 21). Therefore, one possible incentive for retention that higher education can offer these employees is continuing professional development and educational opportunities.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study combines theories from business management, psychology, and education. The job satisfaction and motivational theoretical works of P. C. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959); and Maslow (1954) influenced this study. The works discussed start with the most recent and move to the oldest frameworks while showing connections from the preceding work. Houle’s (1961) theory on CPE additionally influenced this study from the training and development perspective.

Job Satisfaction

Although many definitions exist for the construct of job satisfaction, the definition presented by P. C. Smith et al. (1969) are used as the theoretical basis for job satisfaction because Smith’s Job in General (JIG) and Job Descriptive Index (JDI) instruments are used in this study to measure job satisfaction. Smith et al. defined job satisfaction as “an affective (that is, emotional) reaction to a job that results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, and so on)” (p. 1). Additionally, in the JDI user’s manual, Smith defined global satisfaction as an overall, integrative feeling of satisfaction when all aspects of the job are considered (Balzer et al., 2000).

Job satisfaction has been associated with many behaviors in the workplace and has been associated with many theories of work motivation. As described in the *Users’ Manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 version) and the Job in General Scales* (Balzer et al., 2000), many theorists have found job satisfaction to be a direct cause of behavior such as attending work, maintaining quality standards, seeking improved work methods, and cooperating with other employees. Additionally, other theorists have viewed job satisfaction as a consequence of such behavior because these behaviors lead to rewards from the supervisor or the work itself and
therefore lead to enhanced job satisfaction. Others theorists have seen job satisfaction as merely a symptom or a byproduct of a work process such as inadequate job design, leading to both job dissatisfaction and uncooperative employee behavior (Balzer et al., 2000). In any case, job satisfaction, if carefully measured and defined, is a useful and readily available guide for understanding behaviors in the workplace.

Motivation Needs Theory

The motivation theories that drive this study are Herzberg’s (1965) motivation-hygiene theory and Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs. Herzberg’s theory on motivation and its connections to job satisfaction contribute to the concepts investigated in this study. Additionally, because Herzberg acknowledged that Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory influenced his motivation-hygiene theory, a discussion of Maslow’s theory is included for completeness.

The motivation-hygiene theory of Herzberg et al. (1959) is a commonly used motivation theory in the investigation of the construct of job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. suggested that employees could be motivated on the job by the work itself. This theory divides motivation into the two components of satisfiers or motivators and dissatisfiers or hygiene factors. Satisfiers are factors that motivate a person to want to work, yet the absence of a satisfier does not demotivate the worker or cause dissatisfaction. Satisfiers can included such factors such as recognition of achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement (Quick, 1985).

A dissatisfier, on the other hand, serves only to prevent job satisfaction and has little impact on the happiness of the worker. A dissatisfier does not demotivate the worker, and its presence does not cause dissatisfaction. However, a dissatisfier has the characteristics of being preventative and environmental and therefore is hygienic in nature. Additionally, when a dissatisfier is absent, dissatisfaction can still occur (Herzberg, 1965). The following factors of
supervision, company policy and administration, positive working condition, interpersonal
relations with peers, subordinates and superiors, status, job security, salary, personal life and the
possibility of growth are often commonly considered dissatisfiers (Quick, 1985).

Herzberg et al. (1959) conducted their original research with engineers and accountants.
Similarly, this study examines a technically oriented population, using a population of
information technology professionals.

In *Motivation and Personality*, Maslow (1954) presented his influential theory on
motivation called the hierarchy of needs, which was derived primarily from clinical observations.
The hierarchy of needs theory states that people are motivated to satisfy certain needs, beginning
with basic and bodily needs and advancing to complex and psychological needs. A corollary to
this theory is that, once a need is largely satisfied, it no longer acts as a motivator. Described
below is the hierarchy of needs from least complex need to most complex need:

1. Physiological Needs – These are the bodily needs that include conditions such as
   food, drink, and sleep.
2. Safety Needs – These needs describe a person’s desire to be safe and secure. This can
   include the desire to have stability and protection.
3. Belongingness and Love – This is the desire for family, friends, and intimacy.
4. Esteem Needs – These needs include self-esteem and the desire for respect from
   others. Esteem needs also can include feelings of competence, importance, and usefulness.
5. Self-actualization – The final level of the need hierarchy is the need to strive for
   personal potential (Maslow, 1954; Quick, 1985).

Motivation theory is an important concept, especially in terms of its relationship to job
satisfaction. While the debate about the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation
continues (Quick, 1985), the current study has drawn upon this relationship as a basis to correlate why IT professionals seek CPE (a motivator) with job satisfaction. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory has been described as being difficult to apply to the work environment from a manager’s perspective, and Herzberg’s two-factor theory does not completely explain how employees are motivated to become satisfied with their jobs (Quick, 1985). These two theories together provide an understanding of the relationship between what motivates an employee to work and his or her job satisfaction.

Continuing Professional Education

Cyril O. Houle (1964) was interested in professional learning and education. From his inquiry, Houle developed a way to classify adult learners according to a motivation scheme (Morstain & Smart, 1977). Houle’s (1961) theory proposed three orientations to explain why adults are motivated to continue learning. His orientations include the following:

1. Goal-oriented individuals are adults, who use education as a means to accomplish definite objectives.

2. Activity-oriented individuals are adults who take part in education because they find in the circumstances of the learning a meaning which has no necessary connection to the content or the announced purpose of the activity.

3. Learning-oriented individuals are adults who seek knowledge for the sake of learning.

Based on Houle’s (1980) theory of continuing professional education, Grotelueschen (1985) created the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS). The instrument classifies the reasons for participation in CPE into five factors: (a) professional improvement and development, (b) professional service, (c) collegial learning and interaction, (d) professional commitment and reflection, and (e) personal benefits and job security.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to determine whether the perceived reasons for pursuing continuing professional educational activities correlates with improved job satisfaction for information technology employees in institutions of higher education. The study also examines the relationship between the number of hours of professional development attended and the degree of job satisfaction and whether the position level held by an employee relates to his or her perceived benefits of training and overall job satisfaction. The population of this study is information technology employees from higher education.

Research Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses examined by this study as related to perceived benefits of professional development and job satisfaction are as follows:

Hypothesis 1
H₀₁ₐ: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of continuing professional education (CPE) hours that information technology (IT) managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the Job In General (JIG) scale summary.

H₀₁₈: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

H₀₁₉: There will be no statistically significant difference between IT managers’ and non-managers’ degree of overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.
Hypothesis 2

H02: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reasons why IT managers and non-managers pursue CPE as determined by summarizing the five factors of Participation Reasons Scale (PRS).

Hypothesis 3

H03a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale.

H03b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

Hypothesis 4

H04a: For IT managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

H04b: For IT non-managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

Delimitations

The restrictions that I imposed upon this study as a researcher include the following:

1. The population of this study was employees working in information technology positions in their respective institutions.

2. I solicited the population of the study by e-mail from e-mail discussion lists that cater to
information technology employees working in institutions of higher education. This method of sampling is a convenience population; members self-selected membership in the list, and members also chose to respond to the survey and therefore the sample was not a random.

3. The IT professionals participating in this study were employed, holding professional positions from entry-level to management positions at their respective institutions.

4. I took advantage of modern electronic survey techniques using e-mail to contact the population and distributed the survey over the World Wide Web. These techniques were convenient for the population under study.

Limitations

The restrictions that were outside my control as the researcher include the following:

1. I did not control for the quality of the training received by the participants.

2. This study did not account for the general personality construct of happiness. P. C. Smith (1992) concluded that “the happy person not only tends to be more satisfied with everything, including his or her experiences and behaviors, but also views events differently” (p. 13). The impact of happiness could be that, in all probability, people who are generally happy have greater job satisfaction.

3. This study recognizes that self-reporting instruments have inherent errors and biases in assuming that the subjects will provide honest responses to instruments.

4. I did not control the type of training or CPE received by the population. As a researcher, I was interested only in knowing that the individuals within the population have pursued some type of training.

5. I did not control for the duration of the training received by the participants and I did not consider whether the participants attended an hour-long training session or a weeklong
workshop. As a researcher, I was interested only in the total number of training hours the participants attended during a 6-month period.

6. I did not control for the number of managers versus non-managers participating in the study.

Summary

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides the framework, describing how and why this study contributes to the existing body of research on job satisfaction and professional development. The sections Background, Significance of Study, Theoretical Framework, and Purpose of Study describe the importance and significance of this study to the body of literature. Additionally, this chapter clarifies the study’s focus through the Research Hypotheses, Delimitations, and Limitations.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the relevant literature related to job satisfaction and continuing professional education. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used to study the problems, including relevant information about the study’s population and sample, the instruments used in the study, and the data collection and data analysis methodologies. Chapter 4 presents the data collected during the study of the problem, and chapter 5 presents the conclusions drawn from the collected data. It also describes possible improvements and future directions that I chose and other researchers may choose to use.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This study examines the relationship between the perceived benefits of attending continuing professional development and job satisfaction for Information Technology (IT) professionals in higher education. The relationship between Continuing Professional Education (CPE) and job satisfaction is assessed using the five reasons identified by Grotelueschen (1985), as measured by the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) for CPE with the five factors for job satisfaction identified by P. C. Smith et al. (1969), as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job In General (JIG) scale.

This chapter includes a review of the literature related to the importance of and reasons for pursuing CPE and studies that have used the PRS instrument to determine the reasons for attending continuing professional education. Additionally, this literature review examines the importance of job satisfaction to the work environment and includes studies that have used the JDI and JIG instruments to measure job satisfaction. The examination of past studies is necessary to discover possible relationships between CPE and job satisfaction as related to the amount of CPE attended and the job level of IT professionals.

Continuing Professional Education

In today’s society, individuals base their self-worth on their work and increasingly find that their identity and satisfaction come from their profession (Mott, 2000). According to Mott, education is becoming an increasingly important factor in people’s lives, especially in the workplace. Professional employee educational participation was described by Grotelueschen (1985) as the involvement in formal education activities that are typically short-term, part-time, or both. Educational institutions, professional associations and societies, professional service
agencies, the government, and other organizations provide continuing professional activities. Additionally Grotelueschen made the distinction between continuing education in general and continuing professional education. The distinctions between the two types of education are the characteristics of the referent population, the nature of the participation, and the benefits received from the educational experience. Continuing education is described as learning experiences that prepare employees for future positions (Spears & Parker, 2002). Spears and Parker also defined training as the preparation an employee receives to improve performance on his or her present job. Training expense is necessary in order for the organization to become more effective and to increase productivity. Mott (2000) expanded the definition of continuing professional education as “improving professional competence and practice” (p. 23). However it is defined, continuing professional education and training for many professions is growing in size, coherence, and stature (Cervero, 2000).

Reason for and Benefits of CPE

Houle (1961), regarded as one of the leading theorists in adult learning, identified a difference between continuing professional education and general education. He also predicted that professional education would grow in size and stature and compete with pre-service education. Houle postulated three orientations to explain why adult learners choose to pursue continuing professional education, describing the learners as having one of the following orientations:

1. Goal-oriented individuals are adults who take part in educational activities as a means to accomplish definite objectives.

2. Activity-oriented individuals are adults who take part in educational experiences because they find the circumstances of the learning meaningful. These individuals do not need to have a compulsory connection to the content or an announced purpose for the learning activity.
3. Learning-oriented individuals are adults who seek knowledge for the sake of learning (Houle, 1961).

Additional explanations for why CPE has become an important aspect of the workplace environment include rapid societal changes, the increase of research-based knowledge, and spiraling technological innovations (Cervero, 2000). Grotelueschen (1985) added that employees seek CPE due to a need for personal fulfillment, collegiality, professional advancement, or skill development. Mott (2000) explained that the goal of CPE is the development of professional expertise for the improvement of workplace practice.

Cervero (2000) predicted that if professions required certification and licensure then CPE use would be more frequent. Information technology professionals do not typically have a mandated certification or licensure path; therefore, CPE is viewed mainly as a valuable commodity for recruitment and retention (Barron, 1999). According to Barron, professional development provides a way to maintain job satisfaction.

CPE Studies

Researchers have studied the concepts of CPE from many different perspectives. To reveal the breadth of different continuing professional education studies, this section discusses the populations and factors that have been associated with CPE.

Studying social-work care managers, Gorman (2003) examined the difference between the skills and competency needed for continuing professional education. Gorman’s study identified particular skills necessary for a care manager to pursue during continuing education. Additionally, the study verified that CPE improves the professional skills of care managers. Gorman also found that an investment in CPE is a necessary investment for care managers to enable strategies for planned care to succeed.
The relationship between the reasons for participating in CPE and leadership effectiveness was studied by McCamey (2003) for first-line supervisors in the nuclear power industry. Using regression analysis, McCamey concluded that a relationship exists between the reasons for participating in CPE and the perceived leadership effectiveness of first-line supervisors. However, the study did not find a relationship between motivation to participate and leadership effectiveness.

Bolton (2002) studied chiropractors’ attitudes and perceptions of CPE in relationship to clinical practice. Bolton concluded that chiropractic professionals perceived CPE as enhancing knowledge and skills, increasing confidence, stimulating enthusiasm, and motivation to continue to learn. Thus, he declared that CPE created a more reflective attitude and provided an opportunity for meeting other professionals to exchange ideas. However, this study did not find that CPE actually contributed to changes in professional practice or improved care for patients.

Other studies have focused on the barriers against participation in continuing professional education. Cullen (1998) conducted a study on a population of registered nurses in the state of Delaware. This study found three major reasons for nonparticipation in continuing professional education: disengagement; the conditional effect of indifference, apathy, boredom, and insecurity; and alienation toward CPE. Additional reasons for nonparticipation were cost and quality of the training programs.

As these studies show, much of the recent work focuses on participation in CPE. The research varies in both the conclusions drawn and the populations studied. The present study contributes to the body of literature on CPE through its examination of the reasons IT managers and IT non-managers from higher education pursue CPE. Additionally, this study examines the relationship between CPE and job satisfaction for IT managers and non-managers.
Studies Using the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS)

This study explores the relationships between the reasons why IT managers and non-managers choose to pursue CPE and their job satisfaction. Many studies use the PRS instrument to identify the reasons for seeking continuing professional education. The PRS created by Grotelueschen (1985) is a self-reporting instrument used to discover the reasons why professionals participate in continuing professional education. The author of the PRS was seeking an instrument that would help to explain the reasons for participation that focused less on adult learning in general and more on the subgroup of working adult professional learning. Because an instrument did not exist that measured the subgroup of adult professional learning, Grotelueschen had to create an instrument (Kenny & Harnisch, 1982). As a framework for the instrument, Grotelueschen expanded Houle’s (1964) theoretical learner orientations by creating five operational constructs to further detail the reasons adults seek continuing professional education. Grotelueschen identified the following five factors to explain why adults participate in continuing professional education: (a) professional improvement and development, (b) professional service, (c) collegial learning and interaction, (d) professional commitment and reflection, and (e) personal benefits and job security. Table 1 describes Grotelueschen’s five factors in more detail.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Improvement and Development</td>
<td>relates to reasons that are clearly associated with the day-to-day practices. The PRS items in this factor include such key words as &quot;knowledge or skill&quot;, and/or references to a concern for &quot;competent&quot;, &quot;quality performance&quot;. The concepts in this factor relate to the need to keep up with rapid changes in technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>relates to participation reasons that are associated with the service aspects. Key words in this factor are &quot;effective&quot;, &quot;proficient&quot;, and &quot;better service&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning and Interaction</td>
<td>includes participation reasons related to learning through an interchange with professional colleagues. Key words in this factor include &quot;exchange thoughts&quot;, &quot;relate ideas&quot;, and learn from &quot;interaction. The concepts in this factor however, are learning oriented rather than socially oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits and Job Security</td>
<td>includes participation reasons related to job security, financial gain, or professional advancement. Words that are illustrative of these reasons include &quot;increase...benefits, &quot;change the emphasis of&quot;, &quot;professional advancement&quot;, and &quot;individual security&quot;. This concept is descriptive of the establishment of a professional role that provides longevity and rewards accomplishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment and Reflection</td>
<td>includes participation reasons related to a membership within a larger professional body, and to reasons which are external to the technical aspects. Key words such as &quot;maintain identity&quot;, &quot;enhance the image&quot;, &quot;reflect on the value&quot;, and &quot;review my commitment to my profession&quot;, illustrate concepts in this factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The PRS is a versatile instrument. Populations that have been measured using the PRS include managers in nuclear power plants (McCamey, 2003), army engineers (Grzyb, Graham, & Donaldson, 1998), registered nurses (DeSilets, 1990), physicians (Cervero, 1981), and veterinarians (Harnisch, 1980).

Grzyb et al. (1998) used the PRS to measure the effects of academic preparation, leadership, functional roles, and occupational specialty on reasons for becoming involved in training and education with army engineers. The authors contended that the world of work has changed and that employees no longer can expect lifetime employment with one company. Rather, employees must become continuous learners who respond to the needs of their organizations and the organization’s clients. Therefore, effective training programs need to be based on the needs of the learner. Understanding the needs of the learner requires an understanding of the reasons people participate, the instructional methods selected, the content covered in the training, and the
evaluation procedures used. Additionally, the motives for involvement in education and training can vary significantly according to characteristics related to a profession, organizational roles, and previous educational preparation (Grotelueschen, 1985; Houle, 1980). The Grzyb et al. study observed that educational background had no significant impact among leadership, functional role, specialty areas, and reasons for involvement in education or training. The implications from the Grzyb et al. study are that organizational context has a powerful influence on training participation and the reasons for attendance. Grzyb et al. also found that linking training specifically to the employee’s role within the organization enhances the training.

DeSilets (1990) examined the reasons nurses seek to participate in CPE in relationship to job function and demographic characteristics. The author found that nurses are concerned with professional competence and participate in CPE for reasons related to acquiring new skills and knowledge. DeSilets also conducted a factor analysis on the PRS and found that five factors contribute to the reasons: professional improvement and development, professional service, collegial learning and interaction, personal benefits and job security, and professional commitment and reflection. These factors accounted for 60.5% of the variance. This current study used the factors identified by DeSilets’ research.

Cervero (1981) used the PRS to study physicians’ reasons for seeking continuing professional education. Findings indicated that physicians’ reasons for participation clustered into four main areas: (a) to maintain and improve professional competence and service to patients, (b) to enhance personal and professional position, (c) to understand themselves as a professional, and (d) to interact with colleagues.

Harnisch’s (1980) research is included in this review because as a researcher, Harnisch continued to develop the PRS instrument. Harnisch’s original work reported that veterinarians
participated in CPE for reasons of (a) professional improvement and development, (b) professional reflection, (c) personal benefits and job security, and (d) collegial learning and interaction.

Understanding the reasons why professionals voluntarily pursue CPE will help the creators of professional development programs to concentrate on learner interests, needs, and logistical considerations when designing educational programs (Grzyb et al., 1998). This study will add to the existing literature by providing a relationship between the reasons an individual participates in CPE and job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

After Herzberg’s published work in the 1950s, job satisfaction has been one of the most studied constructs in social science, with an estimated 3,000 articles and dissertations dealing with the construct (Wofford, 2003). With this amount of research regarding job satisfaction, it is not surprising to find that job satisfaction has several variations of definitions. P. C. Smith et al. (1969) defined job satisfaction as “an affective (that is, emotional) reaction to a job that results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, and so on)” (p. 1). I used this definition for job satisfaction because it was the basis of the instrument used to collect data for this study. Table 2 shows several variations of the definitions for job satisfaction, taken from Wofford’s (2003) work on job satisfaction.
Table 2

*Definitions of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vroom (1964)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the basis of an employee’s evaluation of whether one gets what he/she wants from a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzberg (1968)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the basis of human-relations theory, which posits that employees develop positive job attitudes if their jobs allow them to fulfill their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke (1976)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction refers to employees’ affective relations to their work role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it is offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrich and Lake (1991)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state produced from a person’s experience associated with his or her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weissman, Alexander, and Chase (1980)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the degree of positive affect toward the overall job or its components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is an individual’s general attitude toward one’s job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarpello and Vandenberg (1992)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the disparity between what the employee desires from a job and what he or she actually receives from the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLeon and Taher (1996)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is a function of its intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, as well as the employee’s needs, expectations, and characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm and Mathaisel (2000)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the difference between perception of work and expectations and importance of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson and Johnson (2000)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the employee’s response to the conditions of the workplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Reasons for and Benefits of Job Satisfaction

Researchers attribute many workplace behaviors to job satisfaction. These behaviors include voluntary turnover (Trevor, 2001), commitment to the organization (Lopopolo, 2002), pay satisfaction for university faculty (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004), work performance (Gibbons, Corrigan, & Newton, 2000; Petty, McGee, & Cavendar, 1984), absenteeism (Scott & Taylor, 1985), job relocation (Geyer & Daly, 1998), intent to leave (Hellman, 1997), employee turnover.
According to P. C. Smith et al. (1969), theorists who are interested in human motivation are also concerned with job satisfaction as it relates to the theories of human behavior and attitudes.

The construct of job satisfaction is also important to practicing managers in a variety of occupational settings (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). It has been studied with many populations, including public health nurses (Campbell et al., 2004), dental therapists (Gibbons et al., 2000), elementary school teachers (Woods & Weasmer, 2004), college professors (Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003), information technology professionals (Compton, 2002), and municipal government employees (Ellickson, 2002). Additionally, job satisfaction has been studied over various position levels, from line employees to upper-level management (F. J. Smith, Scott, & Hulin, 1977).

Campbell et al. (2004) researched the construct of job satisfaction and found that job satisfaction was critical to retaining and attracting a well-qualified, public health nursing workforce. The authors’ findings suggest that the work environment in which supervisors and subordinates all consult concerning job tasks and decisions and individuals are involved with peers in decision-making and task definition relates positively to job satisfaction. The research of Campell et al. helps support the idea that job satisfaction has a relationship to employee retention.

Other research supports the present study in the connections drawn between the population of IT employees and job satisfaction. Brown’s (2002) research on job satisfaction and work motivation with IT professionals in the Delaware Valley concluded that training and development are necessary components for retention and recruitment.

Spears and Parker (2002) studied the relationship of specific training to employees’ satisfaction with the performance appraisal process. The authors found that employees have greater
job satisfaction when they have new employee training, in-house training, and support for continuing education. This particular study is relevant to the present literature review because it establishes a connection between job satisfaction and continuing professional education. However, Spears and Parker focused on only one training event related to the employee appraisal process.

Demographic Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction

The last section examines studies that focus on the factors influenced by job satisfaction. This section examines the demographic factors that influence job satisfaction. Some of the factors that contribute to changes in job satisfaction include age, gender, work roles, and organizational structure (Rowden, 2002; P. C. Smith et al., 1969).

Rowden (2002) studied the impact of company size and workplace learning. The author found that workplace learning contributes significantly to the aspect of job satisfaction, especially in small to midsize businesses. Rowden’s study is valuable because it directly connects workplace learning to job satisfaction.

Ellickson (2002) recently examined municipal government employees’ job satisfaction. The author used regression analysis to determine what environmental factors and demographic factors influence job satisfaction, finding that demographic factors such as age and gender are poor predictors of job satisfaction.

As a demographic factor, age has received much research interest. In the 1950s and the 1960s, studies on satisfaction and age showed a definite U-shape pattern (Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996). The authors described the U-shape pattern as beginning with a moderate level of job satisfaction in the early years of employment, declining through the middle stages of employment, and increasing steadily as the employee moves to retirement. Clark et al. recently reconfirmed the U-shape relationship between age and job satisfaction.
Studies Using the JDI and the JIG Scale

Studies researching job satisfaction are numerous, as seen from the sections above. Yet this review scarcely takes into consideration the body of research on job satisfaction. Therefore, this section focuses only on a small sample of job satisfaction studies that have used the JDI and/or JIG instruments.

P. C. Smith et al. (1969), the authors of the JDI and JIG, were interested in the connection of job satisfaction to the employees’ past productivity, with the assumption that a happy worker was a productive worker. However, the simplicity of this construct was not adequate to explain the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. Additionally, no reliable or substantial evidence supported this relationship. Smith et al. therefore created a series of instruments to measure the factors associated with the workplace. The instruments of interest for the present study are the JDI and the JIG scale. The JDI measures five characteristics: the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision and coworkers. The five facets of job satisfaction as defined by Balzer et al. (2000) in the JDI user manual are the following:

1. Satisfaction with Work: this facet concerns the employee's satisfaction with the work itself. The satisfaction literature has identified various attributes of work related to satisfaction: including opportunities for creativity and task variety; allowing an individual to increase his or her knowledge; and changes in responsibility, amount of work, autonomy, job enrichment, and job complexity. Based on these attributes, satisfying work appears to be work that can be accomplished and is intrinsically rewarding.

2. Satisfaction with Pay: Pay satisfaction addresses attitude toward pay and is the basis for the perceived difference between actual and expected pay. Expected pay is based both on the value of perceived inputs and outputs of the job and the pay of other employees holding
similar jobs and possessing similar qualifications. Employee’s satisfaction with pay is influenced by the personal financial situation of the employee, the economy, and the amount of pay an employee has received previously.

3. Satisfaction with Promotion: satisfaction with promotion measures the employee's satisfaction with the company's promotion policy and the administration of that policy. Employee’s satisfaction with promotion is thought to be a function of the frequency of promotions, the importance of promotions, and the desirability of promotions.

4. Satisfaction with Supervision: the supervision facet reflects an employee's satisfaction with his or her supervisor(s). Employees have the greater the levels of satisfaction with supervisors if the supervisor is more considerate and employee-centered (e.g., praising good performance, taking personal interest in employees, providing feedback, and listening to subordinates' opinions). Furthermore, the greater the supervisor's perceived competence on the job, the greater the levels of satisfaction with supervision.

5. Satisfaction with People on the Present Job (Co workers): the facet concerning people on the present job assesses the level of employee satisfaction with his or her fellow employees. The degree of satisfaction with coworkers is thought to be determined by the work-related interaction among coworkers and the mutual liking or admiration of fellow employees.

The JDI and JIG are versatile instruments used to measure job satisfaction. These instruments have recently been used to evaluate the relationship between organizational communication (Goris, Pettit, & Vaught, 2002), absenteeism and job turnover (Compton, 2002), and trust (Morris, Marshall, & Rainer, 2002). A review of studies that use the JIG is also included in this section because the JIG is often used in conjunction with the JDI.
Compton (2002) used the JDI and JIG to measure the level of job satisfaction for members of the Association of Information Technology Professionals (AITP.) The author was examining job satisfaction as it related to absenteeism and job turnover. Additionally, Compton found that the degree of satisfaction that an employee derives from the work environment corresponds directly to the employee’s needs and work-related problems. Compton’s study found that AITP members possessed a high degree of job satisfaction within the subscales of work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers and also had a high degree of satisfaction in general as measured by the JIG.

Goris et al. (2002) assessed the influence of organizational communication on the association between an individual’s job congruence and job satisfaction. The authors found a weak relationship between communication overload (receiving too much information) and communication underload (processing too little information) to job satisfaction and job performance.

Morris et al. (2002) examined the relationship of trust and job satisfaction within virtual teams. Virtual teams are employees who work together cooperatively from different locations supported by IT systems to overcome the limitations of time and location. When researchers used the JDI to measure job satisfaction, they found a significant positive impact between user satisfaction and trust on job satisfaction.

Contribution of This Study

The studies reviewed in this chapter are only a few from the body of research that exists about job satisfaction and CPE separately. The review of literature demonstrates that the breadth of the research is wide; however, there is little research connecting CPE and job satisfaction. Therefore, the present study will contribute to the body of literature because it connects the two
constructs of CPE and job satisfaction. Additionally, this study complements the research of Bruce and Blackburn (1992), who concluded that training is critical to an employee’s job satisfaction and job performance. This study also will shows that the reasons why IT professionals seek continuing professional development could influence IT training and retraining programs.

Additionally, the literature under represents the population of IT professionals working in higher education. IT professionals are essential and critical to business initiatives and are a highly specialized workforce. Because this workforce typically has higher costs associated with it than some other types of employee-employer relationships, employers want to safeguard their employee investment (Schafer, 2005).

Summary

Chapter 2 reviews the existing literature related to the study. The literature review for this chapter includes research related to CPE and job satisfaction. Additionally, this literature review considered research that used the instruments used for the present study. The chapter included a review of journal articles relevant to CPE and studies that used the PRS. The chapter then examined literature related to job satisfaction, with subsections describing studies related to reason and benefits of job satisfaction and demographic factors influencing job satisfaction. Specifically examined were studies that have used the JDI and JIG instruments. The chapter concluded with a section describing how this study contributes to the existing body of literature. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used to execute this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between continuing professional education and job satisfaction. The study used a variety of statistical techniques depending on the data and the hypotheses. This study assesses the relationships between the five reasons for participation in CPE identified by Grotelueschen (1985), as measured by the PRS, and the five constructs of job satisfaction as identified by P. C. Smith et al. (1969), as measured by the JIG and the JDI scale. The chapter includes descriptions of the design used for the study, the study’s population, and the sampling methodology used for the study. Additionally, the instruments used in the study and statistical analysis methods used to assess the hypotheses are discussed.

Research Hypotheses

Data collected from survey questionnaires addressed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

H01a: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

H01b: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

H01c: There will be no statistically significant difference between IT managers’ and non-managers’ degree of overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.
Hypothesis 2

H₀₂: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reasons why IT managers and non-managers pursue CPE as determined by summarizing the five factors of PRS.

Hypothesis 3

H₀₃a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

H₀₃b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

Hypothesis 4

H₀₄a: For IT managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

H₀₄b: For IT non-managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

Research Design

The purpose of this ex post facto design research is to provide results that may identify the importance of continuing education as it relates to job satisfaction for IT professionals in higher education. Examining the relationship between the reasons for attending CPE and job satisfaction required the use of a variety of statistical analysis methods. The statistics used in this study include the Spearman $\rho$, Mann Whitney $U$, and exploratory factor analysis.
As the researcher, I collected data for this study using an Internet-based survey. Although the traditional survey methods have some distinct advantages and disadvantages, Web-based surveys include many of the same advantages and disadvantages of the traditional survey process while also introducing some new benefits and concerns (Umbach, 2004). The Web-based survey offers the advantages of costing less to administer than a mail survey, and the response and turnaround times for the data are often quicker (Dominelli, 2003). Additionally a Web-based survey can have a more interactive format that allows for such options as immediate feedback to the participants with survey summaries, an opportunity not possible with the traditional paper and pencil survey. The Web-based survey also has an advantage when considering the data. With a Web-based survey, there is less opportunity for coding transcription errors, and it is easier to manipulate the data because they are already in a form usable by most statistical software packages (Dominelli, 2003; Umbach, 2004). Finally, the Web-based survey can allow a researcher to ask and receive responses to socially threatening questions that a participant perhaps would not have responded to with other survey modes (Umbach, 2004).

However, the Web-based survey does create concerns that a researcher must be aware of when making the decision to use this method. These concerns include security of the data, participation issues related to Web-based surveys, the burden of responding (Dominelli, 2003), the introduction of measurement errors such as coverage errors and sampling errors, and measurement errors related to inaccurate responses introduced by the survey mode (Umbach, 2004). Additionally the Web-based survey requires that the researcher have technical expertise in order to administer the survey.

I contacted the participants for this study through e-mail solicitations to multiple email discussion lists. To increase the response rate for participation, I took careful consideration in
composing the initial message as well as follow-up reminder e-mail notifications. Umbach (2004) gave the following suggestions for notifying the survey population via electronic methods:

1. Use multiple e-mail contacts, at a minimum use two messages, an initial message and a reminder.
2. Keep the message format simple.
3. Keep the content of the e-mail message similar to a paper survey. Be sure to include a deadline and inform the respondent how long it may take to complete the survey. Also, indicate that the recipient is one of a small group selected for the study.
4. If possible, personalize the e-mail message. The research on the effect of personalization is mixed; however, current software packages can make it relatively easy to personalize the message.
5. Again, if possible, keep the survey short. Pilot test the survey in order to provide concise directions on how long it may take to complete.
6. Do not feel pressure to offer an incentive to survey respondents. The effects of incentives with Web-based surveys are mixed, and most researchers cannot afford to offer incentives.

In the case of this study, the e-mail notifications included sending an initial message and two reminder messages, a simple format that included directions and an indication about how long it would take to complete the survey. Additionally, I offered the incentives of an IPOD shuffle or $100 to increase the response rate from the participants.
Population

The population for this study was professionals employed in IT jobs in institutions of higher education. As the researcher, I chose the population because of easy access through the use of e-mail discussion lists, since e-mail is a commonly used form of communication by this group, and because the population of IT professions in higher education has not been well researched. Educause (2002) estimated that over 100,000 people hold similar IT positions worldwide.

Sample

The numbers of individuals (n = 215) who responded to the survey determined the size of the sample. I used a convenience sample drawn from four e-mail discussion lists commonly used by IT professionals in higher education. The target sample selected for this study was a cross-section of employees holding jobs in higher education IT. The participants in the study represented employees working at both public and private institutions worldwide.

Initial contact with participants for this study used an e-mail notification sent to four discussion e-mail lists. The e-mail discussion lists used for this study included the Association of Computing Machines Special Interest Group for University and College Computing Services (SIGUCCS) membership-only e-mail list and open e-mail list; the Higher Education and Resource Technologies of Texas (HEARTT) peer group, a community of IT user service professional in Texas; and the lab manager (LABMGR) e-mail discussion list associated with employees who are responsible for college computing centers. Permissions to use the SIGUCCS and LABMGR lists appear in Appendix B.

In correlation studies, traditional sample methodologies recommend that a minimum sample size should be 30 subjects to approximate a normal distribution (Gall, Borg, & Gall,
1996). However, some statistical methodologies assist in calculating a more precise sample size (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998). When determining an appropriate sample size, I considered the factors of alpha of .05, with 2-tailed directionality and a power of .80. Using the sample size tables in Hinkle et al. (1998) the sample was estimated to be at least 197.

Instrumentation

As the researcher, I used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) instruments to measure job satisfaction. A sample of the JDI/JIG format appears in Appendix E. Additionally, I used the Participation Reasons Scale (PRS) survey instrument to collect data about the perceived reasons for pursuing continuing professional education. The PRS instrument appears in Appendix F. I also gathered the demographic data about the individual participants with the Demographic Questionnaire shown in Appendix G. Permissions to use the JDI/JIG and PRS appears in Appendixes B and C, respectively.

Job Descriptive Index

The JDI is a survey instrument designed to measure job satisfaction in the five subfactors of the work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and coworkers. The JDI consists of five sections that contain 9 to 18 yes/no statements related to each measured factor.

P. C. Smith et al. (1969), having conducted considerable research on job satisfaction, concluded that job satisfaction is a multidimensional construct containing five facets. The conclusion comprised a number of early studies of job satisfaction, with factor analyses revealing at least four facets of satisfaction that were clearly distinguishable from one another. The research also showed a general satisfaction factor. The four facets found were the work itself, pay and promotions, supervision, and coworkers. During further research, Smith et al. found that satisfaction with pay and promotion could be very different, and therefore, the authors divided
pay and promotion into two individual facets. From their work, Smith et al. also found that it was possible to break the other facets into smaller subgroups. However, the designers of the JDI believed that most investigators would want to identify broad areas of strength and weakness and then follow up with more detailed investigations where necessary. Thus, they decided to stay with a simple five-scale formulation for the JDI as a reasonable compromise.

Reliability data for JDI and JIG. A revision of the JDI in 1987 reflected the changing workforce. The authors also reanalyzed the scales. With the new revisions to the JDI, the reliabilities remained relatively high, with an average internal consistency (alpha) of .88 across six samples (Balzer et al., 2000). In 1997, the authors calculated revised JDI and JIG internal reliability estimates for each subscale using data from over 1,600 cases of the national norm data. The reliability results reported by Balzer et al. (2000) for the JIG was an alpha value of 0.92. The reported coefficient alphas for each subscale of the JDI were 0.90 (Work itself), 0.86 (Pay), 0.87 (Opportunities for Promotion), 0.91 (Supervision), and 0.91 (Coworkers).

Validity of JDI. P. C. Smith et al. (1969) began the validation process of the JDI in 1959. For a period of 5 years, the authors conducted the validation process using a series of four studies with four unique samples. From the results of the validation studies, the authors drew the following about the validity of the JDI instrument:

1. The JDI possessed high levels of discriminant and convergent validity based on the results of both cluster analysis and factor analyses.

2. The authors of the JDI/JIG found that the direct scoring procedure used by the instrument is the best response format.
3. The use of negatively phrased items with scoring reversed and positively phrased items were found to have closely similar loadings and therefore both types of items could be used (Balzer et al., 2000).

Job in General Scale

The authors developed the JIG to complement the JDI and give an indication of overall job satisfaction. Simply summing across JDI facets does not produce an overall job satisfaction score because it excludes important components and therefore does not provide an accurate measure of overall satisfaction (Balzer et al., 2000).

*Validity of JIG.* The authors used several methods of validation for the overall general satisfaction scale. These methods include convergent validity using three correlation methods and construct validity with pattern of correlations, along with 18 other tests for a sample of 670 employees. The convergent validity correlations ranged from 0.66 to 0.80 from a simple numerical rating scale of -100 to +100 (Balzer et al., 2000). Although reliability and validity estimates of the JDI and JIG look strong, reliability and validity are properties of data and not tests. Chapter 4 presents reliability and validity estimates for this study.

*Scoring the JDI and JIG.* The five facets of the JDI and JIG are scored separately, but the scoring process is the same for both scales (Balzer et al., 2000). Scales are scored by assigning numeric values to each “Y,” “N,” and “?” response. Approximately half the items in the scale are positively worded, with a “Y” response indicating satisfaction. For those items, “Y” responses are assigned a point value of 3, “N” responses receive a point value of zero, and the “?” is assigned 1 point. For the remaining items, which are negatively worded, a “Y” response indicates dissatisfaction. The unfavorable items are reverse scored, with “N” receiving 3 points, a
“Y” receiving 0 points, and the “?” receiving 1 point. The “?” response tends to be closer to an unfavorable response than to a favorable response.

A researcher computes the scores of the JDI work, supervision, coworkers’ scales, and the JIG scales by summing the points obtained from an individual’s responses to the item in each scale. Scores on the JDI pay and promotions scales are also computed by adding up the total points, but these totals are doubled to create the scale score because these two scales include only half as many items as the other three scales (Balzer et al., 2000).

Missing responses for the JDI work, supervision, coworkers, and JIG with three or fewer missing responses should be treated as “?” responses and given the point value of 1. Missing responses for two or fewer responses on the JDI pay and promotions facets should be treated as a “?” response given the value of 1 point. If a greater number of items is missing, the authors of the JDI recommend not scoring those scales (Balzer et al., 2000).

Participation Reasons Scale

The PRS is a 30-item self-reporting instrument using a 7-point likert scale (see Appendix F). To complete the PRS, participants indicate the importance of each of 30 items. The scale of importance is the following: 1-2 (not important); 3-5 (moderately important); 6-7 (very important).

This instrument has been refined over time as more data have been collected and analyzed. The scale has had several iterations, differing by number of items and applicability to different professions. The original PRS began as a 19-item scale, evolved into a 35-item scale, and then changed into its final form of 30 items. The authors of this scale were concerned with keeping the instruments concise while still maintaining reliability and validity (Grotelueschens, 1985).
The authors of the PRS used the analyses of several professional groups to compute reliability with internal consistency statistics. The author of the PRS has tracked the administration of the instrument to several studies that have included veterinarians, judges, and public health administrators. Data taken from these studies yielded satisfactory levels of reliability, with coefficients ranging from a low of .78 to a high of .92 (Grotelueschen, 1985). Although reliability and validity estimates of the PRS look strong, reliability and validity are properties of data and not tests. Chapter 4 presents reliability and validity estimates for this study.

Factor analysis is a statistical tool used to reduce large sets of data into manageable factors. The factor structure of the PRS created by DeSilets (1990) was used in this study to cluster the reasons for CPE into the factors of (a) professional improvement and development, (b) professional service, (c) collegial learning and interaction, (d) professional commitment and reflection, and (e) personal benefit and job security.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection method used for this study was a computerized, Web-based, self-administered questionnaire technique. The Web-based, self-administered instruments consisted of the 9 to 18 yes/no questions for five topic areas taken from the JDI, 18 yes/no questions from the JIG, 30 likert scale items from the PRS, and 10 short answer and multiple choice items from a personal demographic characteristic questionnaire. As the researcher, I used a Web-based survey/assessment tool called Perception to administer the instruments. The Perception tool provided confidentiality and anonymity of the data. The Perception Web server recorded and stored the participants’ survey responses. The Perception server provided data security because
computer security techniques such as password protection allowed only myself to have access to
the questionnaire data.

I sent an e-mail notification describing the purpose and statement of consent to the target
population through the e-mail lists. The e-mail contained two hot links, the Web address of the
survey and my e-mail address to allow participants to ask questions or report technical problems.
As the researcher, I offered each participant completing the survey entry into a random drawing,
with the incentive of an IPod Shuffle or $100 cash. E-mail notification is a feasible approach to
contacting the sample population because the participants use e-mail messages to communicate
with the discussion list.

Over the span of 3 months, the participants’ received a total of three e-mail reminders
about the survey through the e-mail lists. Participation was voluntary, and participants could
complete and submit the survey only one time.

Pilot Study

I conducted a pilot study using IT professionals from my place of employment. This
institution’s data were included in the study. The pilot study assisted me as a researcher to
proofread the survey instrument and refine the data collection and data analysis steps of the
methodology.

Data Analysis

As the researcher, I used a variety of statistical methods to analyze the data for this study.
The statistical software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 was used
to analyze the survey data. The reliability of the data collected for this study was analyzed with
Chronbach’s alpha and was compared to the reliability of other studies. The data also were
analyzed for normality and for missing data. However, if the participant chose not to complete the survey, the record was not included in the final data analysis.

The statistical methods chosen for this study were dependent on the research hypotheses being considered. Additionally, the means of the PRS were ranked from highest to lowest to indicate the preferences of the reasons why managers and non-managers participate in CPE.

To address hypotheses 1a, 1b, 3a, and 3b a Spearman rank order coefficient was computed to determine the association between variables. The Spearman rank order coefficient indicates the direction and magnitude of association between the variables. Hypotheses 1c and 2 were analyzed using a Mann Whitney U. The Mann Whitney U is a nonparametric test used to test the null hypothesis that populations are identical. An exploratory factor analysis was used to evaluate hypotheses 4a and 4b to determine whether any correlations existed among the variables associated with the reasons for participating in CPE and the constructs of job satisfaction for each group of managers and non-managers.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between CPE and job satisfaction by examining the hours of training attended for IT managers and non-managers. Chapter 3 detailed the methodology used for this study. This chapter began by discussing the research hypotheses examined in this study. Additionally, the chapter described the ex post facto design used for this research project. The population included members of four e-mail lists used primarily by higher education IT employees. Participants who chose to respond to the e-mail notification determined the sample. This chapter details the JDI/JIG and PRS instruments used in this study. The Web-based data collection process used also is detailed in this chapter. The chapter
concluded with a discussion explaining how the data were analyzed for each hypothesis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study’s collected data.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to determine whether the perceived reasons for pursuing continuing professional educational activities correlates with improved job satisfaction for IT employees in institutions of higher education. The study also examines the relationship between the hours of CPE attended and the degree of job satisfaction and whether the position level held by an employee relates to his or her perceived benefits of training and overall job satisfaction. The population of this study was IT employees from higher education.

Participants in the Study

As the researcher, I conducted a pilot study to determine the accuracy of the Web-based questionnaire and the instructions. The pilot study consisted of eight IT professionals who provided initial data input and feedback. The feedback from the pilot participants resulted in minor typographical corrections and a more accurate estimate of the survey timing. The pilot group also tested the notification process and delivery methodology of the survey. The pilot study data points were not included in the survey results.

I solicited participants through a series of e-mail messages posted to four e-mail lists frequently used by IT professionals in higher education. Two e-mail lists were moderated message lists, and two lists were open lists where individuals freely post messages. The list included the Association of Computing Machines Special Interest Group for University and College Computing Services (SIGUCCS) \((n = 1190)\); Lab Manager (LABMGR) \((n = 548)\); and the members of Higher Education and Resource Technologies of Texas (HEARTT) \((n = 120)\) peer group, a community of IT user service professionals in Texas. Of the 227 surveys attempted, 11 were not completed.
These partial attempts were not included in the analysis. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the demographic data collected for this study.

Table 3

*Demographic Frequencies of Participant’s Gender, Education Level, Residential Region, and Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside US</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 215, n = 116$ for managers, $n = 99$ for non-managers.

Table 4

*Basic Participant Demographics Associated to Age, Time Working Professionally, and Time on Current Job.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-managers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43.82</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Working Professionally</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years on current job</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 215, n = 116$ for managers, $n = 99$ for non-managers.
Instrumentation

I computed reliability of the data for each instrument used in this study with Chronbach’s alpha, which is a measure of internal consistency. A coefficient alpha ranges in value from 0 to 1. A high coefficient alpha indicates more reliability for the data processed with that instrument. Nunnaly (1978) indicated that an alpha of 0.7 is an acceptable reliability coefficient.

The reliability of the JIG data collected during this study for all cases of the 18 items was 0.896. Coefficient alphas for each subscale of the JDI were 0.907 (Work itself), 0.864 (Pay), 0.853 (Opportunities for Promotion), 0.983 (Supervision), and 0.839 (Coworkers).

The PRS data reliability was computed for all cases of the 30 items together (i.e., data from the entire instrument) for a coefficient alpha of 0.943. Coefficient alphas for each reason were 0.911 (Professional Improvement and Development), 0.911 (Professional Service), 0.863 (Collegial Learning and Interaction), 0.789 (Personal Benefits and Job Security), and 0.845 (Professional Commitment and Reflection).

Additionally, I used a split-half analysis validating the data of the study. Good and Hardin (2003) described three main approaches for validation as independent verification, splitting the sample, and resampling. Sample splitting divides the sample into two parts, with one part estimating the model’s parameters and the other half of the data used for verification. SPSS calculated a Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient of 0.189. Coefficient alpha for the first half was 0.733 and for the second half, 0.842.

Data Assessment

Prior to the analysis, I examined each independent variable to determine how closely the data corresponded to a normal distribution. The more normally distributed the data, the fewer biases and distortions that are likely to occur in data analysis. The most common checks for
normality include histograms and measurement of kurtosis and skewness. The histogram offers a visual inspection of the data to determine whether the data approximates a normal distribution. Kurtosis indicates the peakness or flatness of the distribution in comparison to the normal curve. Skewness indicates the degree of symmetry around the means for the data distribution (Hinkle et al., 1998). Histograms for each variable indicated that all the variables had a high negative skew.

Table 5 shows the results of the descriptive analysis of the independent and dependent variables. Kurtosis and skewness values of zero indicate normal distributions. For the skewness measure, large derivations from zero are indicative of non-normally distributed data. A negative value indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed. From the values shown in Table 5, the data were very skewed. Therefore, nonparametric tests were used to analyze the data, because these tests are not affected by non-normal and heterogeneity of variance (Hinkle et al., 1998).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Data Set</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>-.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>-.940</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>-1.281</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>125.27</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>-1.310</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>-1.905</td>
<td>5.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>-.910</td>
<td>1.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>-.482</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>-1.214</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>-.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>-.864</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>-1.541</td>
<td>1.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job In General</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>128.66</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>-1.587</td>
<td>1.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>-1.860</td>
<td>5.806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, I used scatterplots to visual inspect the data to check for a linear association between the variables in this study. The scatterplots indicated that the data tended to clump together for the variables, therefore violating the assumption of linearity needed for computing a Pearson product-moment coefficient. Therefore, as the researcher, I used the nonparametric Spearman rank order coefficient because the data violated the assumptions of linearity and normal distribution.

Data Analysis

Ranking the results of the PRS from highest to lowest showed that IT professionals’ ranked professional development as the most important reason to attend continuing professional education, while collegial learning was ranked lowest. Comparing the reasons between the groups showed that both managers and non-managers ranked professional development as the highest and collegial learning as the lowest. As seen in Table 6, IT professionals placed a high importance on skills, knowledge, and ability when considering their choices for CPE. The rank order also indicated that IT professionals do not consider collegial learning, learning from their peers, as a
high priority when choosing CPE. A comparison of the two groups revealed that managers and non-managers agreed on the rank order, with the exception of professional commitment and professional service, which the two groups reversed.

The findings of this study are consistent with other studies using the PRS that found professional development to be the most important reason for attending CPE (DeSilets, 1990; Grotelueschen, 1985; Harnisch, 1980).

Table 6

*Rank Order of PRS Reasons (N=215)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Data Set</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this section presents the results of the data analysis for each hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1

H₀¹a: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.
A Spearman rank order correlation was used to determine whether a relationship existed between an IT manager’s total number of hours of attendance in CPE and his or her overall job satisfaction. The Spearman \( \rho \) was not statistically significant (\( r_s = 0.053, p = 0.569 \)). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Expanding the hypothesis from just evaluating total hours of CPE, the correlation coefficients between overall job satisfaction and each type of contributing CPE activities were computed to see whether a significant correlation existed (shown in Table 7). A statistically significant negatively Spearman \( \rho \) coefficient (\( r_s = -0.196, p = 0.035 \)) was found for the activity hours of attending college courses and job satisfaction. However, the correlation coefficient was negligible.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discuss</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Selfst</th>
<th>Disted</th>
<th>Worksp</th>
<th>Confer</th>
<th>TotCPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.196*</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( sig )</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Discuss = discussion groups; College = college courses; Selfst = studying on own; Disted = distance education, Worksp = Workshops and seminars, Confer = conferences, TotCPE = Total CPE hours; JIG = overall job satisfaction. *Alpha is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).*

\( H_{01b} \): There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

A Spearman rank order correlation was used to determine whether a relationship existed between an IT non-manager’s total number of hours of attendance in CPE and his or her overall job satisfaction. The Spearman \( \rho \) was not statistically significant (\( r_s = -0.109, p = 0.284 \)). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.
Expanding the hypothesis from just evaluating total hours of CPE, the correlation coefficients between overall job satisfaction and each type of contributing CPE activities were computed to see whether a significant correlation existed (shown in Table 8). A statistically significant positive Spearman \( r_s = 0.249, \ p = 0.013 \) was found for the activity hours of attending workshops and seminars and job satisfaction. However, the correlation was negligible.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discuss</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Selfst</th>
<th>Disted</th>
<th>Worksp</th>
<th>Confer</th>
<th>TotCPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>–.028</td>
<td>–.144</td>
<td>–.132</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>–.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Discuss = discussion groups; College = college courses; Selfst = studying on own; Disted = distance education, Worksp = workshops and seminars, Confer = conferences, TotCPE = Total CPE hours; JIG = overall job satisfaction. *Alpha is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

**H_{01c}:** There will be no statistically significant difference between IT managers’ and non-managers’ degree of overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

When comparing the rank means for overall job satisfaction for managers and non-managers, the Mann-Whitney \( U \) test did provide statistically significant results for overall job satisfaction. The \( z \) score \( (z = –2.529, \ p = .011) \) indicates that a statistically significant difference exists between IT managers’ and non-managers’ mean rank for overall job satisfaction, and therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. Table 9 shows the mean rank comparison between managers’ and non-managers’ overall job satisfaction as determined by the JIG scale.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( U )</th>
<th>( Z )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>4593.00</td>
<td>–2.53</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>117.91</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117.91</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*p < .05\) level (2-tailed).
Hypothesis 2

H02: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reasons why IT managers and non-managers pursue CPE as determined by summarizing the five factors of PRS.

Using the Mann-Whitney U test to examine the differences between managers’ and non-managers’ reasons for attending CPE failed to provide statistically significant results (Professional development: \( z = -1.725, p = .084 \); Professional Service: \( z = -1.231, p = .218 \); Collegial Learning: \( z = -1.320, p = .187 \); Personal Benefits: \( z = -.842, p = .400 \); Professional Commitment: \( z = -1.372, p = .170 \)). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Table 10 shows the mean rank comparison between managers’ and non-managers’ reasons for attending CPE.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( U )</th>
<th>( Z )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>( N )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>4959.00</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>114.75</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.09</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>5184.50</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>112.81</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102.37</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>5144.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>113.16</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.96</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>5359.50</td>
<td>- .84</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>111.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104.14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>5119.00</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>113.37</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101.71</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alpha is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Hypothesis 3

H$_{03a}$: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

A Spearman rank order correlation was used to compute relationships between a manager’s total number of hours of attendance in CPE and the constructs of job satisfaction. For managers, a statistically significant correlation for the construct of supervision was found ($r_s = –0.335, p < .001$). Additionally, none of the other constructs were found to be statistically significant, as shown in Table 11, and therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for those correlations. However, the null hypothesis was rejected for the condition of supervision.

Table 11

Correlation Between Number of CPE Hours and JDI Subscales for Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coworkers</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>–0.060</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>–0.073</td>
<td>–0.080</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College courses</td>
<td>–0.149</td>
<td>–0.095</td>
<td>–0.113</td>
<td>–0.087</td>
<td>–0.214*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self study</td>
<td>–0.184*</td>
<td>–0.136</td>
<td>–0.072</td>
<td>–0.373*</td>
<td>–0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>–0.130</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>–0.024</td>
<td>–0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop and seminars</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>–0.148</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>–0.010</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CPE hours</td>
<td>–0.119</td>
<td>–0.076</td>
<td>–0.074</td>
<td>–0.335*</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alpha is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

To see whether if other correlations exist, each type of CPE activity was examined to see if a statistically significant relationship existed for the individual CPE activity hours and the subscales of job satisfaction. The Spearman $\rho$ test yielded statistically significant correlations between self-study and coworker ($r_s = –0.184, p = 0.048$) and self-study and supervision ($r_s = –0.373, p < .001$). The correlations in both instances were negative, and although there was a statistical significance, the correlation coefficient between self-study and coworkers indicated a low correlation. In the instance of self-study and supervision, the correlation was negligible.
Another statistically significant correlation was found between attending college courses and the work itself \( (r_s = -0.214, p = 0.021) \). This correlation was also negligible.

H\(_{03b}\): There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

For this hypothesis, a Spearman rank order correlation was used to compute relationships between a non-manager’s total number of hours of attendance in CPE and the constructs of job satisfaction. For non-managers no statistically significant correlations existed between the constructs of job satisfaction and the total hours of CPE attended as shown in Table 12.

Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12

*Correlation Between Number of CPE Hours and JDI Subscales for Non-Managers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coworkers</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>–.045</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>–.061</td>
<td>–.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Courses</td>
<td>–.022</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>–.226</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>–.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self study</td>
<td>–.132</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>–.103</td>
<td>–.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>–.041</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>–.003</td>
<td>–.052</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop and seminars</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.240*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>–.064</td>
<td>–.070</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>–.114</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CPE hours</td>
<td>–.122</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>–.090</td>
<td>–.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alpha is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

To see if other correlations exist, each type of CPE activity was examined to see whether a statistically significant relationship existed for the individual CPE activity hours and the subscales of job satisfaction. The Spearman rho test did yield statistically significant correlations for workshop attendance in relationship to pay \( (r_s = -0.210, p = 0.037) \) and the work itself \( (r_s = -0.240, p = 0.017) \). The correlations in both instances were positive. Although there was statistical
significance, the correlation between attending workshops and pay and attending workshops and supervision indicated that the results were negligible.

Hypothesis 4

\( H_{04a} \): For IT managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

I used exploratory factor analysis to uncover any underlying structure among the 10 variables of reasons for attending CPE and job satisfaction for IT managers. My à priori assumption was that any indicator may be related with any factor. Using the extraction method of principle component analysis and a varimax orthogonal rotation, it was determined that only two factors were present, which explained 57.52% of the component variance. The decision criteria for determining the factors were simple structure and the root criterion. The root criterion method stops the extraction process when the eigenvalues are > 1. Hair, Anderson, and Tatham (1987) stated that the root criterion method is the best, most accurate approach to use when the number of variables is small and the communalities are high. Simple structure is a criterion for the “goodness” of a factor solution (Hair et al., 1987).

Table 13 shows the components of the rotated matrix. From the factor analysis, IT non-managers’ reasons for attending CPE only correlated with reasons for attending CPE and constructs of job satisfaction only correlated with job satisfaction indicating that the variables were not intercorrelated. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.
### Table 13

**Rotated Component Matrix for Two Factors With the Means and Standard Deviations for IT Managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Component 1 Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Component 2 CPE reason</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co workers</td>
<td>.714*</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>10.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.561*</td>
<td>– .004</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>15.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.679*</td>
<td>– .183</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>15.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.727*</td>
<td>– .048</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>13.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.647*</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>13.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.825*</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>8.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.793*</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>5.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.754*</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>5.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>– .300*</td>
<td>.691*</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>7.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>– .082</td>
<td>.823*</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>7.356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor is significant at > .3. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Another approach for determining factors involves using a scree plot. Hair (1987) recommends using a combination of approaches for determining the number of factors to extract and that use of the root criterion and scree test provides an effective means for determining the number of factors.

Upon examination of the scree plot (shown in Figure 1) the root criterion was examined for eigenvalues > .8 to ensure that too few or too many factors were not extracted. With eigenvalues > .8, three possible components were produced for IT managers. Hair et al. (1987) indicated that the criteria for choosing the significance of factor loading are related to the size of the sample, the number of variables being analyzed, and the number of factors. A rule of thumb for preliminary evaluation is to use factor loading of > ± .3 when the sample is greater than 50. Examination of the factor matrix, showed that the two-factor solution had stronger factor loadings for the simple structure than the three-factor solution (shown in Table 14). The three-factor solution also had high loadings on more than one factor and therefore did not provide any further explanation for the relationships between the variables other than increasing the accounted for percentage of variance.
Figure 1. Scree plot for IT managers.

Table 14

Rotated Component Matrix for Three Factors With the Means and Standard Deviations for IT Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Comp. 1 CPE reasons</th>
<th>Comp.2 Combination</th>
<th>Comp. 3 Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.698*</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.843*</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.366*</td>
<td>.660*</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.573*</td>
<td>.450*</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.816*</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>.787*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>.750*</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>.701*</td>
<td>-.483*</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>.834*</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Factor is significant at > .3. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis with Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Additionally, the factors were analyzed with oblique rotation, again yielding no further explanations for the addition of more components.

H$_{04b}$: For IT non-managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.
Again, an exploratory factor analysis was used to uncover any underlying structure among the 10 variables of reasons for attending CPE and job satisfaction for IT non-managers. My à priori assumption was that any indicator relates to any factor. Using the extraction method of principle component analysis and a varimax orthogonal rotation, it was determined that only two factors were present, which explained 54.6% of the component variance. The decision criteria for determining the factors were simple structure and the root criterion. Using the root criterion method stops the extraction process when the eigenvalues are > 1.

Table 15 shows the components of the rotated matrix for non-managers. From the factor analysis, non-managers’ reasons for attending CPE only correlated with reasons for attending CPE, and constructs of job satisfaction only correlated with job satisfaction, indicating that the variables were not intercorrelated. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>10.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>14.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>16.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39.61</td>
<td>12.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>12.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>11.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>7.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>5.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefits</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>8.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>8.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor is significant at > .3. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis with Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Upon examination of the scree plot (shown in figure 2), the root criterion was examined for eigenvalues > .8 to ensure that too few or too many factors were not extracted. For IT non-
managers, eigenvalues > .8 produced two possible components. Additionally, the factors were analyzed with oblique rotation, again yielding no further explanation for the components.

Figure 2. Scree plot for IT non-managers.

Further Assessment

The sample size \( n = 215 \) for this study was sufficient for the factor analysis (Hair et al., 1987). However, the sample size was not sufficient to overcome the sample non-normality. The sample sizes needed for each variable were calculated post hoc and are recorded in Table 16. The lack of normality in the distribution also can be seen in the cases where the standard deviations are larger than the mean.

The effect sizes for this study are considered small. Hinkle et al. (1998) described effect size as the degree to which a phenomenon exists, although the description is ambiguous. Cohen’s (1965) benchmarks for effect size are usually expressed as “small” greater than or equal to .2, “medium” greater than or equal .5 and “large” greater than or equal .8 when used for mean values. However, for correlations, Kirk (1996) recommends using the population point biserial correlation coefficient. The effect size values for \( \rho_{bp} \) are usually expressed as “small” = .1,
“medium” = .24 and “large” = .37. Table 16 shows the SPSS and PASS 2000 calculations for effect sizes. As a researcher, I calculated the effect size for each variable used in this study.

Summary

This chapter discussed the purpose of this study as related to the data and also described the participants of the study with summaries of the descriptive demographic data. The instrumentation section presented the results of Chronbach’s alpha to measure the instrumentation’s reliability and validity as related to the data of this study. Concerns surrounding the data’s lack of normality of the data and linearity were discussed in the section on data assessment. The data analyses section presented the statistical test used to analysis the data and the results of the analysis. The results were organized by hypotheses. Chapter 5 presents the implications and conclusion from the data analysis.
Table 16

**Power Analysis and Post Hoc Sample Size Calculation for Each Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Managers (N=116)</th>
<th>Non-Managers (N=99)</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
<th>Eta</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Effect size (d')</th>
<th>N needed (each group) for 80% power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>40.09 (10.87)</td>
<td>39.93 (10.81)</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>&gt;.001</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>&gt;10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>20.24 (15.66)</td>
<td>16.34 (14.29)</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>34.76 (15.68)</td>
<td>28.65 (16.82)</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>38.59 (13.93)</td>
<td>39.61 (12.79)</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>42.73 (13.48)</td>
<td>39.71 (12.79)</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>53.34 (8.47)</td>
<td>50.83 (11.16)</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>27.52 (5.79)</td>
<td>25.91 (7.71)</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Learning</td>
<td>21.79 (5.19)</td>
<td>21.01 (5.23)</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit</td>
<td>27.64 (7.04)</td>
<td>26.52 (8.32)</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Commitment</td>
<td>27.59 (7.36)</td>
<td>25.86 (8.72)</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>128.66 (36.24)</td>
<td>121.29 (33.08)</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE Hours</td>
<td>221.31 (273.90)</td>
<td>196.71 (273.25)</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations based on assuming $a = .05$, Power = 80%, Normal Distribution, (unknown) equal variances, and 2-sided 2 Independent Samples $t$-test.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the perceived reasons for pursuing CPE activities related to improved job satisfaction for IT employees in institutions of higher education. This study examined the relationship by comparing the number of hours of professional development attended to overall job satisfaction and the job satisfaction subscales. Additionally, I examined the relationships among job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE by position level. This chapter summarizes the study and provides discussion and conclusions about the study results. The limitations of these results, the implications for higher education IT managers, and suggestions for possible research also are presented in this chapter.

Summary of Study

The goal of the study was to discover relationships between attending CPE and job satisfaction for IT professionals in higher education. The study examined relationships between the hours of CPE attended, overall job satisfaction, and the constructs of job satisfaction for managers and non-manager holding IT jobs in higher education. In addition, the difference between managers’ and non-managers’ reasons for attending CPE was examined. Finally, I investigated whether any relationships existed between the constructs of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE.

I collected data for this study using a Web-based survey application. I solicited participation through a series of e-mail discussion lists frequently used by IT employees in higher education. The survey was comprised of three instruments and a demographic section. The instruments used for this study were the PRS to measure the reasons an individual pursues CPE
and the JIG and the JDI to measure job satisfaction. The survey data were analyzed using frequency counts, means, standard deviations, Spearman rho correlations, Mann Whitney U mean rank order, and exploratory factor analysis.

Discussion of Results

Results compiled from survey responses address the following hypotheses, discussed in order below:

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁a: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

For this study, the definition used for CPE was those learning activities that an individual employee participates in that are directly related to the growth of that individual’s knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Job satisfaction was defined for this study to be an affective reaction to a job that results from the incumbent’s comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, etc.) (P. C. Smith et al., 1969). Data collected in this study indicate that the null hypothesis concerning an IT manager’s total number of hours of CPE attended and his or hers overall job satisfaction was not rejected. Therefore, the results show that no relationship exists between a managers’ overall job satisfaction and the total of hours of CPE attended. Prior to the study, as a researcher, I believed that a relationship existed between a manager’s total number of hours of CPE and job satisfaction. However, the data in this study failed to provide evidence that a relationship exists between a manager’s overall job satisfaction and the total number of CPE hours that the individual attends.
Therefore, I expanded the hypothesis to determine whether the types of CPE hours contributing the total number of hours had a relationship to overall job satisfaction. In the case of managers, attending college courses has statistical significance; however, the correlation was negligible, and therefore the magnitude of the correlation was not large enough to indicate a strong statistical relationship. Additionally, the correlation coefficient was negative, which indicates that attending more college courses may decrease a manager’s overall job satisfaction.

These results support and add to the existing literature relating training and development to the job satisfaction literature. This study supports similar studies examining job satisfaction and workplace, showing that workplace learning does influence an employee’s job satisfaction (Acker, 2004; Rowden, 2002). Additionally this study contributes new information to the body of literature by establishing a relationship between the organizational roles of manager to the specific types of CPE learning activities that an individual receives and overall job satisfaction.

For managers this study indicates that a negative correlation exists between attending college courses and overall job satisfaction, and although correlation was low, the negative relationship was an unexpected result. This negative relationship demands further investigation to determine the underlying causes for why attending colleges would have a negative influence on overall job satisfaction. One possible explanation that needs further investigation is to determine whether learning new theories and ideas causes managers to view their work environment differently, perhaps creating a desire to try new approaches to managing that may create frustration with their existing job constraints thereby influencing their job satisfaction in a negative manner.

The negative correlation does not indicate that managers should not attend college courses because it will lower overall job satisfaction. Instead, it indicates that employers need to
understand more about the connections between new learning and an employee’s job satisfaction. It would be worth examining this correlation in more detail to discover the underlying causes to why attending college courses would have a negative influence on job satisfaction.

H01b: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT non-managers attend and their overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale.

The null hypothesis concerning non-managers’ total number of hours of CPE attendance and their overall job satisfaction was not rejected. Therefore, a non-manager’s overall job satisfaction has no relationship to the total number of hours of CPE he or she attends. Prior to the study, as a researcher, I believed that a relationship existed between a non-manager’s total number of hours of CPE and job satisfaction. However, the data in this study failed to provide evidence that a relationship exists between a non-manager’s overall job satisfaction and the total number of CPE hours that the individual attended.

I expanded the hypothesis to determine whether the types of CPE hours contributing to the total number of hours had a relationship to overall job satisfaction. In the case of non-managers, attending workshops and seminars was statistically significant; however, the correlation was negligible. In this case, the correlation was positive, which indicates that increasing the number of hours attending workshops and seminars increased overall job satisfaction.

These results support and add to the existing literature. This hypothesis supports the results of similar studies that examine job satisfaction showing that workplace learning does influence an employee’s overall job satisfaction (Acker, 2004; Rowden, 2002). Additionally this
study contributes new information to the body of literature by establishing a relationship between the organizational role of non-manager to specific type of CPE learning activities that an individual receives and overall job satisfaction.

For non-managers, the relationship between the learning activity of workshops and seminars and overall job satisfaction adds new information to the existing literature. This relationship indicates that what non-managers learn through a workshop or seminar influences their overall job satisfaction. One possible explanation for this positive relationship could be that the type of information covered in a workshop or seminar is usually directly applicable to an individual’s job. Therefore, the employee uses the new learning right away on the job that positively influences his or her overall job satisfaction because the employee’s new learning contributes right away to the job.

\[ H_{01c} \]: There will be no statistically significant difference between IT managers’ and non-managers’ degree of overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale summary.

As a corollary to the above hypotheses, I wanted to see whether a there was a difference between IT managers’ and non-managers’ degree of overall job satisfaction. In this case, the data show that a difference exists between the mean rank scores for managers’ and non-managers’ overall job satisfaction. Managers reported a higher mean rank score for overall job satisfaction than non-managers. Therefore, the position level that an employee holds does contribute to his or her overall job satisfaction. Further examination of the subscales of JDI helped to explain more about the differences in overall job satisfaction. The subscales indicate that differences are present between managers and non-managers for the subscales of pay and the work itself. A possible explanation for these results may be that a manager’s higher pay and additional work responsibility contribute to his or her overall job satisfaction. These finding are consistent with
prior job satisfaction research (Grzyb et al., 1998; Kuo & Chen, 2004) indicating that job levels, such as management and non-management, influence differences in an employee’s overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2  

$H_0^2$: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reasons why IT managers and non-managers pursue CPE as determined by summarizing the five factors of PRS.

Prior to this study, I anticipated that managers and non-managers would have different reasons for choosing CPE activities. This hypothesis was questioning whether Houle’s (1961) theory of adult learners would be different for position level. However, in an examination of the differences between managers’ and non-managers’ reasons for pursuing CPE, the data failed to provide statistically significant results for the factors of professional development, personal benefit, professional commitment, collegial learning, and professional service. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected concerning differences between why the managers and non-managers pursue CPE.

Therefore, the result of this hypothesis contributes new information to the literature of workplace learning in that the reasons why IT managers and non-mangers employed in higher education attend CPE do not have statistically different means from one another. One explanation for failing to indicate a difference between the managers and non-managers could be that IT professional in higher education may be too similar to each other when choosing reasons for attending CPE. For example, IT professionals in higher education are well educated (as shown in Table 6), and many managers are working managers who are doing IT work as well as managing. Choosing another population might produce a statistically significant difference in the reasons for choosing CPE. For example, a population where managers and non-managers have
different educational experiences might provide a greater difference in the mean difference.

Another explanation could be that the reasons indicated by the PRS are not the reasons this population chose CPE.

Hypothesis 3

$H_{03a}$: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours that IT managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of each subscale of the JDI scale.

From the work of P. C. Smith et al. (1969), job satisfaction is theorized to be a multidimensional construct comprised of five subscales – work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers. I computed correlations between the subscales of job satisfaction and with the total hours of CPE attended by IT managers. The data collected indicate that the null hypothesis was not rejected with regard to explaining of the difference an IT manager’s total of hours of CPE attended and his or her job satisfaction as measured by the subscales of pay, promotion, coworkers, and the work itself. However, the null hypothesis was rejected for the total hours of CPE attended by IT managers and the subscale of supervision.

Prior to this study, as a researcher, I believed that relationships may exist between the subscales of job satisfaction and the total hours of CPE that a manager attends. For example, attending professional development activities related to management could make existing managers more confident about their own work, thereby contributing positively to manager job satisfaction. For managers, only the subscale of supervision showed statistical significance; however, the correlation was low and negative.

Expanding the evaluation, I examined the relationships between the types of CPE hours contributing to the total number of hours and the job satisfaction subscales. In the case of
managers, the results are statistically significant between the CPE activity type of self-study and
the job satisfaction constructs of coworkers and supervision. Additionally, the results are
statistically significant between the CPE activity type of attending college courses and the job
satisfaction construct of the work itself. However, in all these cases the correlation coefficients
indicate low correlations. Additionally, the correlation coefficients were negative, which
indicates that increasing the hours of CPE attended decreases a manager’s job satisfaction
regarding coworkers, supervision, and the work itself.

Although the correlations were low, these results contribute new information to the
literature about CPE and job satisfaction. Therefore, this study demands further investigation
with a larger, more powerful sample, to prove that CPE contributes to a manager’s job
satisfaction.

H03b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the total number of CPE hours
that IT non-managers attend and their job satisfaction as measured by the summary of
each subscale of the JDI scale.

I computed correlations between the subscales of job satisfaction and with the total hours
of CPE attended by IT non-managers. The data collected indicate that the null hypothesis was
not rejected with regard to explaining of the difference between an IT manager’s total of hours of
CPE attended and his or her job satisfaction as measured by the subscales of pay, promotion,
coworkers, supervision, and the work itself.

Prior to this study, I believed that relationships existed between the subscales of job
satisfaction and the total hours of CPE that a non-manager attends. For example, attending
professional development activities related to the employee’s work could make an existing
employee more satisfied with what he or she does on the job.
Through further inspection, I examined the relationships between the types of CPE activities contributing to the total number of hours and the job satisfaction subscales. In the case of non-managers, the results were statistically significant between the CPE activity type of attending workshops and seminars and the job satisfaction subscales of pay and work. However, in both of these cases the correlation was negligible. The correlation was positive, which indicates that increasing attendance in workshops and seminars will increase job satisfaction in the areas of pay and work.

Although the correlations were low, these results contribute new information to the literature about CPE and job satisfaction. Therefore, this study demands further investigation with a larger, more powerful sample, to prove that CPE contributes to a manager’s job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4

$H_{04a}$: For IT managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

From the results of the factor analysis, the null hypothesis was not rejected in the case of IT managers. The researched used exploratory factor analysis to determine whether an underlying structure existed between the variables associated with subscales of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE. Prior to this study, as a researcher, I wanted to see whether a relationship existed between these variables. However, the results show that the constructs of job satisfaction relate to job satisfaction and the factors associated with the reasons for attending CPE relate to the reasons for attending CPE. Therefore, the results show no associations among the constructs of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE. The result that no
relationship exists between the subscales of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE does contributes new information to the literature.

Another conclusion worth pursuing is the results from examination of the scree plot, which indicates the existence of a third component for IT managers. The third component solution was rejected because of cross-factor loading. However, if the study had a larger, more normally distributed sample, a third component factor solution relating the job satisfaction and reason for attending CPE may exist for IT managers. Therefore, further investigation is necessary to prove or disprove the existence of a third component relating the constructs of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE. Although the results are not strong, this hypothesis contributes new information the literature of job satisfaction and workplace learning with the possible relationship between the job satisfaction subscales of coworkers, pay, supervision, and the work itself and the CPE reason of personal benefits.

H04b: For IT non-managers, there are no statistically significant correlations between the summary of the five groups of reasons for pursuing CPE as measured by the PRS and the summary of the five constructs of job satisfaction subscales as measured by the JDI.

From the results of the factor analysis, the null hypothesis was rejected in the case of non-managers. The exploratory factor analysis failed to uncover an underlying structure between the subscales of job satisfaction and reasons for attending CPE. Prior to this study, I wanted to determine whether a relationship existed between the subscales of job satisfaction and reasons for attending CPE. However, the results show that for non-managers’ job satisfaction constructs are related to job satisfaction and the factors associated with the reasons for attending CPE are related to the reasons for attending CPE. Therefore, the results show no associations between the subscales of job satisfaction the reasons for attending CPE. The result that no relationship exists
between the subscales of job satisfaction and the reasons for attending CPE does contribute new information to the literature of both job satisfaction and workplace learning.

Limitations of Results

The data for this study were not normally distributed, but rather they had negative skew for all but the variables of promotion. Therefore, I used the nonparametric tests of the Spearman rank order and Mann Whitney $U$ to analyze the data. These test statistics tend to be more conservative in producing results. The lack of normality could be a function of the population’s being too similar or a function of my sampling process not being random enough to identify a cross-section of the population, thereby eliminating the possibility of generalizing the results of this study.

Another limitation of these results relating to the lack of normality could be the inherent difficulties associated with self-reporting surveys (Gall et al., 1996). With self-reporting surveys, I had to assume that the participants will answer honestly to the best of their ability. In addition, there may be confusion on the part of the participants about how to respond to specific questions. For example, some of the questions related to the hours of the CPE could have been difficult to respond to if the participant did not keep accurate records of the CPE that they had attended during the last 6 months. In addition, the categories that I used may not have been relevant to the participants’ CPE activities. Other limitations that I was not able to control for include the duration of the CPE activities and the types of CPE that participants attended and that I did not ask about on the survey. Also, the quality of the CPE activities that the participants attended in the past was not controlled. A possibility for improving this study to account for these issues could be the use of a longitudinal design with a smaller sample.
Although the sample size of 216 appears to be a large sample, a larger sample is necessary for this study to be generalizable to the population of IT professionals in higher education. With 1,858 IT employees being solicited for participation in this research, the response rate was only 12%, indicating a low response. The inherent limitations of online research could explain the low response rate that I experienced. Joinson (2001) noted that Web-based surveys have been found to have lower response rates than traditional mail surveys, but that some of the low response rate could be overcome by multiple reminders. Although I employed several techniques to solicit participation such as multiple reminders and incentives, the population still voluntarily had to agree to participate. Gall et al. (1996) acknowledged that volunteerism also contributes to biased sampling of the target population.

Another factor that could have affected the data of the study was nonresponse bias. Nonresponse bias can take two forms, one being total nonresponse, which occurs when the individual chooses not to respond at all, and unit nonresponse, which occurs when all the items on the survey are not completed (Joinson, 2001). I used all fully completed survey attempts and I did not use incomplete attempts for data. Therefore, unit nonresponse was not an issue; however, total nonresponse bias was a possible limitation of this study, and this issue could partially explain the lack of normally distributed data.

The results of this study are bound by the limitations of the JIG and JDI. For example, as the researcher, I did not control for the general personality construct of happiness. P. C. Smith (1992) concluded that “the happy person not only tends to be more satisfied with everything, including his or her experiences and behaviors, but also views events differently” (p. 13). The influence of happiness could be that, in all probability, people who are generally happy have greater job satisfaction. Additionally the JDI does not account for other workplace factors such as
stress, a common workplace condition which has been attributed to job dissatisfaction (Stanton, Bachiochi, Robie, Perez, & Smith, 2002).

Additionally, the results of this study are bound by the limitations of the reason for participation in CPE as described by the factors measured by the PRS. There are several factors that PRS does not take into consideration. For example, the PRS does not account for participants who attend CPE activities because of coercion by management in their organization, professional affiliations, or legal requirements. Additionally, the PRS does not address barriers to attending CPE such as travel, budget, and time, which also may have influenced the results. Also, factors such as formal versus informal, current oriented versus future oriented, voluntary versus mandatory (McCamey, 2003) were not measured by the PRS and could have impacted the participants’ results.

Implications for Higher Education IT Managers

In this study, total hours of CPE activities failed to be associated with overall job satisfaction and the constructs of job satisfaction. However, the results indicate some small associations between the types of CPE activities with overall job satisfaction and the subscales of job satisfaction. Therefore, CPE may contribute to aspects of an employee’s job satisfaction, but more research is necessary to determine these associations, definitively.

In addition, there was no evidence that the reasons measured by the PRS produced different results for IT managers versus non-managers. Additionally, the reasons for attending CPE as measured by the PRS failed to be associated with the five subscales of job satisfaction. Therefore, the reasons of professional development, professional commitment, personal benefit, professional service and collegial learning used by this study may not explain the reasons IT professionals in higher education choose to attend CPE. Other factors such as formal versus informal, current
oriented versus future oriented, voluntary versus mandatory (McCamey, 2003) may be more relevant.

However, this study did find that both managers and non-managers prefer to attend CPE activities related to their professional development and improvement as seen from the descriptive data ranking. This result was consistent with prior research results (DeSilets, 1990; Grzyb et al., 1998; McCamey, 2003). In addition, this study shows that IT professionals in higher education tend to have high job satisfaction as seen from the mean values for overall job satisfaction and the job satisfaction subscales.

Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study contribute to the body of research associated with CPE and job satisfaction. This research focused on the relationship between the total hours of CPE, types of CPE activities, job satisfaction, and relationships between attending CPE and job satisfaction and differences between job satisfaction and the reason for CPE for managers and non-managers employed in IT job at institutions of higher education. However, this research can be extended to either prove or disprove the results and discover the causes for the relationships found. Some possible recommendations to extend the research of this study include the following suggestions.

1. One of the results of this study shows that college course correlate negatively to job satisfaction. This surprising result is worth further examination to discover the underlying causes. Understanding more about the contribution between workplace learning and employee job satisfaction could help IT management to make smarter decisions about choosing learning activities for employees.

2. This study solicited the population through e-mail lists; replication of the study using different sampling methods could produce better results. The type of solicitation used for survey
participation inherently produces low response rates and has a high possibility for nonresponse bias (Joinson, 2001). Selecting the population and sample with more care such as targeting a specific institution or institutions of higher education also may produce a better sample with a more normally distributed data while still keeping the data generalizable.

3. The focus of the study examined the population of IT professionals in higher education and their position levels as managers or non-managers. Further research could replicate this study using IT professionals who are not working in higher education and compare those employees to IT professional in higher education to see the difference in preferences for CPE and job satisfaction. Comparing IT professional in higher education to their counterparts in industry could help higher education managers attract and retain IT employees.

4. This study used a specific population of IT professional in higher education; another suggestion would be to replicate this study using a different population of working professionals to see if the results would be similar or different to IT professionals.

5. Another suggestion would be to duplicate this study using different instruments to measure the reasons for attending CPE or to measure job satisfaction. The use of other instruments could produce better correlations between the CPE and job satisfaction. The reasons for CPE as measured by the PRS may not be the reasons IT professionals consider relevant when choosing CPE. Therefore, a qualitative or mixed-methods study to determine the reasons for choosing CPE would be beneficial to the IT managers and would contribute to the existing literature.

6. Lastly, an interesting extension of this research would be to investigate the reasons IT professionals stay in higher education. This extension could have worthwhile implications to help IT management in recruiting and retaining employees. A mixed-methods approach would probably be necessary to implement this suggestion.
Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the reasons for attending CPE and job satisfaction for employed managers and non-managers in higher education IT positions. This study furthers the existing research into job satisfaction and continuing professional education. The results do not indicate strong evidence that relationships exist between the reasons for participating in CPE and overall job satisfaction or the construct of job satisfaction - work, pay, promotion, supervision, and the work itself. The study shows weak evidence that manager and non-managers have a difference between overall job satisfaction. Additionally, this study indicates that weak relationships exist between overall job satisfaction and certain types of CPE activities. This study shows that relationships do exist between attending CPE and job satisfaction. Better sampling methods may produce better results and is worth pursuing with other studies.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER
I am currently involved in a research project investigating the reasons why information technology professionals working in higher education choose to attend educational, training and/or development activities and how those reasons for attendance relate to their job satisfaction. This study will strive to explain the importance of why IT professionals need continuous educational and training experiences. I would appreciate your assistance with this research project. All you need to do is complete this online questionnaire, which should take approximately 20 minutes.

To volunteer for this study you must meet the following criteria:
1. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate
2. You must be working in an information technology positions
3. You must be employed at an institution of higher education that can include community colleges or public or private colleges and universities.

If you would like to participate in this study, you must read and agree to the following information:
1. I understand what the study is about and how and why it is being conducted.
2. I understand that my responses will be completely anonymous; my name will not appear with questionnaire data. The data will be stored on a secure server.
3. I understand that I do not have to participate in this study and my refusal to participate or my decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop my participation at any time.
4. There are no foreseeable psychological or physical risks associated with participation in this study. Although there is no direct benefit for participating in the study, my participation will increase the body of research involved in understanding the issues surrounding an employee’s attendance in development and training activities and their job satisfaction.
5. If you have any questions not discussed here you may contact Sandra Bennett, graduate student in the Applied Technology, Training and Development program at the University of North Texas by telephone at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or by email at Sandy_Bennett@xxxx.xxx or your may contact Dr. Jeff Allen in Applied Technology Training and Development department by telephone at (940) 565-2093 or by email at jallen@xxx.xxx.
6. I understand my rights as a research subject and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. Completing and submitting the questionnaire constitutes my consent to participate.
7. This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). If there are any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the UNT IRB at (940) 565-3940 or by email to sbourns@unt.edu. You may also request a summary of the research findings after the study is completed by contacting Sandra Bennett at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or Sandy_Bennett@xxxx.xxx.
Copy of Permission to Use SIGUCCS E-mail List

Sandy,
I also received the pdf document with the approval from UNT's institutional review board (IRB) from you professor. Your e-mail went out yesterday afternoon to the membership list. Also, feel free to send it to the open list if you'd like. It includes many of the same folks but has a good number not on the membership list. See http://www.acm.org/sigs/siguccs/lists.htm

If you need to send out a reminder, just send email to: xxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx and I'll approve it for you.

Good luck!
Terry

-----Original Message-----
From: Teresa Lockard
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2005 2:03 PM
To: Bennett, Sandy
Subject: Re: Request for assistance

Sandy,

SIGUCCS would very much like to work with you on your project. The topic sounds like it would be of interest to our members and we would be very interested in the result. Maybe you could do an article for our web site or perhaps you would consider presenting your results at one of our 2 conferences. But we can talk about that later.

To get started, I will need an e-mail (nothing elaborate) from you advisor indicating that this is part of your research - just so we can cover our bases. Then I can approve an email from you to our general listserv and the membership mailing list with the link to your survey.

I think this is a great idea and we look forward to working with you.

Terry

--On Friday, February 25, 2005 5:20 PM -0600 "Bennett, Sandy" wrote:

Dear Terry Lockard,

I am a PhD candidate working on my dissertation in Applied Technology, Training and Development at the University of North Texas. My dissertation research is examining the relationship between training and job satisfaction in Information Technology Professionals. In order to gather data, I will be administering a web-based survey. I feel the SIGUCCS
membership, of which I am a part, would provide a rich source of data for this purpose. Therefore, I request your permission to survey the SIGUCCS membership in one of the following ways:
* Through forwarding a link to my research survey through your Listserv.
* Through providing me with a list of email addresses of membership to which I can send my link, or
* Through approving the delivery of an email to members whose email addresses I have gathered from previous conference lists.

Please let me know which of the methods best fits the SIGUCCS mission. In return for your assistance, I will gladly share the results of my research and its implications with the membership.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

Sandy Bennett
Certainly. I've subscribed you to the list.

Donnie

Original Message From "Bennett, Sandy"
Hello,

I would like to have your permission to post a request for participation in an online survey that I am conducting for my doctoral research on the attitudes of continuing professional education as these attitudes relate to an individual's job satisfaction. I am a doctoral student at the University of North Texas. The population that I am studying is information technology professionals in higher education and your list is a great resource for higher IT professionals. I am requesting your permission so that this message does not get filter out as spam.

Below the signature is a copy of what I would post to the list. IF you need any additional information, please let me know.

Cheers,

Sandy
APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO USE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

AND JOB IN GENERAL SCALE
Dear Sandy,

Thank you for your interest in the JDI. I will attempt to answer each of your questions in turn. Yes, we would like to have your signature on the non-commercial agreement. You can do this by either emailing a PDF of the agreement with your electronic signature or by faxing the agreement. Administering the JDI on the internet, using the precautions you have mentioned, should be fine. Finally, we ask that you not place the full JDI in your dissertation. I have attached the sample items that may be used for reproduction. Please include only these items. This way the JDI may not be put together in a piecemeal fashion from various sources. Once I received your agreement signed I will process your order.

Best regards,
Alison

----------------------------------
Alison A. Broadfoot
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
----------------------------------
I am writing you to request permission to use the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale to collect data for my dissertation. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas and I am doing my research on the relationship between the reasons an individual pursues continuing professional education and their job satisfaction. I am planning to administer the survey to information technology employees who work in higher education. I am happy to work with in your non-commercial contract and share all my data with you. The population for my survey is approximately 1190 although, I expect that between 100-300 participants will actually responded and that is probably ambitious. I am attaching the non-commercial agreement; however, I realize that this document is not signed. I will be happy to fax or send a signed pdf document if that is necessary.

Additionally, with your permission I would like to administer the survey via the World Wide Web. The instrument would be available only to the participants in this research through a password protected web site. This website is also not searchable from web scanning systems so the Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale will remain copyright secure.

Lastly, as you the copyright holder of the survey, may I have permission to include the instruments in the appendix of my dissertation.

Respectfully yours,
Sandy Bennett
APPENDIX D

PERMISSION TO USE PARTICIPATION REASONS SCALE
Sandy,
Great to hear of your interest in using the PRS in your thesis research. With this note to you I am giving you permission to use the PRS for your thesis research and in the preparation of an online form to capture the data. Please show the copyright details of the form in all locations where it is posted.

Please share with me a copy of your results and your final thesis.

Best regards,
Del

On 5/23/05, Bennett, Sandy wrote:

Dear Dr. Harnisch,

I am writing you to request permission to use the Participation Response Survey to collect data for my dissertation. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas and I am doing my research on the relationship between the reasons an individual pursues continuing professional education and their job satisfaction. I am planning to administer the survey to information technology employees who work in higher education. I would be delighted to send you my results or any form of the data that I receive.

Additionally, with your permission I would like to administer the survey via the World Wide Web. The instrument would be available only to the participants in this research through a password protected web site. This website is also not searchable from web scanning systems so the Participation Reasons Scale will remain secure.

Lastly, are you the copyright holder of the survey and if so may I have permission to include the survey in the appendix of my dissertation?

Respectfully yours,
Sandy Bennett

Doctoral Candidate
University of North Texas
Applied Technology and Training Development Program
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE OF JDI AND JIG INSTRUMENTS
Selected sample items from the JDI:

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

_ _  for "Yes" if it describes your work
_ _  for "No" if it does NOT describe it
_ ? for "?" if you can not decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

_ _  Fascinating
_ _  Pleasant
_ _  Can see my results

PRESENT PAY

_ _  Barely live on income
_ _  Bad
_ _  Well paid

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

_ _  Opportunities somewhat limited
_ _  Promotion on ability
_ _  Regular promotions

SUPERVISION

_ _  Doesn’t supervise enough
_ _  Around when needed
_ _  Knows job well

CO-WORKERS

_ _  Stimulating
_ _  Unpleasant
_ _  Smart

JOB IN GENERAL

_ _  Pleasant
_ _  Worse than most
_ _  Worthwhile
APPENDIX F

SAMPLEPRS INSTRUMENT
Selected sample items from the Participation Reasons Scale
(Executive form)

There are many reasons that for participating in continuing professional education activities. The following items are designed so that you can indicate the relative importance of the general reasons you might have for participating in a continuing professional education activity. For each item circle, the numeral, which best represents the degree of importance you attach to each reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Further matched my knowledge or skills with the demands of my work situation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 To better accommodate the needs of my clients</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 To obtain leadership capabilities for my profession.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 To enhanced the security of my present work position</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 To reflected on the value of my professional responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From An analysis of the Participation Reasons Scale administered to business professionals (Occasional Paper No. 7), by (Grotelueschen, Harnisch, & Kenny, 1979), Urbana: Office for the study of continuing professional education: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Copyright 1979 by D. K. Harnisch
APPENDIX G

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
This form is designed to obtain descriptive information from professionals so that the researcher has a greater understanding about your participation in continuing professional education activities. All responses will be kept confidential. Thank-you for assistance.

1. Highest level of formal education you have completed:
   - High School
   - Associate Degree
   - Bachelor’s Degree
   - Master’s Degree
   - Doctor’s Degree (PhD, MD, JD)

2. Your age: __________

3. Your gender:
   - Male
   - Female

4. Your home zip code: __________

5. Is your current position considered management?
   - Yes
   - No

6. What is your job title? ________________

7. How many years have you worked professionally?
   ______ year(s)

8. How many years have you performed the kinds of duties you are presently performing?
   ______ year(s)

9. How much time has passed since you have participated in a continuing professional education activity (such as college class, seminar, workshop, or conference) while employed in your current profession?
   - Within the 6 months
   - 1-2 years
   - 3-5 years
   - More than 5 years
   - Have not participated

10. Please indicate the method of study you have attended in the past year with the number of hours for each activity:
    - Discussion Groups ______ hours
    - College Course ______ hours
    - Study on my own ______ hours
    - Distance Education ______ hours
Workshops/Seminars _____ hours
Conferences ______ hours

Organizational Demographics
11. Are you working for an institution of higher education?
   (community college, college or university)
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

12. Is your institution considered:
   ☐ Public
   ☐ Private

13. What region of the country are you from?
   ☐ New England
   ☐ Mid-Atlantic
   ☐ South
   ☐ Midwest
   ☐ Southwest
   ☐ Western
   ☐ Outside of United States

14. Your workplace zip code: ___________

Thank you for your participation.

Your response to this survey is anonymous, however if you would like to be considered for a chance to win an IPOD shuffle for participating in this survey, please enter your e-mail address. A random drawing will take place at the end of the data collection phase and you will be contacted by email if you win. Your name will not be associated with your responses.__________________________________
APPENDIX H

FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE PRS (DeSilets, 1990)
Professional Improvement and Development (Factor 1)
To further match my knowledge or skills with the demands of my work situation Q1
To help me be more productive in my professional role Q3
To maintain my current abilities Q5
To develop new professional knowledge and skills Q16
To sharpen my perspective on my professional role or practice Q17
To help me keep abreast of new developments in my field Q18
To help me be more competent in my current work Q21
To develop proficiencies necessary to maintain quality performance Q27
To maintain the quality of my supervisory service Q29

Professional Service (Factor 2)
To enable me to better meet client expectations Q4
To accommodate more effectively the needs of my clients Q9
To increase my proficiency with my clients Q14
To help me increase the likelihood that clients are better served Q19
To improve my individual service to the public as a supervisor Q25

Collegial Learning and Interaction (Factor 3)
To mutually exchange thoughts with my colleagues Q2
To relate my ideas to those of my professional peers Q7
To learn from the interaction with other professionals Q12
To be challenged by the thinking of my professional colleagues Q23

Personal Benefits and Job Security (Factor 4)
To increase the likelihood of benefits for family and friends Q6
To increase the likelihood of personal financial gain Q11
To help me develop leadership capabilities for my profession Q13
To consider changing the emphasis of my present professional responsibilities Q15
To increase the likelihood of professional advancement Q22
To enhance my individual security in my present work condition Q28

Professional Commitment and Reflection (Factor 5)
To maintain my identity with my profession Q8
To review my commitments to my profession Q10
To assess the direction in which my profession is going Q20
To enhance the image of my profession Q24
To consider the limitations of my role as a supervisor Q26
To reflect the value of my professional responsibilities Q30
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