

where respondents may have based their answers more on their reactions to the institution as opposed to the profession.

A second limitation was the response rate. The response rate of 20% was lower than expected, however it was consistent with the recent trend of declining response rates in survey research (Dey, 1997; Sheehan, 2001). Possible reasons for the decline in survey responses are survey length and issue relevance (Sheehan, 2001). The current study was designed to be short and easy to complete. Pilot data suggested a maximum completion time of 10 minutes. In addition, the recent discussion of attrition of athletic trainers at the national level hopefully made the study relevant and salient to the possible respondents. However, various factors may have outweighed these attempts at ensuring a higher response rate. A major reason may have been the lack of control in the distribution of the e-mail solicitation. The principle investigator did not send out the solicitation and had no access to the list of e-mails addresses that were solicited. Because of this, multiple respondents were ineligible due to not meeting the inclusion criteria. Future studies should certainly take measures to ensure the target sample meets the inclusion criteria (such as being employed in a college or university) prior to solicitation.

A second reason for the poor response rate was the use of only one follow-up solicitation. Research has clearly demonstrated the more solicitation attempts conducted, the higher response rate (Groves et al., 2004). The NATA distribution service only allowed one follow-up and without access to the sampling list, it was impossible to conduct a manual solicitation. In terms of data collection period, it has been shown surveys conducted in as short as 10 days can achieve almost 100% contact rates, (Groves

et al., 2004) therefore the three week collection period seemed to be an adequate time frame

Suggestions for Future Research

The current study was designed to determine how job satisfaction and intention to leave is affected by various demographics. Based on the results of this study no conclusive differences of job satisfaction or intention to leave can be made based on various athletic training demographics.

Future research examining job satisfaction should develop a consistent and comprehensive definition for various primary job titles. The current study was limited due to the large variety of job titles which led to filtering of some responses. Perhaps a more detailed or refined sample could provide more meaningful results on various job titles.

Secondly, we should continue to examine job satisfaction differences in the NCAA divisions. The results from the current study seem to suggest that as long as a work environment is stimulating and interesting, job satisfaction will not be affected. Further research should be conducted to determine what aspects of each NCAA division makes them interesting and stimulating for athletic trainers.

Finally, the job satisfaction subscale of *operating conditions* showed HATs as having significantly lower scores, however it consisted of only two items. A better defined construct with more items may be needed in future research to determine exactly how meaningful these results actually were.

Based on the results regarding intention to leave, the major question which still remains is the affect of age. The literature is inconsistent on intention to leave in regards

to the younger professional. Whereas the younger professional is eager to leave if a profession is not fulfilling (Aiken et al., 2001), they are also resilient and willing to suffer some hardships before deciding to leave (Hellman, 1997). Future research needs to be directed at different age groups and populations to determine which groups have the highest intentions to leave and why. Studies should attempt to develop more in-depth analysis of intentions to leave through the use of interviews with individuals who have demonstrated high intentions to leave. Such data could provide great insight into what makes an athletic trainer wish to leave the profession. Such research may also help to illustrate the differences between occupational intention to leave and organizational intention to leave. Understanding how much an individual wishes to leave the profession versus their current employment setting may help to provide solutions for keeping athletic trainers within the profession.

Finally, developing a survey which can be distributed to athletic trainers who have left the profession may help to validate the ITLS. The ITLS is an original instrument and is intended to project and individual's attitudes and feelings towards an outcome they have not accomplished. Surveying individuals who has taken the ITLS and have actually left the profession will help to validate if the items of the ITLS are measuring the same items which caused the individual to leave. This will provide even more data on what factors influence an athletic trainer's desire to leave the profession.

Conclusions

This study explored job satisfaction and intention to leave the profession of athletic training in clinically oriented ATs employed in various NCAA institutions. The findings of this study indicate NCAA division and job title do not affect the levels of job

satisfaction or intention to leave. Although NCAA Division I may be considered the highest level of athletic training in collegiate athletics, the data does not suggest these athletic trainers have any higher job satisfaction. In addition, graduate assistants do not seem to be suffering from lower job satisfaction than full-time athletic trainers such as head or assistants. On the contrary, the results suggest head athletic trainers are being overworked and having lower satisfaction in this area.

Athletic trainers seem to feel variables such as pay and rewards are the most important factors in their job satisfaction and in their intention to leave the profession. Eight subscales of job satisfaction all significantly influence their intention to leave and should all be considered when determining the likelihood of an individual staying in the profession. As retention and attrition of athletic trainers continues to become an issue at the national level, it will be important to understand the many variables and aspects which affect an athletic trainer's satisfaction with the profession.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. H., Clarke, S. P., Sloane, D. M., Sochalski, J. A., Busse, R., Clarke, H., et al. (2001). Nurses' reports on hospital care in five countries. *Health Affairs, 20*(3), 43-53.
- ANA. (2005). President's FY 2006 budget cuts \$1 million from nurse workforce development programs. *The New Mexico Nurse, 50*(2), 12.
- ANA. (2006). Who we are: Frequently asked questions. Retrieved 10/10/2006, from <http://www.nursingworld.org/about/faq.htm#def>
- Bailey, D. M. (1990a). Reasons for attrition from occupational therapy. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 44*(1), 23-29.
- Bailey, D. M. (1990b). Ways to retain or reactivate occupational therapists. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 44*(1), 31-37.
- Barrett, J. J., Gillentine, A., Lamberth, J., & Daughtrey, C. L. (2002). Job satisfaction of NATABOC Certified Athletic Trainers at Division One National Collegiate Athletic Association institutions in the Southeastern Conference. *International Sports Journal, 6*(2), 1-13.
- Bedeian, A. G., & Armenakis, A. (1981). A path-analytic study of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*, 417-424.
- Biers, L., & Murphy, J. F. (1970). A descriptive study of educational needs and career blockages. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 24*, 196-200.
- Blau, G. (2003). Testing for a four-dimensional structure of occupational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(4), 469-488.
- Bluedorn, A. (1982). The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning. In S. Bacharach (Ed.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (pp. 75-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Burnett-Beaulieu, S. (1982). Occupational therapy profession dropouts: Escape from the grief process. *Occupational Therapy in Mental Health, 2*(2), 45-55.
- Campbell, D., Miller, M. H., & Robinson, W. W. (1985). The prevalence of burnout among athletic trainers. *Athletic Training, 20*(2), 110-113.
- Campion, M., & McClelland, C. (1991). Interdisciplinary examination of the costs and benefits of enlarged jobs: A job design quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 186-198.
- Capel, S. A. (1986). Psychologist and organizational factors related to burnout in athletic trainers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57*(4), 321-328.
- Capel, S. A. (1990). Attrition of athletic trainers. *Athletic Training, 25*(1), 34-39.
- Carmeli, A., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Exploring turnover intentions among three professional groups of employees. *Human Resource Development International, 9*(2), 191-206.
- Carr, J. C., Pearson, A. W., Vest, M. J., & Boyar, S. L. (2006). Prior occupational experience, anticipatory socialization, and employee retention. *Journal of Management, 32*(3), 343-359.
- Cavanagh, S. (1989). Nursing turnover: Literature review and methodological critique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 14*, 587-596.
- Cavanagh, S. (1992). Job satisfaction of nursing staff working in hospitals. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 17*, 704-711.
- Chelladurai, P., & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sports Management, 17*(1).
- Coomber, B., & Barriball, K. L. (2006). Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital based nurses: A review of the research literature. *International Journal of Nursing Studies.*

- Cooper, C. L., & Cartwright, S. (1994). Healthy mind; health organization: A proactive approach to occupational stress. *Human Relations, 47*, 455-471.
- Cowin, L., & Hengstberger-Sims, C. (2006). New graduate nurse self-concept and retention: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 43*, 59-70.
- Cranny, C., Smith, P., & Stone, E. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington.
- Dey, E. (1997). Working with low survey response rates: The efficacy of weighting adjustments. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(2), 215-227.
- Dolan, M. G. (1998). Managing stress and burnout in athletic therapy. *Athletic Therapy Today, 3*(3), 23.
- Dunteman, G. H. (1989). *Principal Components Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fochsen, G., Sjögren, K., Josephson, M., & Lagerström, M. (2005). Factors contributing to the decision to leave nursing care: A study among Swedish nursing personnel. *Journal of Nursing Management, 13*, 338-344.
- Frayne, T. (1992). The ultimate goal: The almighty buck. *Maclean's, 105*(6), 65.
- Gardulf, A., Söderström, I.-L., Orton, M.-L., Eriksson, L. E., Arnetz, B., & Nordström, G. (2005). Why do nurses at a university hospital want to quit their jobs? *Journal of Nursing Management, 13*, 329-337.
- Gauci-Borda, R., & Norman, L. (1997). Factors influencing turnover and absence of nurses: A research review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 34*(6), 385-394.

- Gay, L., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Gieck, J. (1984). Stress management and the athletic trainer. *Athletic Training, 19*(2), 115-119.
- Gieck, J., Brown, R. S., & Shank, R. H. (1982). The burnout syndrome among athletic trainers. *Athletic Training, 17*(1), 36-40.
- Gieck, J., Lephart, S., & Saliba, E. (1986). NATA certification: A 5 & 10 year follow-up. *Athletic Training, 21*(2), 120-121, 163.
- Goldstein, M. (2001). Physical therapist salaries show improvement. *PT Magazine, December*, 32-33.
- Groves, R. M., Jr., F. J. F., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangean, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. .
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.
- Hardy, M., & Hardy, W. (1988). Role stress and role strain. In M. E. Hardy & M. E. Conway (Eds.), *Role theory: Perspectives for health professionals* (2nd ed.). Norwalk, CT: Appleton & Lange.
- Harkson, D. G., Unterreiner, A. S., & Shepard, K. F. (1982). Factors related to job turnover in physical therapy. *Physical Therapy, 62*(10), 1465-1470.
- Hasselhorn, H.-M., Tackenberg, P., Müller, B. H., & Group, N-S. (2005). *Intent to leave nursing in the European nursing profession*. from <http://www.next.uni-wuppertal.de/>.
- Hellman, C. (1997). Job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*, 677-689.

- Hendrix, A. E., Acevedo, E. O., & Herbert, E. (2000). An examination of stress and burnout in Certified Athletic Trainers at Division 1-A universities. *Journal of Athletic Training, 35*(2), 139-144.
- Herrera, R., & Lim, J. Y. (2003). Job satisfaction among athletic trainers in NCAA division 1aa institutions [Electronic Version]. *Sport Journal, 6*. Retrieved 2/17/07 from <http://www.thesportjournal.org/2003Journal/Vol6-No1/satisfaction.asp>.
- Herrick, J., Takagi, C. Y., Coleman, R., & Morgan, L. J. (1983). Social workers who left the profession: An exploratory study. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 10*, 78-94.
- Hill, D. (2002). The ABCs of OT. *Athletic Management, Feb/Mar*, 45-51.
- Hiller, D. V., & Philliber, W. W. (1980). Necessity, compatibility and status attainment as factors in the labor-force participation of married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*(2), 347-354.
- Huey, F. L., & Hartley, S. (1988). What keeps nurses in nursing? 3,500 nurses tell their stories. *American Journal of Nursing, 88*, 181-188.
- Irvine, D. M., & Evans, M. G. (1995). Job satisfaction and turnover among nurses: Integrating research findings across studies. *Nursing Research, 44*(4), 246-253.
- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of group think*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jordan, J., Mullane, S., & Gillentine, A. (2004). *Job satisfaction in sport organizations: An examination of NCAA division I and III basketball coaches*. Paper presented at the 2004 AAHPERD National Convention and Exposition New Orleans, LA.
- Kaplowitz, M., Hadlock, T., & Levine, R. (2004). A comparison of web and mail survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 68*(1), 94-101.
- Kemery, E., & Mossholder, K. (1987). Role stress, physical symptomatology, and turnover intentions: A casual analysis of three alternative specifications. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 8*, 11-23.

- Klenke-Hamel, K. E., & Mathieu, J. E. (1990). Role strains, tension, and job satisfaction influences on employess' propensity to leave: A multi-sample replication and extension. *Human Relations*, 43(8), 791-807.
- Laff, M. (2007). The myth of multitasking. *T & D*, 61(3), 20.
- Lambert, V. A. (2001). Literature review of role stress/strain on nurses: An international perspective. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 3, 161-172.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J., & Allen, N. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799-811.
- Lev-Ram, M. (2006). How to make your workspace *work* better. *Business 2.0*, 7(10), 58-60.
- Lewis, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1987). Stress in two-earner couples and stage in the life-cycle. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 289-303.
- Lockard, C. B. (2005). Athletic trainers: Providing healthcare for athletes of all kinds. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*(Spring), 38-41.
- Lussier, K. G. (2006). Taming burnout's flame. *Nursing Management*, 14.
- Martin, K. (2005). Anticipating the future. *2004-05 NCAA Division II Membership Report*.
- Mayhew. (2005). Ergonomics inthe workspace: Aligning workstations, workers, and work. *Canadian Manager*, 30(3), 16-17.
- Mazerolle, S. M., & Bruening, J. E. (2006). Sources of work-family conflict among Certified Athletic Trainers, part 1. *Athletic Therapy Today*, 11(5), 33-35.
- Mazerolle, S. M., Bruening, J. E., Casa, D. J., Burton, L., & Heest, J. V. (2006). *The impact of work-family conflict on job satisfaction and life satisfaction in Division*

I-A athletic trainers. Paper presented at the NATA Annual Meeting and Clinical Symposia, Atlanta, GA.

McChesney, J. C., & Peterson, M. (2005). There is no off-season anymore. *Athletic Therapy Today*, *10*(6), 6-10.

McKeena, E. (2000). *Business psychology and organizational behavior: A student's handbook* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

McLaine, A. J. (2005). An overview of burnout in athletic trainers. *Athletic Therapy Today*, *10*(6), 11-13.

Mensch, J., & Wham, G. (2005). It's a quality-of-life issue. *Athletic Therapy Today*, *10*(1), 34-35.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organization commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*(1), 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to the organization and occupation: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*(4), 538-551.

Michaels, C., & Spector, P. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*(1), 53-59.

Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*(4), 408-414.

Moss, C. (1994). 1992 entry-level athletic trainer salaries. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *29*(3), 205-207.

Moss, C. (1996). 1994 entry-level athletic training salaries. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *31*(1), 25-28.

- Nahm, H. (1940). Job satisfaction in nursing. *American Journal of Nursing*, 40, 1389-1392.
- NATA. (2005, July). New salary survey shows increased pay in most settings. *NATA News*, 22-23.
- NATA. (2006). Membership statistics. Retrieved 10/10/06, from <http://www.nata.org/membership/stats.htm>
- NATA. (2008). 2008 NATA certified membership by setting and district. Retrieved 4/25/08, from http://www.nata.org/members1/documents/membstats/2008_02.htm
- NATA Board of Directors. (2007). Summary of Minutes. Retrieved 10/31/07, 2007, from http://www.nata.org/members1/documents/BOD_minutes/0607.pdf
- NCAA. (2007). Membership. Retrieved 8/1/07, from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal!/ut/p/kcxml/04_Sj9SPykssy0xPLMnMz0vM0Y_QjzKLN4j3CQXJgFjGpvqRqCKOcAFfj_zcVH1v_QD9gtzQiHJHRUUAc0tpTA!/delta/base64xml/L3dJdyEvUUD3QndNQSEvNEIVRS82XzBfTFU!?CONTENT_URL=http://www2.ncaa.org/portal/about_ncaa/membership/
- Nogueras, D. J. (2006). Occupational commitment, education, and experience as a predictor of intent to leave the nursing profession. *Nursing Economics*, 24(2), 86-93.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pastore, D. (1993). Job satisfaction and female college coaches. *Physical Educator*, 50(4), 216-221.
- Pearl, M. J. (1990). Factors physical therapists use to make career decisions. v70(n2), p105(103).
- Perez, P., Cleary, M., & Hibbler, D. (2002). *Women in athletic training: Striving for equity*. Paper presented at the Florida International University College of Education Annual Research Conference Proceedings, Miami, FL.

- Perez, P. S., Hibbler, D. K., Cleary, M. A., & Eberman, L. E. (2006). Gender equity in athletic training. *Athletic Therapy Today*, 11(2), 66-69.
- Peters, L., O'Connor, E., & Rudolf, C. (1980). Situational constraints and work outcomes: The influences of a frequently overlooked construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 391-397.
- Pfeffer, J. (1976). Beyond management and the worker: The institutional function of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(2), 36-46.
- Pitney, W. (2002). The professional socialization of Certified Athletic Trainers in high school settings: A grounded theory investigation. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 37(3), 286-292.
- Pitney, W. (2006). Organizational influences and quality-of-life issues during the professional socialization of Certified Athletic Trainers working in the National Collegiate Athletic Association division I setting. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 41(2), 189-195.
- Pitney, W., Ilsley, P., & Rintala, J. (2002a). The professional socialization of Certified Athletic Trainers in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I context. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 37(1), 63-70.
- Pitney, W., Ilsley, P., & Rintala, J. (2002b). The professional socialization of Certified Athletic Trainers in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I context. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 37(1), 63-70.
- Reed, S., & Giacobbi, P. (2004). The stress and coping responses of certified graduate athletic training students. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 39(2), 193-200.
- Rice, R., Frone, M., & McFarlin, D. (1992). Work-nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 155-168.
- Rice, R., Philips, S., & McFarlin, D. (1990). Multiple discrepancies and pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 386-393.

- Ries, E. (2004). Mirror images: how PTs view their profession. *PT: Magazine of Physical Therapy*, 12(1), 38-44.
- Robinson, G. E. (2003). Stresses on women physicians: Consequences and coping techniques. *Depression and Anxiety*, 17, 180-189.
- Rozier, C. K., Raymond, M. J., Goldstein, M. S., & Hamilton, B. L. (1998). Gender and physical therapy career success factors. *Physical Therapy*, 78(7), 690-704.
- Sabiston, K. B., & Summers, S. (2004). Life balancing opportunities: Pregnancy leave and flexible schedules. *NATA News*(July), 32-34.
- Salvatori, P., Williams, R., Polatajko, H., & MacKinnon, J. (1992). The manpower shortage in occupational therapy: Implications for Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 59(1), 40-51.
- Shanahan, M. M. (1993). A comparative analysis of recruitment and retention of health care professionals. *Health Care Management Review*, 18(3), 41-51.
- Sheehan, K. (2001). Email survey response rate: A review. *JCMC*, 6(2).
- Smith-Ribner, D. (2003). State System of Higher Education v Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (Vol. 408 CD 2002): Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania.
- Spector, P. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Staurowsky, E., & Scriber, K. (1998). An analysis of selected factors that affect the work lives of athletic trainers employed in accredited educational programs. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 33(3), 244-248.

- Staw, B. (1980). The consequences of turnover. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 1*, 253-273.
- Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*(4), 673-686.
- Stilger, V., Etzel, E., & Lantz, C. (2001). Life-stress sources and symptoms of collegiate student athletic trainers over the course of an academic year. *Journal of Athletic Training, 36*(4), 401-407.
- Tovey, E., & Adams, A. (1999). The changing nature of nurses' job satisfaction: An exploration of sources of satisfaction in the 1990s. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 30*(1), 150-158.
- USDOL. (2006). Athletic Trainers. Retrieved 11/1/06, from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/pdf/ocos294.pdf>
- Wall, T., & Martin, R. (1987). Job and work design. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 61-92). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- War, P., & Payne, R. (1983). Affective outcomes of paid employment in a random sample of British workers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 4*, 91-104.
- WATC. (1996a). Men in athletic training survey. Retrieved 2/18/07, from http://www.nata.org/members1/committees/watc/watc_membersurvey/watc_membersurvey/surveyemen.htm
- WATC. (1996b). Women in athletic training survey. Retrieved 2/18/07, from http://www.nata.org/members1/committees/watc/watc_membersurvey/watc_membersurvey/surveyewomen.htm
- Webb, T. L., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*(2), 249-268.

- Weisberg, J., & Kirschenbaum, A. (1991). Employee turnover intentions: Implications from a national sample. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(3), 359-366.
- Weisman, C., Alexander, C., & Chase, G. (1981). Determinants of hospital staff nurse turnover. *Medical Care*, 19(4), 431-443.
- Winter-Collins, A., & McDaniel, A. (2000). Sense of belonging and new graduate job satisfaction. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 16(3), 103-111.
- Winterstein, A. P. (1998). Organizational commitment among intercollegiate head athletic trainers: Examining our work environment. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 33, 54-61.
- Wolpert, R., & Yoshida, K. (1992). Attrition survey of physiotherapists in Ontario. *Physiotherapy Canada*, 44(2), 17-24.
- Yusof, A. (1999). *The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and leadership substitutes variables with the job satisfaction of coaches at NCAA Division I and III institutions*. Unpublished Dissertation, The University of Connecticut.

APPENDIX A

PRINT VERSION OF THE ONLINE JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY (JSS) & INTENTION TO LEAVE SURVEY (ITLS)

Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave the Profession of Athletic Training

[Exit this survey >>](#)

1. Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave Survey

Welcome and thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey.

The purpose of this survey is to examine the job satisfaction of Certified Athletic Trainers employed in NCAA Divisions I, II, and III. A secondary purpose is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and the intent to leave the athletic training profession.

These data are important as the NATA has recently experienced a decline in membership numbers.

The survey consists of three sections:

The first section deals with basic demographic information.

The second section is a 36-item Job Satisfaction Survey.

The final section is a 8-item Intent to Leave Athletic Training Survey.

It should take you no longer than 10 minutes to complete all 3 sections.

Completion of this survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. Institutional Review Board Approval has been granted by The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Please click the "next" button below to begin the survey.

Next >>

2. Demographics

1. Gender

2. NCAA Division

3. NATA District

4. Years Certified

5. Primary Job Title

Other (please specify)

6. Primary employment classification

<< Prev

Next >>

[Exit this survey >>](#)

3. Job Satisfaction Survey

This section will examine your job satisfaction. Please select the option which best represents your perspective for each question. All questions must be answered. At the end of this section, please click the "next" button to proceed to the following section.

1. *I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do*

I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do
 Disagree Moderately
 Disagree Slightly
 Agree Slightly
 Agree Moderately
 Agree Very Much

2. *There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.*

There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.
 Disagree Moderately
 Disagree Slightly
 Agree Slightly
 Agree Moderately
 Agree Very Much

3. *My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.*

My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.
 Disagree Moderately
 Disagree Slightly
 Agree Slightly
 Agree Moderately
 Agree Very Much

4. *I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.*

I am not
 Disagree Moderately
 Disagree Slightly
 Agree Slightly
 Agree Moderately
 Agree Very Much

satisfied with the benefits I receive. Moderately Slightly Slightly Moderately Very Much

Disagree Very Much

5. *When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.*

When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

Disagree Very Much

6. *Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult*

Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

Disagree Very Much

7. *I like the people I work with.*

I like the people I work with. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

Disagree Very Much

8. *I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.*

I sometimes feel my job is Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

meaningless.
Disagree Very
Much

9. *Communications seem good within this organization.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree
Communications	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
seem good					
within this					
organization.					
Disagree Very					
Much					

10. *Raises are too few and far between.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree
Raises are	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
too few and					
far between.					
Disagree Very					
Much					

11. *Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree
Those	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
who do well					
on the job					
stand a fair					
chance of					
being					
promoted.					
Disagree Very					
Much					

12. *My supervisor is unfair to me.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree
My	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
supervisor is					
unfair to me.					
Disagree Very					
Much					

13. *The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.*

<input type="checkbox"/>					
The	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
benefits we	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
receive are as					
good as most					
other					
organizations					
offer.					
Disagree	Very				
Much					

14. *I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.*

<input type="checkbox"/>					
I do not	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
feel that the	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
work I do is					
appreciated.					
Disagree	Very				
Much					

15. *My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.*

<input type="checkbox"/>					
My	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
efforts to do a	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
good job are					
seldom					
blocked by red					
tape.					
Disagree	Very				
Much					

16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.

<input type="checkbox"/>					
I find I	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
have to work	Moderately	Slightly	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much
harder at my					
job because of					
the					
incompetence					
of people I					

work with.
Disagree Very
Much

17. I like doing the things I do at work.

I like
doing the
things I do at
work.
Disagree Very
Much

Disagree
Moderately

Disagree
Slightly

Agree
Slightly

Agree
Moderately

Agree
Very Much

18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.

The goals
of this
organization
are not clear to
me. Disagree
Very Much

Disagree
Moderately

Disagree
Slightly

Agree
Slightly

Agree
Moderately

Agree
Very Much

19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.

I feel
unappreciated
by the
organization
when I think
about what
they pay me.
Disagree Very
Much

Disagree
Moderately

Disagree
Slightly

Agree
Slightly

Agree
Moderately

Agree
Very Much

20. People get ahead here as fast as they do in other places.

People
get ahead here
as fast as they
do in other
places.

Disagree
Moderately

Disagree
Slightly

Agree
Slightly

Agree
Moderately

Agree
Very Much

Disagree Very
Much

21. *My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.*

<input type="checkbox"/> My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Very Much
---	--	--	---	---	--

Disagree Very
Much

22. *The benefit package we have is equitable.*

<input type="checkbox"/> The benefit package we have is equitable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Very Much
--	--	--	---	---	--

Disagree Very
Much

23. *There are few rewards for those who work here.*

<input type="checkbox"/> There are few rewards for those who work here.	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Very Much
---	--	--	---	---	--

Disagree Very
Much

24. *I have too much to do at work.*

<input type="checkbox"/> I have too much to do at work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Disagree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Slightly	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Moderately	<input type="checkbox"/> Agree Very Much
---	--	--	---	---	--

Disagree Very
Much

25. *I enjoy my coworkers.*

I enjoy my coworkers. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

26. *I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.*

I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

27. *I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.*

I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

28. *I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.*

I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

29. *There are benefits we do not have which we should have.*

There are benefits we do not have which we should have. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much

not have
which we
should have.
Disagree Very
Much

30. *I like my supervisor.*

I like my supervisor. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very
Much

31. *I have too much paperwork.*

I have too much paperwork. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very
Much

32. *I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.*

I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very
Much

33. *I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.*

I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree
Very Much

34. *There is too much bickering and fighting at work.*

There is too much bickering and fighting at work.
 Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very Much

35. *My job is enjoyable.*

My job is enjoyable.
 Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very Much

36. *Work assignments are not fully explained.*

Work assignments are not fully explained.
 Disagree Moderately Disagree Slightly Agree Slightly Agree Moderately Agree Very Much
Disagree Very Much

Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave the Profession of Athletic Training
[Exit this survey >>](#)

4. Intent to Leave Survey

This section will examine your intent to leave the profession of athletic training. Please select the option which best represents your perspective for each question. All questions must be answered. At the end of this section, please click the "next" button to proceed to the following section.

1. *Within the past 6 months how often have you considered leaving the athletic training*

profession?

Within the past 6 months how often have you considered leaving the athletic training profession? A little A lot Constantly
Never

2. Within the past 6 months how actively have you pursued a job outside of athletic training?

Within the past 6 months how actively have you pursued a job outside of athletic training? I have made inquiries into jobs outside of AT I have applied for jobs outside of AT I have accepted jobs outside of AT
I have done nothing

3. Within the past 6 months how often have you considered exploring other career opportunities in another allied health field (physical therapy, nursing, physician assistant, etc.)?

Within the past 6 months how often have you considered exploring other career opportunities in another allied health field (physical therapy, nursing, physician assistant, etc.)? A little A lot Constantly
Never

4. Within the past 6 months how often have you considered exploring other career opportunities in a field outside of allied health?

Within the past 6 months how often have you considered exploring other career opportunities in a field outside of allied health? A little A lot Constantly
Never

5. *What is the probability you will be working in the athletic training profession one year from today?*

What is the probability you will be working in the athletic training profession one year from today?
Excellent (75-100%)

Good (50-74%)

Fair (25-49%)

Poor (0-24%)

6. *What is the probability you will be working in another allied health field (physical therapy, nursing, physician assistant, etc.) one year from today?*

What is the probability you will be working in another allied health field (physical therapy, nursing, physician assistant, etc.) one year from today?
Excellent (75-100%)

Good (50-74%)

Fair (25-49%)

Poor (0-24%)

<< Prev

Next >>

5. Intent to Leave/Allied Health Field

1. *If you were in another allied health field one year from today, what is the probability you would retain your ATC credential?*

If you were in another allied health field one year from today, what is the probability you would retain your ATC credential? Excellent (75-100%) Good (50-74%) Fair (25-49%) Poor (0-24%)

2. *If you were in another allied health field one year from today, what is the probability you would continue your NATA membership?*

If you were in another allied health field one year from today, what is the probability you would continue your NATA membership? Excellent (75-100%) Good (50-74%) Fair (25-49%) Poor (0-24%)

<< Prev

Next >>

6. Intent to Leave Survey II

1. *What is the probability you will be working in a field outside of allied health one year from today?*

- What is the probability you will be working in a field outside of allied health one year from today? Excellent (75-100%)
- Good (50-74%)
- Fair (25-49%)
- Poor (0-24%)

<< Prev

Next >>

7. Intent to Leave/Outside Allied Health

1. *If you were in a field outside of allied health one year from today, what is the probability you would retain you ATC credential?*

If you were in a field outside of allied health one year from today, what is the probability you would retain you ATC credential? Excellent (75-100%) Good (50-74%) Fair (25-49%) Poor (0-24%)

2. *If you were in a field outside of allied health one year from today, what is the probability you would retain your NATA membership?*

If you were in a field outside of allied health one year from today, what is the probability you would retain your NATA membership? Excellent (75-100%) Good (50-74%) Fair (25-49%) Poor (0-24%)

<< Prev

Next >>

8. Thank You

Thank you for completing this survey.

Please click the "Submit Survey" button at the bottom of this page.

By clicking and submitting you are agreeing to participate in this study.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this study.

This web page will close after your submission

<< Prev

SUBMIT SURVEY

APPENDIX B

E-mail Solicitation Letter and Informed Consent

Dear Certified Athletic Trainer,

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro currently pursuing my Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Exercise and Sport Science. I am examining job satisfaction and intention to leave the profession of athletic training in Certified Athletic Trainers among the NCAA Divisions I, II, and III. These data are important as there has recently been a decline in NATA membership. I received your e-mail from the NATA Membership Database and am asking for your assistance in completing an on-line survey at URL listed at the bottom of this letter.

The survey consists of three sections: 1) Demographics, 2) Job Satisfaction Survey, and 3) Intention to Leave Athletic Training Survey.

To participate in this study you need to be:

A Certified Athletic Trainer in good standing with the BOC.

Currently employed (part-time or full-time) at an NCAA college or university.

You will access the survey by clicking the link at the bottom of this letter and then be directed to a remote web site. You are asked to answer the questions honestly. You will not be identified in any way and all responses will be confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you may wish to withdrawal at any time by discontinuing the survey. If you do not wish to receive future solicitation asking for your participation you may click here: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx> and be removed from the sampling list.

By submitting the survey you are providing informed consent for your participation in the study. This survey has been approved by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board.

The results of this study may be used in future publications however no identification will be used. The raw data will be secured on a data-based server and password protected CD-ROM, and will be destroyed three years after the publication of results. A copy of the results will be made available upon request. Please feel free to contact with any questions regarding this study.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Aaron Terranova, M.Ed., ATC, LAT
atcsanditl@gmail.com

336-334-5925

Please click this link to access the survey : <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Participant for this survey were selected at random from the NATA membership database according to the selection criteria provided by the investigator. This survey is not endorsed by the NATA. It is being sent to you because of the NATA's commitment to athletic training education and research.

APPENDIX C

Follow-up Solicitation Letter and Informed Consent

Dear Certified Athletic Trainer,

If you have already completed this survey, thank you, and please disregard this follow-up e-mail. I apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you, and again thank you for your contributions.

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro currently pursuing my Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Exercise and Sport Science. I am examining job satisfaction and intention to leave the profession of athletic training in Certified Athletic Trainers among the NCAA Divisions I, II, and III. These data are important as there has recently been a decline in NATA membership. I received your e-mail from the NATA Membership Database and am asking for your assistance in completing an on-line survey at URL listed at the bottom of this letter.

The survey consists of three sections: 1) Demographics, 2) Job Satisfaction Survey, and 3) Intention to Leave Athletic Training Survey.

To participate in this study you need to be:

A Certified Athletic Trainer in good standing with the BOC.

Currently employed (part-time or full-time) at an NCAA college or university.

You will access the survey by clicking the link at the bottom of this letter and then be directed to a remote web site. You are asked to answer the questions honestly. You will not be identified in any way and all responses will be confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you may wish to withdrawal at any time by discontinuing the survey. If you do not wish to receive future solicitation asking for your participation you may click here: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx> and be removed from the sampling list.

By submitting the survey you are providing informed consent for your participation in the study. This survey has been approved by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board.

The results of this study may be used in future publications however no identification will be used. The raw data will be secured on a data-based server and password protected CD-ROM, and will be destroyed three years after the publication of results. A copy of the results will be made available upon request. Please feel free to contact with any questions regarding this study.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Aaron Terranova, M.Ed., ATC, LAT
atcsanditl@gmail.com
336-334-5925

Please click this link to access the survey : <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

Participant for this survey were selected at random from the NATA membership database according to the selection criteria provided by the investigator. This survey is not endorsed by the NATA. It is being sent to you because of the NATA's commitment to athletic training education and research

Appendix D

Additional Results Tables

Table 16.

Principle Component Analysis of the JSS Using a Varimax Rotation with Kaiser Normalization.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Component</i>								
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>
30	.84	.10	.06	.15	.03	.21	-.05	.16	-.02
3	.82	.13	-.06	.01	.05	.14	-.05	.16	.07
12	.80	.15	.09	.07	.08	.21	.01	.02	.13
21	.78	.21	.11	.06	.08	.09	.10	.19	.08
36	.49	.17	.12	.13	.15	.20	.30	.21	-.07
5	.49	.46	.06	.21	.23	-.05	.11	.18	-.04
34	.43	.14	.02	.06	.04	.41	.28	.36	-.03
19	.09	.80	.13	.16	.11	.02	.08	.15	.06
1	.09	.68	.10	.13	.09	.08	.02	.06	-.23
32	.26	.65	.04	.25	.07	.11	.25	.12	.14
28	.13	.63	.29	.37	-.01	.02	-.03	-.02	.06
14	.30	.59	.05	.24	.28	-.01	.14	.17	.11
10	-.00	.57	.33	.05	-.24	.16	.06	-.02	.36
23	.13	.56	.20	.41	.05	.12	.16	.21	.05
22	.09	.16	.88	.09	.04	.03	.08	-.01	-.12
13	.15	.11	.84	.05	.08	-.00	.14	-.05	.00
4	-.09	.03	.73	.12	.01	.06	-.12	.04	.27
29	.07	.25	.72	-.09	.01	.04	.02	.16	-.06
33	.12	.35	.13	.76	.04	-.04	.04	.10	-.06
11	.18	.32	.01	.66	.06	.19	.02	-.01	.00
20	.17	.19	.06	.66	.15	-.09	.26	.06	.03
2	-.14	.15	-.10	.61	.03	.23	-.13	.23	.41
27	.12	.09	-.02	.04	.82	.09	-.17	.05	.19
17	-.04	-.05	.15	.02	.75	.05	.21	.20	-.16
35	.25	.21	.06	.26	.70	.25	.10	.10	-.04
8	.24	.37	-.08	-.01	.53	-.16	.19	-.05	.42
25	.36	-.04	.11	.16	.13	.73	.10	.04	-.07
7	.47	.01	.03	.14	.14	.67	.08	.09	-.02
16	.20	.18	.05	-.10	.06	.63	.24	.18	.12
15	.38	-.17	.05	.02	.10	-.39	.33	.18	.14
31	-.02	.16	-.09	-.02	-.03	.28	.78	.11	.05

24	.06	.17	.17	.19	.10	.06	.76	.07	.09
26	.34	.12	.18	.14	.08	.01	.13	.74	-.01
18	.25	.18	-.06	.07	.18	.13	.09	.72	.12
9	.37	.29	.04	.12	.16	.27	.08	.47	.08
6	.35	.00	.12	.12	.12	-.06	.34	.17	.62

Table 17.

Interclass Correlation Between the Nine Subscales of the JSS During Pilot Testing.

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pay	1.00								
Promo	0.78	1.00							
Super	0.46	0.32	1.00						
Benefits	0.60	0.58	0.20	1.00					
Reward	0.78	0.68	0.69	0.61	1.00				
Condition	0.42	0.35	0.51	0.47	0.65	1.00			
Coworkers	0.22	0.14	0.74	0.37	0.46	0.48	1.00		
Nature	0.17	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.35	0.52	0.45	1.00	
Communication	0.42	0.43	0.63	0.63	0.70	0.63	0.71	0.47	1.00

Table 18.

Interclass Cronbach's Coefficient α for the Pilot Version of the JSS Subscales and Total Score.

Scale	Number of Items	Coefficient α
Total Job Satisfaction	36	0.95
Subscales		
Pay	4	0.86
Promotion	4	0.72
Supervision	4	0.88
Fringe Benefits	4	0.88
Contingent Rewards	4	0.93
Operating Conditions	4	0.79
Coworkers	4	0.63
Nature of Work	4	0.81
Communication	4	0.84

Table 19.Interclass Correlations of the ITLS During Pilot Testing.

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Itlnahfyr	1.00						
Itlleave	0.72	1.00					
itlpursued	0.40	0.64	1.00				
Itlahf	0.01	0.03	-0.21	1.00			
Itlnahf	0.73	0.82	0.60	-0.07	1.00		
Itlatyr	0.94	0.77	0.58	-0.02	0.76	1.00	
Itlahfyr	0.16	0.39	0.34	0.52	0.50	0.24	1.00
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items						
0.85	7.00						

Table 20.

Descriptive Statistics for the 36 Items of the JSS.

Item #	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	2.65	1.45
2	2.80	1.38
3	4.77	1.44
4	3.94	1.57
5	3.48	1.46
6	4.03	1.24
7	5.12	0.94
8	4.47	1.40
9	3.57	1.48
10	2.49	1.45
11	3.10	1.29
12	5.00	1.31
13	3.94	1.50
14	3.56	1.39
15		
16	3.98	1.59
17	5.09	.81
18	4.31	1.34
19	2.70	1.47

20	2.860	1.12
21	4.36	1.51
22	3.96	1.52
23	3.16	1.25
24	3.05	1.36
25	5.07	1.06
26	3.57	1.27
27	5.24	0.89
28	2.84	1.39
29	3.12	1.39
30	4.80	1.35
31	3.28	1.43
32	2.97	1.27
33	2.82	1.29
34	4.22	1.46
35	4.83	0.96
36	4.15	1.35

Table 21.

Factorial ANOVA Model Summaries of the JSS Subscales Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Supervision Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	11.83	2	5.91	.10	.91
Job Title	204.34	2	102.17	1.72	.18
Division * Job Title	128.65	4	32.16	.54	.71
Error	10785.98	182	59.26		
Total	191715.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Pay & Rewards Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	45.57	2	22.78	.44	.65
Job Title	69.91	2	34.95	.67	.51
Division * Job Title	206.98	4	51.75	.99	.42
Error	9527.44	182	52.35		
Total	87630.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Fringe Benefits Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	24.06	2	12.03	.57	.57

Job Title	330.94	2	165.47	7.82	.00
Division * Job Title	122.00	4	30.50	1.44	.22
Error	3851.18	182	21.16		
Total	48345.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Promotion Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	31.71	2	15.86	1.10	.33
Job Title	18.21	2	9.11	.63	.53
Division * Job Title	66.21	4	16.55	1.15	.33
Error	2616.93	182	14.38		
Total	27826.00	191	14.38		

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Nature of Work Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	2.20	2	1.10	.12	.89
Job Title	2.90	2	1.45	.16	.86
Division * Job Title	93.31	4	23.33	2.52	.04
Error	1684.18	182	9.25		
Total	75252.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Coworkers Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	15.54	2	7.77	.91	.41
Job Title	23.74	2	11.87	1.38	.25
Division * Job Title	23.81	4	5.95	.69	.60
Error	1560.71	182	8.58		
Total	40033.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Operating Conditions Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	21.43	2	10.72	2.15	.12
Job Title	119.61	2	59.81	12.00	.00
Division * Job Title	19.22	4	4.8	.96	.43
Error	906.58	182	4.98		
Total	8691.00	191			

Factorial ANOVA Model Summary of JSS Communication Subscale Based on NCAA Division and Primary Job Title.					
<i>Source</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Division	9.53	2	4.76	.43	.65
Job Title	31.55	2	15.77	1.43	.24
Division * Job Title	37.55	4	9.39	.85	.49
Error	2003.06	182	11.00		
Total	27163.00	191			

Table 22.

ANOVA Summary of JSS Subscales and Gender.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Supervision	Between Groups	24.76	1	24.76	.42	.52
	Within Groups	11103.18	189	58.75		
	Total	11127.94	190			
Pay & Rewards	Between Groups	12.55	1	12.55	.24	.62
	Within Groups	9770.67	189	51.70		
	Total	9783.22	190			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	19.63	1	19.63	.84	.36
	Within Groups	4445.66	189	23.52		
	Total	4465.29	190			
Promotion	Between Groups	16.01	1	16.01	1.10	.30
	Within Groups	2745.36	189	14.53		
	Total	2761.37	190			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	3.03	1	3.03	.32	.57
	Within Groups	1780.30	189	9.42		
	Total	1783.33	190			
Coworkers	Between Groups	.00	1	.00	.00	1.00
	Within Groups	1610.59	189	8.52		
	Total	1610.59	190			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	8.16	1	8.16	1.43	.23
	Within Groups	1080.62	189	5.72		
	Total	1088.78	190			
Communication	Between Groups	32.12	1	32.12	2.97	.09
	Within	2043.33	189	10.81		

Groups

Total 2075.46 190

Table 23.

ANOVA Summary of JSS Subscales and NATA District.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Supervision	Between Groups	323.23	9	35.91	.59	.81
	Within Groups	8394.91	137	61.28		
	Total	8718.14	146			
Pay & Rewards	Between Groups	653.74	9	72.64	1.54	.14
	Within Groups	6452.71	137	47.10		
	Total	7106.45	146			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	122.77	9	13.64	.57	.82
	Within Groups	3261.21	137	23.80		
	Total	3383.97	146			
Promotion	Between Groups	94.87	9	10.54	.69	.72
	Within Groups	2084.98	137	15.22		
	Total	2179.85	146			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	70.18	9	7.80	.79	.62
	Within Groups	1345.79	137	9.82		
	Total	1415.97	146			
Coworkers	Between Groups	26.63	9	2.96	.34	.96
	Within Groups	1198.77	137	8.75		
	Total	1225.40	146			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	69.22	9	7.69	1.43	.18
	Within Groups	735.97	137	5.37		
	Total	805.18	146			
Communication	Between Groups	89.85	9	9.98	.88	.55
	Within	1563.38	137	11.41		

Groups

Total 1653.22 146

Table 24.

ANOVA Summary of JSS Subscales and Years Certified.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Supervision	Between Groups	89.54	3	29.85	.50	.68
	Within Groups	11037.84	186	59.34		
	Total	11127.37	189			
Pay & Rewards	Between Groups	17.38	3	5.79	.11	.95
	Within Groups	9727.34	186	52.30		
	Total	9744.72	189			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	238.06	3	79.35	3.52	.02
	Within Groups	4192.91	186	22.54		
	Total	4430.97	189			
Promotion	Between Groups	65.71	3	21.90	1.53	.21
	Within Groups	2665.74	186	14.33		
	Total	2731.45	189			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	46.28	3	15.43	1.66	.18
	Within Groups	1730.19	186	9.30		
	Total	1776.47	189			
Coworkers	Between Groups	14.54	3	4.85	.57	.64
	Within Groups	1588.07	186	8.54		
	Total	1602.61	189			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	98.34	3	32.78	6.16	.00
	Within Groups	989.96	186	5.32		
	Total	1088.30	189			
Communication	Between Groups	5.81	3	1.94	.18	.91
	Within	2039.67	186	10.97		

Groups
Total 2045.48 189

Table 25.

ANOVA Summary of JSS Subscales and Employment Classification.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Supervision	Between Groups	96.16	1	96.16	1.65	.20
	Within Groups	11031.78	189	58.37		
	Total	11127.94	190			
Pay & Rewards	Between Groups	.66	1	.66	.01	.91
	Within Groups	9782.56	189	51.76		
	Total	9783.22	190			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	2.27	1	2.27	.10	.76
	Within Groups	4463.02	189	23.61		
	Total	4465.29	190			
Promotion	Between Groups	13.99	1	13.99	.96	.33
	Within Groups	2747.39	189	14.54		
	Total	2761.37	190			
Nature of Work	Between Groups	11.01	1	11.01	1.17	.28
	Within Groups	1772.32	189	9.38		
	Total	1783.33	190			
Coworkers	Between Groups	27.94	1	27.94	3.34	.07
	Within Groups	1582.64	189	8.37		
	Total	1610.59	190			
Operating Conditions	Between Groups	27.37	1	27.37	4.87	.03
	Within Groups	1061.41	189	5.62		
	Total	1088.78	190			
Communication	Between Groups	7.04	1	7.04	.64	.42
	Within	2068.42	189	10.94		

Groups
Total 2075.46 190
