Journal of Agricultural Education, 58(1), 14-35.
https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.01014

Assessing the Relationship of Teacher Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Perception of Work-Life Balance of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers

J. Joey Blackburn,[1] J.C. Bunch,[2] & J. Chris Haynes[3]

Abstract

Agricultural education has faced a national shortage of qualified teachers since 1965. Initiatives, such as NAAE's TeachAg Campaign, seek to alleviate this shortage through recruitment of new agriculture teachers. However, turnover in the teaching profession remains a problem, with attrition rates approaching 60% reported in some research studies. Factors such as teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance have been reported to influence teachers' decision whether or not to remain in the profession. The purpose of this study was to describe Louisiana agriculture teachers' levels of teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perception of work-life balance. Overall, teachers reported being efficacious in their chosen career and satisfied with their job. Additionally, these teachers reported being able to achieve balance in their career and that their family life did not interfere with work. These teachers were undecided as to whether work interfered with their family. It is recommended that further research be completed to understand why this and other studies reported teachers to be satisfied and efficacious, yet a high turnover of agriculture teachers exists. Teachers who excel at balancing teaching and their personal lives should be utilized as workshop presenters to assist other teachers in attaining balance.

Keywords: agricultural education; teacher self-efficacy; job satisfaction; work-life balance

Introduction

A critical shortage of teachers exists in the United States (Kantrovich, 2007; Fandel, 2007; Walker, Garton & Kitchel, 2004). The National Education Association (NEA) indicated that over one million teachers were expected to retire by 2014, thus signifying the need for an additional two million teachers over the next 10 years to fill the demand for qualified educators (NEA; as cited in Walker et al., 2004). This number has more than tripled, with 3.4 million retirees estimated in 2013 (Phillip, 2011). As of 2001, almost 50% of educator turnover has been due to retirement and teacher relocation, with the remaining separating from the educational profession entirely (Wirt et al., 2005). According to Lambert (2006), "the number of new teachers who leave the profession has hovered around 50% for decades" (p. 1). Further, those educators coming into the profession with alternative forms of teacher certification have experienced an attrition rate of 60%, indicating that the recruitment and retention of quality teachers is of epic concern (Darling-Hammond, Berry, & Thoreson, 2001; Walker et al., 2004).

[1] J. Joey Blackburn is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education and Evaluation at Louisiana State University, 129 J.C. Miller Hall, 110 LSU Union Square, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, jjblackburn@lsu.edu

[2] J. C. Bunch is an Assistant Professor of Agricultural Education in the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication at the University of Florida, 307C Rolfs Hall Gainesville, FL 32611, bunchj@ufl.edu

[3] J. Chris Haynes is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Secondary Education/Agricultural Education at the University of Wyoming, McWhinnie Hall 114, Dept. 3374, 1000 E. University Ave., Laramie, WY 82071, jhaynes4@uwyo.edu

Nearly all high school subject areas (i.e., science, math, English as a Second Language etc.) have experienced attrition concerns, with social studies and physical education being the exceptions (Fandel, 2007). A shortage of highly qualified educators has existed in agricultural education as well (Camp, Broyles, & Skelton, 2002; Kantrovich, 2007). In fact, Camp et al. (2002) documented an agriculture teacher deficit as early as 1965. Further, Ball & Torres (2010) reported that the number of open positions has consistently exceeded the supply of agriculture teachers since the 1980s. The National Association of Agricultural Educators (NAAE) has documented this deficiency and has been actively pursuing new teachers through the National TeachAg Campaign (Associated Press, 2010).

The recruitment of agricultural educators by NAAE is a positive move toward easing the teacher attrition crisis. However, researchers have theorized that retention of qualified teachers may be more effective in reducing the occurring shortage in the U.S (Smethem, 2007). On the subject of retention, Darling-Hammond (1999) posited that 30% of all beginning in-service teachers will leave the profession within their first five years, and Johnson (2004) identified the attrition rate being as high as 50%. These are alarming statistics. Thus, further developing an understanding of the reasons behind attrition in the agricultural education profession is a critical concern (Crutchfield, Ritz, & Burris, 2013).

Researchers have identified a number of factors that influence teachers leaving the profession, including (a) low self-efficacy concerns, (b) low motivation, (c) a demoralizing work environment, (d) work-life balance issues, and (e) burnout (Boone & Boone, 2009; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Clark, Brown, & Ramsey, 2012; Cooper & Nelson, 1981; Epps, Foor, & Cano, 2010; Kitchel et al., 2012; Newcomb, Betts, & Cano, 1987; Odell, Cochran, Lawrence, & Gartin, 1990; Thieman, Henry, & Kitchel, 2012). Common issues researched in the last decade have focused on commitment to teaching and job satisfaction, as well as federal involvement aimed at school improvement (Boone & Boone, 2009; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Blackburn & Robinson, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008; Clark et al., 2012; Epps et al., 2010; Kitchel et al., 2012; Thieman et al., 2012). Nationally, teachers have been targeted by legislation that has "proposed cutting collective bargaining rights, eliminating tenure and slashing teacher benefits," decreasing the desire for those preparing for a career in education to pursue teaching at all (Phillip, 2011, p. 7).

A primary concern related to teacher attrition has been found to be self-efficacy (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Bandura (1994), defined self-efficacy as an individuals' "beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (p. 1). Additionally, a lack of self-efficacy can impact a persons' ability to cope with difficult situations, thereby affecting their motivation toward educational responsibilities and diminishing their academic success (Bandura, 1995).

Teacher self-efficacy, specifically, has been defined as "the teacher's belief in his or her own capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a specific context" (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 223). Teacher self-efficacy concerns contributing to attrition revolve around what has been termed as a *can-do* thought process (Schwarzer, 1992). Educators who internalize a high level of self-efficacy are more likely to succeed and continue in their chosen profession. Conversely, they are more likely to fail when low levels of self-efficacy exist (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996; Saklofske, Michaluk, & Randhawa, 1988). Further, Glickman and Tamashiro (1982) found that low teacher self-efficacy contributed to a reduction in commitment to teaching that led to teachers leaving the profession. Additionally, teacher self-efficacy, along with job satisfaction, motivation, and

commitment have been shown to influence teachers' professional identity (Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2012).

Crutchfield et al. (2013) sought to determine what agriculture teacher retention factors existed among teachers who had taught for a minimum of four years. Specifically, the study sought to investigate the relationships among work engagement, work-life balance, and occupational commitment related to the teachers' decision to remain in the agricultural education profession (Crutchfield et al., 2013). As a result of the findings, it was implied by researchers that teachers who participated in the study were able to remain in the profession when they were able to balance their work commitment and family life. However, those teachers who devoted much time to activities beyond classroom instruction realized there was potential for negative impact on their career commitment (Crutchfield et al., 2013). In prior studies, teachers have also reported that long work hours without adequate compensation were taxing on their ability to balance work and family obligations (Murray, Flowers, Croom, & Wilson, 2011). Similarly, personal and family factors have been found to influence the overall job satisfaction of agriculture teachers, possibly leading to an increased rate of attrition (Ball & Torres, 2010; Cooper & Nelson, 1981; Odell et al., 1990).

So, why do teachers remain in the classroom (Crutchfield et al., 2013)? Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors have been documented as reasons why teachers choose to remain in the profession (Inman & Marlow, 2004; Nieto, 2003). Approximately, 50% of teachers surveyed with 4-9 years of teaching experience identified salary as a factor that led them to remain in the teaching profession (Inman & Marlow, 2004). Further, collegiality and a positive work environment have been identified as important retention factors, (Inman and Marlow, 2004; Nieto, 2003), which in turn can allow for an increase in teacher self-efficacy and dedication to the profession (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Soodak & Podell, 1996; Rocca & Washburn, 2006).

Pedagogical understanding dictates that the longer a teacher is in the profession, the more effective they are compared to their novice counterparts (Day, Sammons, Kington, Gu, & Stobart, 2006). As such, the costs associated with teacher attrition can be measured not only monetarily through the associated costs of recruiting and retaining qualified teachers, but through the costs associated with a less effective learning environment (Allen, & Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO., 2005). Which begs the question, how can teachers effectively balance their careers and personal life, thus decreasing attrition in the profession (Crutchfield et al., 2013)?

Conceptual Frame

Attribution theory served as the conceptual underpinning of this study. Attribution theory is centered on how an individual's beliefs or perceptions of causality influence his or her subsequent courses of action (Canrinus et al., 2012; Weiner, 1972). Brooks and Clarke (2011) posited that attribution theory is useful "to explain how people interpret events or other people's motives, and how their behaviors are affected by these interpretations" (p. 34). Obvious reasons exist for why people behave in certain ways and attribution theory targets the dimensions of stability, controllability, and locus of control as the dimensions of both internal and external attributes (Weiner et al., 1971). Defined simply, attributions are "perceived causes of outcomes" (Schunck, 2008, p. 455).

Pintrich and Schunk (1996) posited that two assumptions can be aligned to attribution theory. The first assumption being that a motivational goal exists in individuals who seek to master themselves and the environment around them. The second assumption being an attempt to comprehend the behaviors of others, as well as the fundamental causes associated with those behaviors (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). According to Gaier (2015), "combining these assumptions

results in the premise that identifying and understanding the causes of behavior, both their own and that of others, is a primary function for helping people to master their environments and themselves" (p. 7–8).

Attributions can also potentially have a cause and effect relationship on decision-making and future actions, allowing individuals to manage concerns associated with internal and external stress effectively (Gaier, 2015; Hong, Chiu, Dweck, Lin, &Wan, 1999). The impact of attributions can be understood as:

An observer causally interprets a given set of information to arrive at an attribution [cause]. The information concerns behavior, behavioral consequences, and the circumstances under which behavior occurs. The attribution has the effect or result of placing this information in a cause-effect context. It provides an answer to the question: what caused the observed behavior and its consequences, (Jones, et al., 1972, p. ix).

After review of the literature it was determined that no recent research related to Louisiana agriculture teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction, or perceptions of work-life balance exists. Given the persistent shortage of agriculture teachers across the nation, it is imperative to develop an understanding of factors that influence teacher attrition. As per the literature, teachers who are highly efficacious and satisfied with their jobs are more likely to remain committed to the teaching profession (Glickman and Tamashiro, 1982; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996; Saklofske et al., 1988). Therefore, the following primary question arose after the review of literature: what are the current levels of teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance of Louisiana agriculture teachers?

The purpose of this research study aligns closely with sub-bullet one American Association for Agricultural Education's Research Priority Area 3: Sufficient Scientific and Professional Workforce that Addresses the Challenges of the 21st Century (Doerfert, 2011). This section of the National Research Agenda identified "developing the models, strategies, and tactics that best prepare, promote, and retain new professionals who demonstrate content knowledge, technical competence, moral boundaries and cultural awareness coupled with communication and interpersonal skills" as a necessary area of scientific focus (Doerfert, 2011, p. 9).

Purpose of the Study

The twofold purpose of this study was to describe Louisiana agriculture teachers' levels of teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perception of work-life balance. Additionally, this study sought to determine if relationships existed between these variables. The following research objectives guided the study:

1. Describe the levels of teacher self-efficacy (i.e., overall teacher self-efficacy, student engagement self-efficacy, instructional practices self-efficacy, and classroom management self-efficacy) of Louisiana agriculture teachers.
2. Describe the level of job satisfaction of Louisiana agriculture teachers.
3. Describe Louisiana agriculture teachers' perceptions of their work-life balance (i.e., creation of balance and perception of conflict between work and family).
4. Describe the relationships between teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and perception of work-life balance.

Methods/Procedures

Population and Sampling

The target population for this descriptive-correlational study was agriculture teachers who attended Louisiana agriculture teacher's conference in July of 2014. Data were collected face-to-face via a hardcopy questionnaire at the first general session of the conference. The total number of teachers who registered and attended the annual conference was 152. In all, completed questionnaires were collected from 105 teachers. The total number of teachers who attended the general session is unknown, however 105 teachers represent a 69% response rate of those who registered for the conference.

Table 1 depicts the categorical demographics data collected. Most (f = 78; 74.3%) of the teachers were male and were married (f = 82; 78.1%). The bachelor's degree was most common (f = 58; 55.2%), followed by the master's degree (f = 41; 39.0%). The majority (f = 79; 75.2%) of the teachers selected over $50,000 as their annual salary.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Variable	*f*	%
Gender		
Male	78	74.3
Female	27	25.7
Marital Status		
Married	82	78.1
Not Married	23	21.9
Education Level		
Bachelors	58	55.2
Masters	41	39.0
Specialist	3	2.9
Doctoral	2	1.9
Other	1	1.0

Table 1 (continued)

Demographic Characteristics of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Variable	*f*	%
Annual Salary		
$20,000 – 29,999	1	1.0
$30,000 – 39,000	1	1.0
$40,000 – $49,000	17	16.2
Over $50,000	79	75.2
Non-Response	7	6.7

Table 2 depicts the age, years of teaching experience, and the number of children of Louisiana agriculture teachers. The age of these teachers ranged from 21 to 77, with an average of just under 42 years. Teaching experience ranged from zero to 43 years, with just over 15 years as the average length of teaching experience. The responding teachers had an average of about two children each.

Table 2

Age, Years of Teaching Experience, and Number of Children of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Variable	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*M*	SD
Age	21	77	41.76	11.40
Years of Teaching Experience	0	43	15.19	10.13
Number of Children	0	10	1.91	1.49

It should be noted that little research regarding the study's dependent variables (i.e., self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance) as they pertain to Louisiana agriculture teachers has been examined in the past. As such, this study should not be considered representative of the entire teacher population. This study strictly serves as a starting point to begin to understand teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance among Louisiana agriculture teachers better.

Instrumentation

The instrument employed in this study was comprised of four sections. Face and content validity were established by a panel of experts consisting of three agricultural education faculty members, one agricultural education doctoral student, and one practicing agriculture teacher who

was not included in the study's population. Part I of the instrument was the long form of the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The TSES is comprised of 24 items that measure teacher self-efficacy across three constructs, (a) student engagement, (b) instructional strategies, and (c) classroom management. The nine-point Likert-type items were scaled as, 1 = *Nothing*, 3 = *Very Little*, 5 = *Some Influence*, 7 = *Quite A Bit*, and 9 = *A Great Deal*.

The second section of the instrument was the Brayfield-Rothe (1951) Job Satisfaction Index (JSI). The JSI consists of 14 items to assess job satisfaction. The five-point Likert-type scale was anchored as, 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Undecided*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Seven of the items were negatively worded, as such, these items were reverse coded prior to calculating the grand mean of the job satisfaction construct.

The third section of the instrument measured the teachers' perceptions of work-life balance factors using 11 items. The five-point Likert-type scale was anchored as, 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Undecided*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Specifically, four items from Chaney (2007) were used to determine the teacher's perceptions of creating work-life balance. Further, eight items from Gutek, Searle, and Klepa (1991) were used to measure conflict between work and family. These eight items were reverse coded in order that a high score reflected high conflict (Crutchfield et al., 2013). The final section of the instrument was a researcher developed demographics section (i.e., age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, years in the profession, annual salary, and number of children).

Due to the extensive research utilizing the TSES and JSI, a pilot study was not conducted. Cronbach's alpha was calculated *post-hoc* for each section of the instrument that contained scaled items. Greater than acceptable reliability estimates (Santos, 1999) for the TSES (α =.93) and JSI (α =.91) were calculated. Acceptable reliability estimates (Santos, 1999) were found for the perception of creating balance (α =.77) and perception of conflict with family and work (α=.79) sections of the instrument. It should be noted that a α=.70 or higher reliability coefficient is *acceptable* in social science research (UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group, 2016).

Data Analysis

Data related to research objectives one, two, and three were analyzed through percentages, means, and standard deviations. Item summaries, specifically the percentage of respondents who chose each option, were reported for Likert-type data (Warmbrod, 2014). These item summaries "indicate the content of the construct and the direction and intensity of each item's contribution to the summated total score or summated subscale score" (Warmbrod, 2014, p. 32). The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to address the fourth research objective. The strength of relationships was described using Davis' (1971) conventions: $.01 \geq r \geq .09$ = *Negligible*; $.10 \geq r \geq .29$ = *Low*; $.30 \geq r \geq .49$ = *Moderate*; $.50 \geq r \geq .69$ = *Substantial*; and $r \geq .70$ = *Very Strong*.

Findings

Research Objective 1: Describe Levels of Teacher Self-Efficacy of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers

The first research objective was concerned with describing Louisiana agriculture teachers' levels of teacher self-efficacy. Table 3 lists the percentage of respondents who chose each option on the Likert-type items.

Table 3

Item Response Percentages for the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
How much can you get through to the most difficult students?	1.0	1.0	17.1	4.8	31.4	13.3	27.6	1.9	1.9
How much can you do to help your students think critically?	0	0	0	0	19.0	17.1	41.0	10.5	12.4
How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	0	0	1.9	1.9	7.6	4.8	39.0	20.0	24.8
How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	0	0	3.8	5.7	22.9	22.9	25.7	12.4	5.7
To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	0	0	1.0	0	4.8	11.4	23.8	25.7	33.3
How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	0	0	1.0	2.9	11.4	15.2	30.5	27.6	10.5
How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	0	0	0	1.9	4.8	9.5	32.4	28.6	22.9
How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	0	0	1.0	0	5.7	11.4	30.5	30.5	20.0
How much can you do to help your students value learning?	0	0	1.9	3.8	11.4	16.2	33.3	21.0	12.4

Table 3 (continued)

Item Response Percentages for the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	0	0	0	0	4.8	16.2	50.5	18.1	9.5
To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	0	0	0	1.0	3.8	12.4	39.0	30.5	13.3
How much can you do to foster student creativity?	0	0	1.0	1.0	9.5	16.2	34.3	21.9	15.2
How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	0	0	0	1.9	5.7	13.3	32.4	30.5	16.2
How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	0	1.9	1.9	1.9	15.2	24.8	37.1	14.3	2.9
How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	0	0	0	6.7	6.7	16.2	32.4	18.1	19.0
How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	0	0	0	3.8	4.8	7.6	42.9	24.8	16.2
How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students	1.0	0	2.9	1.9	5.7	17.1	40.0	21.9	9.5
How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	1.0	0	1.9	1.0	2.9	18.1	27.6	28.6	19.0

Table 3 (continued)

Item Response Percentages for the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?	1.0	1.9	1.9	0	8.6	19.0	27.6	22.9	17.1
To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	0	0	0	0	8.6	6.7	33.3	28.6	22.9
How well can you respond to defiant students?	0	0	0	2.9	15.2	13.3	31.4	20.0	17.1
How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	0	1.9	1.9	1.9	21.0	16.2	28.6	18.1	10.5
How well can you implement alternatives in your classroom?	0	1.0	1.9	3.8	8.6	21.0	30.5	22.9	10.5
How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	0	0	1.0	1.9	3.8	6.7	31.4	32.4	22.9

Note. 1 = Nothing; 3 = Very Little; 5 = Some Influence; 7 = Quite A Bit; 9 = A Great Deal.

Overall, these teachers indicated they had *Quite A Bit* ($M = 7.02$; $SD = .82$) of influence in various teaching situations as measured by the TSES (see Table 4). The teachers also perceived *Quite A Bit* of influence for each of the three teacher self-efficacy constructs identified by the TSES.

Table 4

Teacher Self-Efficacy of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Teacher Self-Efficacy Category	*M*	*SD*
Overall Teacher Self-Efficacy	7.02	.82
Student Engagement	6.61	.85
Instructional Strategies	7.25	.86
Classroom Management	7.27	.99

Note. 1 = Nothing; 3 = Very Little; 5 = Some Influence; 7 = Quite A Bit; 9 = A Great Deal.

Research Objective 2: Describe the Level of Job Satisfaction of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers

Research objective two sought to describe the level of job satisfaction of Louisiana agriculture teachers. Table 5 reports the percentage of respondents who chose each option on the Likert-type items.

Table 5

Item Response Percentages for the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
My job is interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.	0	1.0	3.8	34.3	61.0
My friends seem more interested in their jobs than I am.	20.0	52.4	18.1	6.7	2.9
I consider my job pleasant	0	2.9	8.6	53.3	34.3
I am often bored with my job.	37.1	50.5	4.8	5.7	1.9
I feel satisfied with my job.	0	3.8	7.6	57.1	31.4
Most of the time, I have to force myself to go to work.	42.9	42.9	6.7	4.8	2.9
I definitely dislike my work.	65.7	27.6	5.7	1.0	0

Table 5 (continued)

Item Response Percentages for the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
I feel happier in my work than most other people.	1.0	6.7	12.4	46.7	33.3
Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	1.0	5.8	6.7	51.4	34.3
Each day of work seems like it will never end.	26.7	53.3	11.4	5.7	2.9
I like my job better than the average worker does.	1.0	5.7	13.3	41.0	38.1
My job in uninteresting.	51.4	38.1	1.9	4.8	3.8
I find real enjoyment in my work.	0	3.8	5.7	44.8	43.8
I am disappointed that I ever took this job.	68.3	28.8	1.0	1.0	1.0

Note. 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Undecided; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree.

The job satisfaction grand mean (M = 3.58; SD = .38) was within the real limits of *Agree* (see Table 6).

Table 6

Overall Job Satisfaction of Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Construct	*M*	*SD*
Job Satisfaction	4.22	57

Note. Real limits: 1.00–1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50–2.49=Disagree; 2.50–3.49= Undecided; 3.50–4.49=Agree; 4.50–5.00=Strongly Agree.

Research Objective 3: Describe Louisiana Agriculture Teachers' Perceptions of their Work-Life Balance

Research objective three was concerned with determining Louisiana agriculture teachers' perceptions of work-life balance. Table 7 lists the percentage of respondents who chose each option on the Likert-type items related to the teacher's perception of creating balance.

Table 7

Item Response Percentages for Perceptions of Creating Balance (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. You are able to balance quality time between your work and your family/personal commitments.	3.8	17.1	17.1	44.8	16.2
2. You are able to balance work demands without unreasonable compromises on family/personal responsibilities.	6.7	13.3	22.9	45.7	11.4
3. You are able to have a fulfilling personal life and adequately perform your work responsibilities.	3.8	8.6	20.0	48.6	19.0
4. A good work-life balance for agriscience teachers helps provide a more effective and successful agricultural education profession.	0	1.0	7.6	44.8	46.7
5. A good work-life balance for agriscience teachers helps retain teachers in the profession.	0	1.0	1.9	38.1	58.1

The overall mean (M = 3.91; SD = .65) of the perception of creating balance construct was within the real limits of *Agree* (see Table 8).

Table 8

Overall Perception of Creating Balance by Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Construct	*M*	*SD*
Creating Balance	3.91	.65

Note. Real limits: 1.00–1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50–2.49=Disagree; 2.50–3.49= Undecided; 3.50–4.49=Agree; 4.50–5.00=Strongly Agree.

Table 9 lists the percentage of respondents who chose each option on the Likert-type items regarding the perceptions of conflict between work and family.

Table 9

Item Response Percentages for Perceptions of Conflict between Work and Family (n = 105)

Item	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
Work Interference with Family (WIF)					
After work, I come home too tired to do some of the things I'd like to do.	5.7	21.9	18.1	38.1	16.2
On the job, I have so much work to do that it takes away from my personal interests.	7.6	29.5	19.0	31.4	11.4
My family/friends dislike how often I am preoccupied with my work while I am at home.	10.5	29.5	21.9	30.5	7.6
My work takes up time that I'd like to spend with family/friends.	12.4	23.8	18.1	36.2	9.5
Family Interference with Work (FIW)					
I'm often too tired at work because of the things I have to do at home.	19.0	49.5	15.2	13.3	2.9
My personal demands are so great that it takes away from my work.	22.9	49.5	15.2	11.4	1.0
My administration and peers dislike how often I am preoccupied with my personal life while at work.	45.7	39.0	11.4	3.8	0
My personal life takes up time that I'd like to spend at work.	54.3	33.3	9.5	2.9	0

Regarding work interference with family (WIF), the mean (M = 3.12; SD = .98) was within the real limits of *Undecided*, while the mean (M = 1.96; SD = .98) of family interference with work (FIW) was within the real limits of *Disagree*. The grand mean of the perception of conflict (M = 3.46; SD = .67) was within the real limits of *Undecided* (see Table 10).

Table 10

Overall Perception of Conflict between Work and Family Louisiana Agriculture Teachers (n = 105)

Construct	*M*	*SD*
Work Interference with Family (WIF)	3.12	0.98
Family Interference with Work (FIW)	1.96	0.66
Overall Perception of Conflict	3.46	0.67

Note. Real limits: 1.00–1.49=Strongly Disagree; 1.50–2.49=Disagree; 2.50–3.49= Undecided; 3.50–4.49=Agree; 4.50–5.00=Strongly Agree.

Research Objective 4: Describe the Relationships Between Teacher Self-efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Perception of Work-life Balance

The fourth research objective sought to describe the relationship between teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance (i.e., perception of creating balance, perception of conflict). Positive, substantial relationships were found between *Overall Teacher Self-Efficacy* and *Job Satisfaction* (r = .59) and *Perception of Creating Balance* and *Overall Perception of Conflict* (r = .65). Positive, moderate relationships were detected between *Job Satisfaction* and *Overall Perception of Conflict* (r = .43) and *Job Satisfaction* and *Perception of Creating Balance* (r = .31). Positive, low relationships were found between *Overall Teacher Self-Efficacy* and *Perception of Creating Balance* (r = .26) and *Overall Teacher Self-Efficacy* and *Overall Perception of Conflict* (r = .23).

Table 5

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Relationships between Teacher Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Work-Life Balance

Characteristic	1	2	3	4
1. Overall Teacher Self-Efficacy	-	.55	.26	.23
2. Job Satisfaction		-	.31	.43
3. Perception of Creating Balance			-	.65
4. Overall Perception of Conflict				-

Conclusions and Discussion

Regarding perceived teacher self-efficacy, these agriculture teachers are efficacious in their chosen career. Per the theory of teacher self-efficacy, these teachers believe their actions will lead to the completion of specific teaching tasks (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Further, high levels of teacher self-efficacy could increase the likelihood these teachers will persist when faced with challenging situations (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). These findings are consistent with previous research on agriculture teacher self-efficacy (Blackburn & Robinson, 2008; Knoblock & Whittington, 2003; Whittington, McConnell, & Knobloch, 2003; Wolf, 2011).

Responding agriculture teachers in Louisiana also reported they are satisfied with their current employment. This finding supports previous research in agricultural education (Blackburn & Robinson, 2008; Kitchel et al., 2012; Walker et al., 2004). Per attribution theory, teachers who are satisfied with their chosen career should be able to effectively manage stress that may arise during the course of the job, thus providing further stability in their chosen profession, especially during times of stress (Hong et al., 1999).

Overall, the teachers perceived they have the ability to achieve balance. This finding aligns with Sorensen and McKim (2014), who reported moderate levels of WLB among teachers in Oregon. This is also consistent with the findings of Crutchfield et al. (2013), who reported that teachers in the southern region of the U.S believed they could influence control to achieve balance. Concurrent with previous research (Crutchfield et al., 2013), these agriculture teachers did not agree or disagree that work interferes with family. Additionally, these teachers indicated family does not interfere with their work responsibilities.

A strong, positive relationship was found between overall teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction, indicating the more efficacious a teacher is, the more satisfied he or she is with the job. Based on previous literature, this should indicate an increase in retention of qualified educators in the agricultural education profession in Louisiana (Boone & Boone, 2009; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Clark et al., 2012; Epps et al., 2010; Kitchel et al., 2012; Newcomb et al., 1987; Thieman et al., 2012). This relationship between teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction aligns with Blackburn & Robinson (2008), who reported strong, positive relationships between the self-efficacy constructs and job satisfaction among most early career agriculture teachers in Kentucky. Perhaps teachers in Louisiana have had quality mastery experiences that have led to a positive outlook on their job, leading to increased self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997) and job satisfaction.

A positive, moderate relationship was found between job satisfaction and the perception of creating balance, similar to the findings of Sorensen and McKim (2014). This may imply that striking a balance between work and family time is an important component of a satisfied agriculture teacher. Further, a positive, moderate relationship was found between job satisfaction and the overall perception of conflict. Odell et al. (1990) reported that marital satisfaction contributed to overall job satisfaction perceived by agriculture teachers. However, Crutchfield et al. (2013) found no relationship between conflict and job satisfaction. Could it be that as conflict increases between work and family, some teachers gravitate toward spending more time at work in order to actually increase their satisfaction? When looking at this question through the lens of attribution theory, Gaier (2015) found potential conflict from home life situations can cause disruptions in an individual's professional role. Similarly, when conflict increases between teacher work and family life, it can cause educators to lean more towards what provides them satisfaction (Canrinus et al., 2012; Odell et al, 1990). Attribution theory dictates that individual's actions are a

result of their beliefs and/or perceptions of causality (Weiner, 1972). Overall, Louisiana agricultural educators are efficacious, satisfied with teaching, and believe they can achieve balance with work and life.

Recommendations

Future research should focus on individuals who have left the agricultural education profession to determine if low levels of job satisfaction, teacher self-efficacy, or work-life balance influenced their decision to leave. The results from this study and others show that teachers are efficacious, satisfied with their job, and perceive they can achieve balance (Blackburn & Robinson, 2008; Crutchfield et al., 2013; Kitchel et al., 2012; Sorensen & McKim, 2014). However, a high turnover rate among agriculture teachers still exists nationally (Walker et al., 2004). Researchers have posited that low self-efficacy and low motivation contributed to a lack of retention in the profession (Boone & Boone, 2009; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Brill & McCartney, 2008; Clark et al., 2012; Kitchel et al., 2012; Thieman et al., 2012). Research should be conducted to see if a relationship exists with this finding to this population group within Louisiana.

While the overall findings from this research are positive, it should be noted that when examining the percentages of individuals who selected each item, there are teachers who are not highly efficacious, are not satisfied with their current career situation, and do not believe they can achieve work-life balance. More research, perhaps qualitative in nature, is needed to understand why some teachers feel this way. Perhaps identifying these teachers and deeply understanding their perceptions will provide more insight into the teacher shortage problem. Most research, including the present study, interprets aggregated data and declares that agriculture teachers are efficacious and satisfied, yet attrition occurs at an alarming rate across the nation.

Additional research is needed to understand the influence that demographic characteristics may have on work-life balance, job satisfaction, and teacher self-efficacy. For instance, does the number of children a teacher has determine his or her perception of conflict? Do males and females view conflict differently? Additionally, occupational commitment should be an added measure in future studies. Years in the professions should be utilized in future research to determine how length of tenure influences teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and the perception of work-life balance. Further, a longitudinal study could be designed to determine how these variables change through the course of an academic year. A qualitative study could be designed to understand the relationship between teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and work-life balance better.

The results of this study should be shared with state agricultural education leaders, as well as practicing agriculture teachers. There are many issues and current policies in education across the nation and within Louisiana that could potentially lower the job satisfaction of agriculture teachers. These results should be shared with teachers to let them know that they, as a group, believe they can make a difference (i.e., are efficacious) and are satisfied with their job. Further, these findings should be shared with the Louisiana Agriculture Teachers' Association to inform the organization that a minority of their members are not efficacious and feel unsatisfied with teaching agriculture. This may allow for targeted professional development opportunities such as utilizing teachers who are efficacious, satisfied, and who excel at achieving balance to present workshops to share their strategies with those who may be struggling in this area. Further, as a preventative measure, teacher educators in Louisiana should also incorporate strategies for achieving work-life balance when working with pre-service agriculture teachers.

Limitations

The greatest limitation of this study was the use of a convenience sample. As such, the results of this research cannot be generalized to all agriculture teachers in Louisiana. However, as discussed above, the information gathered still contributes to the body of knowledge and can inform practice.

References

Allen, M. B., & Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO. (2005). *Eight questions on teacher recruitment and retention: What does the research say?* Distributed by ERIC clearinghouse.

Associated Press (2010). Agriculture teachers in shortage. *Education Week, 30*(14), 5–5. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/12/08/14brief-14.h30.html?qs=%22agriculture+teachers+in+shortage%22

Ball, A. L., & Torres, R. M. (2010). Recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers of agriculture. In R. Torres, T. Kitchel, & A. Ball (Eds.), *Preparing and advancing teachers in agricultural education* (pp. 268–282). Columbus, OH: Curriculum Materials Service, The Ohio State University.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self–efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York, NY: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998).

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Boone, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2009). An assessment of problems faced by high school agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(1), 21–32. doi: 10.5032/jae.2009.01021

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 367–409. doi: 310.3102/0034654308321455

Blackburn, J. J., & Robinson, J. S. (2008). Assessing the teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction of Kentucky's early career agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 49*(3), 1–11. doi: 10.5032/jae.2008.03001

Brayfield, A. H. & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*(5), 307–311. doi: 10.1037/h0055617

Brill, S., & McCartney, A. (2008). Stopping the revolving door: Increasing teacher retention. *Politics & Policy, 36*(5), 750–774. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-1346.2008.00133.x

Brooks, A., & Clarke, L. (2011). Combining client-centered therapy with attribution theory. *Mental Health Practice, 14*(9), 34–37. doi: 10.7748/mhp2011.06.14.9.34.c8527

Camp, W. G., Broyles, T., & Skelton, N. (2002). *A national study of the supply and demand for teachers of agricultural education in 1999-2001*. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agriculture education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 33*(3), 40–46. doi: 10.5032/jae.1992.03040

Canrinus, E. T., Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Buitink, J., & Hofman, A. (2012). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: Exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 27*(1), 115–132. doi: 10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2

Castillo, J. X., & Cano, J. (1999). A comparative analysis of Ohio agriculture teachers' level of job satisfaction. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 40*(4), 67–78. doi: 10.5032/jae.199.04067

Chaney, C. A. (2007). *Work-life variables influencing attrition among beginning agriscience teachers of Texas* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Texas A&M University Library Repository.

Clark, M. S., Brown, N. R., & Ramsey, J. W. (2012, May). *The autonomy trap: Why highly successful agricultural education teachers leave the profession, a phenomenological perspective.* Paper presented at the meeting of American Association for Agricultural Education, Asheville, NC.

Cooper, E. L., & Nelson, C. L., (1981). Professionalism: Spouse and house. *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 54*(1), 17–18. Retrieved from http://www.naae.org/profdevelopment/magazine/archive_issues/Volume53/v53i1.pdf

Crutchfield, N., Ritz, R., & Burris, S. (2013). Why agricultural educators remain in the classroom. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 54*(2), 1–14. doi: 10.5032/jae.2013.02001

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999) *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards.* (New York, Columbia University, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future).

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., & Thoreson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23*(1), 57–77. doi: 10.3102/01623737023001057

Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Day, C., Sammons, P., Kington, A., Gu, Q., & Stobart, G. (2006). Methodological synergy in a national project: The VITAE story. *Evaluation & Research in Education, 19*(2), 102–125. doi: 10.2167/eri422.0

Doerfert, D. L. (Ed.) (2011). National research agenda: American Association for Agricultural Education research priority areas for 2011–2015. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University, Department of Agricultural Education and Communications.

Epps, R. B., Foor, R. M., Cano, J. (2010). *Keepers, stayers, leavers, and lovers: Are there teacher efficacy and job satisfaction differences between novice and experienced teachers?* Paper presented at the meeting of American Association for Agricultural Education, Omaha, NE.

Fandel, L. (2007, Mar 19). *Principal: We're feeling teacher shortages now*. Des Moines Register Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/237788538?accountid=14793

Gaier, S. E. (2015). Understanding why students do what they do: Using attribution theory to help students succeed academically. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 31*(2), 6–19.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569–582. doi: 510.1037/0022-0663.1076.1034.1569

Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1982). A comparison of first year, fifth year, and former teachers on efficacy, ego development, and problem solving. *Psychology in Schools, 19*(4), 558–562. doi: 10.1002/1520-6807(198210)19:4<558::AID-PITS2310190426>3.0.CO;2-F

Gutek, B. A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(4), 560-568. doi: 510.1037/0021-9010.1076.1034.1560

Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Dweck, C. S., Lin, D. M. -S., & Wan, W. (1999). Implicit theories, attributions, and coping: A meaning system approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(3), 588–599. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.588

Inman, D., & Marlow, L. (2004). Teacher retention: Why do beginning teachers remain in the profession? *Education, 124*(4), 605–614.

Jones, E. E., Kanouse, D. E., Kelley, H. H., Nisbett, R. E., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. (Eds.). (1972). *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Johnson, S. M. (2004) *Finders and keepers: helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kantrovich, A. (2007). *A national study of the supply and demand for teachers of agricultural education in 2004-2006.* Morehead, KY: Morehead State University.

Knobloch, N. A., & Whittington, M. S. (2003). Differences in teacher efficacy related to career commitment of novice agriculture teachers. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 20(1), 87-98. Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JCTE/v20n1/knobloch.html

Kitchel, T., Smith, A. R., Henry, A. L., Robinson, J. S., Lawver, R. G., Park, T. D., & Schell, A. (2012). Teacher job satisfaction and burnout viewed through social comparisons. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 53*(1), 31–44. doi: 10.5032/jae.2012.01031

Lambert, L. (2006). *Half of teachers quit in 5 years*. Washington Post, 9 May. Washington, DC: The Washington Post Company. Retrieved from: http://www.washingtonpost.com

Murray, K., Flowers, J., Croom, B., & Wilson, B. (2011). The agricultural teacher's struggle for balance between career and family. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 52*(2), 107–117. doi: 10.5032/jae.2011.02107

National TeachAg Campaign: 2014 year in review. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.naae.org/teachag/TAG%20One-Pager1.pdf

Newcomb, L. H., Betts, S., & Cano, J. (1987). Extent of burnout among teachers of vocational agriculture in Ohio. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 28*(1), 15–22. doi: 10.5032/jaatea.1987.01026

Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Odell, K. S., Cochran, J. E., Lawrence, L. D., & Gartin, S. A. (1990). The job and marital satisfaction of secondary agriculture teachers and their spouses. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 31*(3), 14–18. doi: 10.5032/jae.1990.03014

Phillip, A. (2011). Academy steps up recruitment with looming nationwide teacher shortage. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education, 28*(6), 7–7.

Pintrich, P. & Schunk, D. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs , NJ : Prentice Hall.

Rocca, S. J., & Washburn, S. G. (2006). Comparison of teacher efficacy among traditionally and alternatively certified agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(3), 58–69. doi: 10.5032/jae.2006.03058

Saklofske, D., Michaluk, B., & Randhawa, B. (1988). Teachers' efficacy and teaching behaviors. *Psychological Report, 63*(2), 407–414. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1988.63.2.407

Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension, 37*(2). Retrieved from: http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php

Smethem, L. (2007). Retention and intention in teaching careers: Will the new generation stay? *Teachers and Teaching, 13*(5), 465–480. doi: 10.1080/13540600701561661

Soodak, L., & Podell, D. (1996). Teaching efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi-faceted construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(4), 401–412. doi: 410.1016/0742-1051X(1095)00047- N

Sorensen, T. J., & McKim, A. J. (2014). Perceived work-life balance ability, job satisfaction, and professional commitment among agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 55*(4), 116–132. doi: 10.5032/jae.2014.04116

Schunk, D. H. (2008). *Learning theories: An educational perspective*. Columbus, OH: Pearson-Merrill Prentice Hall.

Schwarzer, Ralf (ed). (1992). *Self-efficacy: Thought Control of Action.* Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Thieman, E. B., Henry, A. L., & Kitchel, T. (2012). Resilient agricultural educators: Taking stress to the next level. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 53*(1), 81–94. doi: 10.5032/jae.2012.01081

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783–805. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248. doi: 10.3102/00346543068002202

UCLA: Statistical Consulting Group (2016). *Introduction to SAS*. Retrieved from http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/notes2/

Walker, W. D., Garton, B. L., & Kitchel, T. J. (2004). Job satisfaction and retention of secondary agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45*(2), 28–38. doi: 10.5032/jae.2004.02028

Warmbrod, J. R. (2014). Reporting and interpreting scores derived from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 55*(5), 30–47. doi: 10.5032/jae.2014.05030

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1971). Perceiving the causes of success and failure. In E. Jones, D. Kannouse, H. Kelly, R. Nisbett, S. Valins & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 95–120). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Weiner, B. (1972). Attribution theory, achievement motivation, and the educational process. *Review of Educational Research, 42*(2), 203–215. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/1170017

Wirt, J., Choy, S., Rooney, P., Hussar, W., Provasnik, S., Hampden-Thompson, G. (2005). *The condition of education, 2005*. NCES 2005-094 Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

Whittington, M. S., McConnell, E. A., & Knobloch, N. A. (2003). Teacher efficacy of novice teachers in agricultural education at the end of the school year. *Proceedings of the 30th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*, Orlando, FL, 204-215.

Wolf, K. J. (2011). Agricultural education perceived teacher self-efficacy: A descriptive study of beginning agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 52*(2), 163–176. doi: 10.5032/jae.2011.02163