DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 038 HE 035 671

AUTHOR Zabriskie, Michael S.; Dey, Eric L.; Riegle, Stephanie G.

TITLE Job Satisfaction in Teaching: An Examination of Personal and Environmental Influences on Faculty. AIR 2002 Forum Paper.

PUB DATE 2002-06-00

NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Institutional Research (42nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 2-5, 2002).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Higher Education; *Influences; *Job Satisfaction; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role; Teacher Surveys; *Work Environment

ABSTRACT

An ongoing tension among faculty roles has generated discussions questioning the amount of teaching faculty members actually do. Before assessing this issue, it is important to investigate satisfaction levels of teaching faculty. Using the model of L. Hagedorn (2000), this study examined how personal and environmental factors combined to influence faculty feelings of satisfaction in their teaching experience. Data came from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey in 1992. Rates of faculty response were judged to be of sufficient quality at 289 institutions, generating responses from 37,417 faculty members. The analysis is restricted to full-time faculty whose primary role was teaching. The strongest individual predictor found within the environmental domain for all three models considered is faculty perception of a caring and supportive environment, followed by themes of student learning, collegial respect, and trust. Fostering an environment in which faculty can spend their time teaching students with support and without the need to spend energy on "defensive" tactics may explain increased levels of satisfaction. (Contains 12 tables and 25 references.) (Author/SLD)

Job Satisfaction in Teaching:
An Examination of Personal and Environmental Influences on Faculty

Michael S. Zabriskie, Eric L. Dey, and Stephanie G. Riegle

Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education
University of Michigan School of Education
610 E. University, 2117 SEB
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

Job Satisfaction in Teaching:
An Examination of Personal and Environmental Influences on Faculty

An ongoing tension among faculty roles has generated discussions questioning the amount of teaching faculty actually do. Before accurately assessing this issue, it is important to investigate satisfaction levels of teaching faculty. Using Hagedorn's (2000a) model, this study examines how personal and environmental factors combine to influence faculty's feelings of satisfaction in their teaching experience.

Job Satisfaction in Teaching:
An Examination of Personal and Environmental Influences on Faculty

Over the past two decades, politicians, the media, and civil advocacy groups have directed considerable attention to the quality of undergraduate education. These conversations have focused on how professors use their time, often portraying the research realm against that of instruction (Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000). Given the organization and reward structure within most colleges and universities, it is not surprising that a disparity exists between the amount of time faculty want to spend on teaching versus the time they wish to spend on research in comparison to past decades. Having acknowledged such structural factors, it is important to have a better understanding of the characteristics that can influence how faculty feel about teaching. Although some kinds of policy changes will likely be necessary in order to continue to attract faculty attention toward the teaching function in higher education, it is also necessary to understand more about the intrinsic rewards associated with this important function.

In our study, we examine how demographic, institutional, personal characteristics, and environmental perceptions contribute to faculty feelings of satisfaction in their teaching experience. Our hope is that the results of our study will not only contribute to the emergent literature on faculty satisfaction, but that they will be of some value to academics, administrators, and policy-makers who seek to improve teaching by better understanding postsecondary faculty.

Literature Review

Teaching, research, and service have been the principal triumvirate composing the postsecondary faculty professional role. Since at least the early 1960s, scholars have acknowledged and debated the plausible discord between the teaching and researching roles on the plate of the American professorate (Kerr, 1963). Scores of studies have attempted to

substantiate the inter-role dynamics between the teaching role and the research role. The results of this type of research are often contradictory and inconclusive when viewed against the backdrop of the entire body of literature.

Research indicates that the faculty reward system (e.g., the current assignment of salary, prestige, and merit pay) overwhelmingly encourages research productivity over teaching (Fairweather & Rhodes, 1995). One study, which collected responses from over 23,000 faculty and administrators at 47 research universities, indicated strongly that respondents felt the reward system favored research activities in relation to teaching (Gray, Froh, & Diamond, 1992). A follow up study four years later showed a similar dichotomy at Carnegie-classified research and doctoral institutions: there remained a discrepancy between the institution's focus on research, and the faculty's interests in a more even balance between research and teaching (Gray, Diamond, & Adam, 1996). This places faculty in the awkward position of having to make role choices without conclusive data about inter-role dynamics and in an environment where the public's views (and potentially their own views) differ dramatically from institutional practices. Many faculty perceive and struggle with this conflict, as captured by Clark: the "greatest paradox of academic work in modern America is that most professors teach most of the time...but teaching is not the activity most rewarded by the academic profession nor most valued by the system at large" (1987, pp. 98-9).

Role conflict theorists assert that proportionately less time and energy will be invested in one role when more is invested in another; time and energy have a direct influence on quality (Goode, 1960). For instance, the role conflict viewpoint contends that even if the quality of instruction is fairly high to begin with, more time and energy invested in teaching (and thus less on research) would likely improve the quality of undergraduate teaching still further (Massy &

Wilger, 1995). Pursuant to this theory, we can expect faculty to devote less time and energy to teaching in an environment that rewards and values research productivity. "For many faculty members, conflict often occurs between the organization's demands for productivity as evidenced by research and their preference for teaching" (Austin & Gamson, 1983, p. 17).

Postsecondary faculty feel rewarded for quality research. Although significantly less research has been conducted on faculty perceptions of rewards for teaching, there is general consensus across those studies: faculty do not feel rewarded for their teaching (Berman & Skeff, 1988; Peters & Mayfield 1982). Few researchers, on the other hand, have investigated whether faculty feel they are rewarded for good teaching. Gray, Froh, and Diamond (1992) found that most respondents (faculty, department chairs, deans, and administrators) favored an effort to modify the reward system to recognize good teaching. Yet, motivating postsecondary faculty to invest time and energy in their teaching continues to be a challenge on many campuses (Berman & Skeff, 1988).

Previous research on faculty motivation and satisfaction suggests two primary spheres of influence: internal and external. Internal variables include a variety of variables ranging from demographic and socioeconomic attributes to intrinsic reasons for motivation; external influences range from items such as environmental characteristics of the workplace to position requirements and expectations. Most faculty are motivated through internal values as opposed to external values. Unfortunately, intrinsic motives important to faculty such as making a difference, interaction with students, a sense of competence, and work autonomy/independence (McKeachie, 1997) are not typically measured and rewarded. Although external values such as monetary rewards are important to some,McKeachie (1997) found that those motivated by money are not likely to choose an academic career. Changes in faculty motivation typically

revolve around specific events in one's career or life rather than life stages (Blackburn, 1997). These events can also determine the level of satisfaction faculty are feeling with their work at a particular time.

A wide range of individual properties influences faculty perceptions of satisfaction in their teaching careers. Demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and ethnicity may play a role that is dependent on the welcoming (or inverse) nature of the environment and how the faculty member views the impact of the support level on her or his career (Hagedorn, 2000b; Paludi & DeFour, 1989; Thompson & Dey, 1998). Academic field and the manner in which future faculty members are socialized into their field of expertise may also have an impact on their desire to teach and conduct research (Finkelstein, 1984); it may ultimately determine their preferred ratio of teaching to research or vice versa. Finally, the institutional type that faculty choose as their professional setting may also play a role in their satisfaction; differing institutional priorities and individual congruence with the organizational mission and culture may enable higher levels of personal growth and contentment (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

Certain characteristics of the environment can also have an effect on faculty feelings of fulfillment in their teaching experience. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995), for example, indicate three primary areas of satisfaction: environmental conditions, environmental responses, and social contingencies. Environmental conditions include items such as institutional type, which involve normative activities that happen at the college or university, and the composition of institutional resources and students. However, previous research has provided mixed messages; one study noted that faculty teaching orientation differs based on institutional type, if the defining factor is research versus non-research institutions (Fulton & Trow, 1974). Another report indicates that there are identifiable characteristics that describe supportive environments

and enhance positive perspectives toward instruction; these characteristics cannot be attributed to specific institutional types but rather to academic departments (Massy, Wilger, & Colbeck, 1994).

Environmental responses encompass formal institutional actions that monitor faculty activity such as evaluations from students, fellow faculty members, and supervisors (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). Satisfaction can be negatively affected in this area if faculty are hired to teach but are evaluated on other criteria, such as research and publication output (Tang & Chamberlain, 1997).

Social contingencies consist of affective variables that happen outside of the workplace in the personal lives of the faculty. This encompasses factors that can influence the faculty member within the work environment; family issues, health concerns, marital/relational stability, and other external variables have the potential to impact perceptions of the professional experience.

Hagedorn (2000a) proposed a framework that incorporated many of the environmental and individual characteristics noted above by utilizing job satisfaction theory developed by Herzberg and colleagues in the late 1950s. Herzberg and colleagues (1959) attributed job satisfaction to intrinsic factors (motivations) and extrinsic factors (hygienes). In this model, motivators and hygienes reflect the structure of the workplace; satisfaction is derived from work content and dissatisfaction originates from the work environment. Building from this concept, Hagedorn's model suggests two primary areas from which faculty motivation and achievement may be grouped that could assist in predicting faculty satisfaction in teaching: mediators and triggers (see Table 1).

Mediators include aspects such as motivators and hygienes, demographics, and environmental conditions. Motivators are items that promote satisfaction, while hygienes

represent factors that result in decreased satisfaction; this area includes items such as achievement within one's field, recognition of such work, advancement, and salary. "Thus, when a worker feels a high level of achievement, is intensely involved, and is appropriately compensated by recognition, responsibility and salary, job satisfaction is enhanced and job dissatisfaction is decreased" (Hagedorn, 2000a, p. 8).

Environmental conditions represent relationships in the workplace between the faculty member and the various constituent groups with whom there is regular contact, such as students, colleagues, and those acting in supervisory capacities. Institutional climate and culture covers a wide array of characteristics, including items such as perceptions of fairness, levels of conflict, representation of different backgrounds and points of view, and the magnitude of student centeredness as a core institutional value.

Triggers consist of changes or transfers in terms of one's personal and professional life (Hagedorn, 2000a). Research has shown that faculty levels of satisfaction change over their career span; job satisfaction tends to increase as the faculty member gains more control over her or his time and has fewer assignments that were not self-selected or externally mandated. Finkelstein terms this the "extent of faculty control over work assignment," meaning that where the faculty member has a high level of control over workload, it is more likely that satisfaction will be greater, whereas with junior faculty members this might not be the case (1984, pp. 93-94). Triggers also reflect affective variables that occur outside of the workplace in the personal lives of the faculty, as mentioned above.

Using this conceptual frame, we have opted to slightly expand the model to include an additional internal motivation measure. This measure reflects a commitment on the part of the faculty member toward the growth achieved by students through the learning process, and goes

beyond content knowledge to reflect faculty attitudes of student developmental issues such as values, emotions, and the general promotion of self enhancement. We are investigating how these properties combine to influence faculty's feelings of satisfaction in their teaching experience.

Data

In order to examine the issue of faculty satisfaction with their teaching roles, we used data from the 1992 faculty survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (Dey, Ramirez, Korn, & Astin, 1993). The HERI project is an omnibus national survey that sought to collect data from entire cohorts of faculty working at institutions who responded to a national invitation to participate in the research effort. An analysis of the responses received from 43,490 faculty at the 341 participating institutions indicated that low response rates were achieved at a number of institutions despite a standardized protocol for data collection. The rates of faculty response were judged to be of sufficient quality at 289 institutions, which generated responses from 37,417 faculty for inclusion in a national normative profile of faculty and their activities (Dey, et al., 1993).

Table 3 indicates the differences in teaching faculty across institutional type. While public and private universities and four-year colleges appear to have similar profiles of faculty, the profile of faculty at two-year institutions is unique, especially, in terms of the percent of whom have completed terminal degrees, have achieved tenure, and hold the rank of full professor. One interesting aspect revealed by this basic data display is the gender discrepancy across types of institutions; women hold a greater proportion of teaching positions at two-year colleges than the other two institutional types, which may indicate difficulty to attract and retain female faculty at the four-year colleges and universities or that women were more likely to be

early in their careers and at lower faculty rank (Dey, Ramirez, Korn, & Astin, 1993). This gender distribution is similar to other studies that found that women were more likely to be early in their careers and at lower faculty rank (Gray, Diamond, & Adam, 1996).

Faculty in the sample show an overwhelming majority of individuals who believe it is important to both be a good teacher and to be viewed positively by their colleagues, which is consistent with the literature on teaching faculty (Finkelstein, 1984). Responses also indicate that at least three quarters of faculty would be willing to "do it all again," given the opportunity. Perceptions of the faculty indicate that they believe that their college or university rewards them for their teaching efforts, although there is variation across institutional type. Not shown, but also noteworthy, is the percentage of faculty respondents who indicated that they had received an award for teaching excellence; the lowest percentage by institutional type was 32% (public two-year colleges), the highest 37% (private two-year colleges).

Methods

Given the focus of this study, we restricted the HERI normative sample to faculty members who were full-time employees at their institution, and whose primary role was teaching. Consequently, faculty respondents whose primary function was administrative, research-oriented, or clinically based were removed from our sample, thus allowing for a clearer perspective of the institutional dynamics influencing faculty satisfaction.

Factor analyses were conducted to help identify and refine scales appropriate to the concepts described by the Hagedorn model (2000a). All told, nine scales were sufficiently connected to thematic areas within Hagedorn's theoretical model and are displayed in Table 5 and applied to the conceptual frame we used for our analysis (Table 6). As noted earlier, we

expanded the model to include a measure reflecting the personal philosophy of the faculty member toward student development.

With one exception, our variables appear to closely parallel the variables described by Hagedorn, though there is a difference in the so-called "Trigger" variables. Hagedorn (2000a) operationalized triggers as a reflection of a change in status or transfer of responsibilities, but given the cross-sectional nature of the HERI data set and the wording contained on the survey form, it was impossible to ascertain whether a change had occurred in the status of the cases studied. Therefore, our variables merely reflect particular circumstances experienced by the faculty respondents at the time of the survey. Though not perfectly consistent with Hagedorn's perspective, these circumstance variables were included in the analysis because we felt they helped inform our analyses.

Regression models were designed to measure the effects of the independent variables on four dependent variables: 1) feelings of overall job satisfaction, 2) feelings of reward for teaching activities, 3) satisfaction with work environment, and 4) willingness to be a faculty member again, if given the opportunity to start over. Variables were entered in blockwise fashion, with motivator and hygiene variables entered as a group into the model first, followed by demographics, environmental conditions, triggers, and finally, the scale measuring philosophy toward student development.

Results

Table 7 shows the relative model strength for each of the four dependent variables considered in this analysis. The amount of variance explained by the combination of independent variables included in the analyses was relatively strong, ranging from 19 to 36.2 percent (with satisfaction with the working environment proving to be the most predictable). The smallest

amount of prediction was recorded for the models predicting faculty perceptions of reward for their teaching, and whether the respondents would choose their career path again if given the option.

Table 8 shows the regression details associated with motivator and hygiene variables. The regression results show that faculty whose primary interest lay within the teaching realm are more likely to be more satisfied across three models, with the fourth model showing a negative relationship between teaching orientation and responses indicating that their institution is one that rewards teaching. As salary increases, satisfaction with work environment, overall job satisfaction, and perception of institutional reward for teaching increases, as does the likelihood of choosing to be a faculty member again.

Overall satisfaction and satisfaction with the work environment are higher among lower ranking faculty members. Faculty who spend more hours per week teaching as opposed to service or research are less likely to choose to be a faculty member again, while those who spend more time on service or research are more likely to choose to be a faculty member again. Faculty who spend more hours per week teaching are also less likely to find satisfaction with their work environment as well as overall job satisfaction, and do not perceive they are being rewarded for teaching.

In contrast, faculty who spend more hours per week on research also are likely to be generally satisfied with their job. Those faculty who spend more hours per week involved in service activities are likely to describe their institution as one who does not reward teaching activities.

Receiving an award for outstanding teaching increases satisfaction with work environment, overall job satisfaction, and perception of institutional reward for teaching; it also increases the likelihood of choosing to be a faculty member again.

The demographic domain (see Table 9) produced mixed results. Those teaching at private institutions, for example, were less likely to be satisfied with the work environment or satisfied overall, but were more likely than their public counterparts to report a perception of reward for teaching and would choose to repeat their career. These results carried across different institutional types as well; compared to four-year institutions, faculty at universities are more likely to be satisfied with their work environment, but less likely to report feeling rewarded for their teaching. Faculty at two-year institutions were less likely to be satisfied with their work environment, but were more likely to respond affirmatively to becoming a faculty member again.

Being female was a significant predictor for satisfaction across all models with the exception of choosing to be a faculty member again. Neither white nor non-white respondents were likely to rate their institution as one that rewards teaching. Non-white respondents were more likely to report overall satisfaction or choose to join the faculty ranks again, given the choice.

Disciplinary affiliation yielded interesting results within the models. All of the significant results in the fourth model (choose to be a faculty member again) yielded positive coefficients. Fewer disciplines produced a statistically significant result in the perception of reward for teaching; only the physical sciences, arts and humanities, and the social sciences, were positively predictive, education was negatively predictive. The majority of disciplines generated negative coefficients in the overall job satisfaction model, although only three disciplines yielded significant results. Engineering and professional faculty were less likely to be

satisfied; social sciences faculty were the positively predictive group. Three disciplines were more likely to be satisfied with their work environment: physical sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences; engineering, conversely, was a negative predictor. Only the social science faculty yielded statistically significant results across all four models, and they were more likely to be satisfied.

The regression results regarding environmental conditions (see Table 10) revealed that faculty at institutions that promote student empowerment, initiate policies to increase minority representation for both students and faculty, and believe their students are well prepared academically are more likely to feel satisfied with their work environment, overall job satisfaction, feel rewarded for teaching and would more likely choose to be a faculty member again. The same is true for faculty at institutions that promote a caring and supportive environment for faculty, students and administrators, and where faculty respect each other.

Interestingly, at institutions with higher prestige, faculty are more likely to be satisfied with their work environment and overall job satisfaction, but they are less likely to choose to be faculty members again, and less likely to feel rewarded for teaching.

Faculty at institutions that are perceived to value underrepresented perspectives (e.g., minority issues, feminist perspectives) are less likely to be satisfied with their work environment, less likely to feel overall job satisfaction, and less likely to become a faculty member again; however they are more likely to perceive reward for teaching.

Those with a personal philosophy toward student development were less likely to be satisfied with their work environment and less likely to feel rewarded for teaching, but would more likely choose to be faculty members again.

Surprisingly, there was a positive and significant relationship across all models relating younger ages and satisfaction (see Table 11). This finding appears to be contrary to other studies that suggested that older faculty might be more satisfied because of the control over their work settings, for example. Year of appointment to the faculty ranks was significant in three of the models, with the exception of the choice to be a faculty member again. Individuals who had considered leaving academe in the past two years prior to responding to this survey were negative predictors across all models. Conversely, those faculty who had received another job offer during the same period of time were more likely to have been satisfied with their work environment, would choose to be a faculty member again, and were generally satisfied with their experience. Having teenagers significantly (though minimally) contributes to three of the models, but does not have a significant influence on perception of reward for teaching. Parenting school-aged and college-eligible children appear to be more predictive of the satisfaction and reward variables; surprisingly, only parents of adult children are predictive of choosing the same career path again.

Limitations

There are numerous constraints to this study that must be noted. First and foremost, the survey instrument did not provide perfectly matched variables for the various theoretical sections proposed by Hagedorn; results may have been very different had the instrument been designed to match the theoretical areas.

Secondly, these data are about a decade old at this writing, which raises the question of whether or not these results would be replicated with a more current data base. The economic and political landscape has changed significantly since 1992, yet the institutional dynamics that privilege research accomplishment over teaching mastery are long-standing, making it unclear

whether or not these results could be replicated. While this information could be relevant, it is important to complete a more thorough and recent examination of today's faculty.

One-quarter of the respondents in the sample were 55 years old or older at the time of this survey. This may impact their responses; a changing orientation as faculty age has been noted by Finkelstein (1984), who states that some faculty may try to complete research projects and focus on teaching in the latter stages of their careers.

Unfortunately, the data set utilized is only a snapshot of what is occurring in the lives of these faculty at one point in time. Results and generalizations could be more powerful if the data set utilized were longitudinal in nature. Unfortunately, there are limited options in this arena, as others have indicated in their studies (Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000; Thompson & Dey, 1998).

Also limiting in nature for this study is the tightly-focused nature of the sample. As was mentioned above, the sample was restricted to faculty members who were full-time employees at their institution and self-identified their primary role as teaching. There is need for future research on areas not included within this study, namely part-time faculty who solely teach, full and part-time faculty who split research and teaching roles, and full and part-time faculty who are primarily researchers but do teach.

The final and probably most major limitation to this study is the predictive power of the model. With 19-36% of the variance accounted for within the various models, one must wonder how a larger portion of the variance could be captured to provide a more global perspective on faculty teaching satisfaction.

Discussion

Contrary to the literature, the strongest predictive block in the first three models (omitting repeating one's career) is environmental in nature, not internally based as the literature suggests

(see Table 12). The strongest individual predictor found within the environmental domain for all models is faculty perception of a caring and supportive environment, followed by themes of student learning, collegial respect, and trust. Fostering an environment in which faculty can spend their time teaching students with support from their and without the need to spend energy on "defensive tactics" may explain the increased levels of satisfaction across all models.

What is not clear within the model is the reason for polarity between scales measuring minority representation and the validity of underrepresented perspectives. In every model except for the perception of reward for teaching, minority representation positively predicts satisfaction while the other does so negatively. Perhaps the latter scale is actually measuring faculty response to institutional directives that enter into what many consider a sacred area: determination of course content and delivery. This remains conjecture, however, and is worthy of additional research beyond the purview of this paper.

Greater numbers of hours spent teaching appears to decrease satisfaction levels across all models, while devoting time on professional development (e.g., research and writing, days off campus for professional activities) improves satisfaction across the majority of models. These patterns imply the need for a evenly-balanced workload that tempers the need for "student" time with periods that nourish the professional and research growth of the faculty member There is need for institutionally-specific responses to support what Gray, Diamond, and Adam (1996) stated: "they are dedicated to their work with students and to pursuing their scholarly lives" (p 23).

Those who spent more time in service-related activities did not feel their institutions rewarded teaching activities, suggesting that any activities that faculty engage in outside of the primary reward structure (i.e., research) are not perceived to be appropriately rewarded. Only

those faculty members who spent the most time conducting research were likely to be satisfied overall and would choose to be a faculty member again. This comes as no surprise in light of previous findings; teaching is generally not perceived to be adequately rewarded.

No clear patterns were revealed when examining the institutional type variables within the demographics. Faculty at two year institutions were most likely to be satisfied overall and would most likely become a faculty member again given the choice. These institutions provided the highest number of female faculty respondents, the highest number of instructor/lecturer respondents, and provided the least tenured faculty members. Additionally, women were more likely to choose to join the faculty ranks again. The same was true for non-white respondents, suggesting despite apparent inequities in treatment and rewards within academic, faculty from traditionally underrepresented groups have a generally positive view of their lives within the professoriate.

As was mentioned earlier, an unexpected predictor of satisfaction across all models was age; younger faculty within this sample appear to be more satisfied, mirroring similar results within the year of appointment at their institution and faculty rank. These results run counter to existing literature (e.g., Finkelstein, 1984), raising possibilities that our modification of Hagedorn's (2000a) model either sufficiently accounts for the variances previously attributed to age and length of stay at a particular institution, uncovers a new trend with younger faculty, reveals a cohort effect among the one quarter of the faculty in this sample that were 55 or older, or perhaps merely reflects a more optimistic perspective when compared to the more senior faculty who have experienced much the academy has to offer.

The personal philosophy toward student development measure also yielded several surprises. We initially hypothesized that this measure would reflect a level of fulfillment in their

careers that would be shown by positive coefficients; this seems only to hold true for the fourth model, choosing to be a faculty member again. Overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with the work environment were negatively predicted by this thematic area, suggesting that the faculty might not be supported in their endeavor in this area or see a mismatch with institutional values.

Institutional leadership that is cognizant of these factors, coupled with a desire to formally recognize teaching in organizational reward structures, may increase levels of faculty satisfaction over time. Since the ability of higher education institutions to meet its varied goals is entirely dependent upon its ability to attract – and retain – the highest quality faculty, progress toward creating rewards directed at activities supporting central institutional functions is critical. There has been some momentum established by concern about the quality of undergraduate education, making this an ideal time for institutional leadership to invest time and energy into this important goal.

References

Austin, A. E. & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report no. 10.*

Berman, J. & Skeff, K. M. (1988). Developing the motivation for improving university teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 12* (2), 114-125.

Blackburn, R. T. & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation expectation, satisfaction.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braxton, J. M. (1996). Contrasting perspectives on the relationship between teaching and research. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Faculty teaching and research: Is there a conflict?* New Directions for Higher Education, no. 90. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, B. R. (1987). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Princeton University Press.

Dey, E. L., Ramirez, C. E., Korn, W. S., & Astin, A. W. (1993). *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1992-93 HERI faculty survey.* Los Angeles: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Faculty reward structures: Toward institutional and professional homogenization. *Research in Higher Education 34* (5), 603-623.

Fairweather, J. S. & Rhodes, R. A. (1995). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17,* 227-289.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Froh, R. C., Menges, R. J., & Walker, C. J. (1993). Revitalizing faculty work through intrinsic rewards. In R. M. Drummond and B.E. Adam (Eds.), *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000.* New Directions for Higher Education, no. 81, (pp. 87-95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fulton, O. & Trow, M. (1974). Research activity in American higher education. *Sociology of Education, 47* (1), 29-73.

Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review, 25,* 483-496.

Gray, P. J., Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (1996). *A national study of the relative importance of research and undergraduate teaching at colleges and universities.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development.

Gray, P. J., Froh, R. C., & Diamond, R. M. (1992). *A national study of research universities on the balance between research and teaching.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000a). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L. S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff.* New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 105, (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hagedorn, L.S. (2000b). *Gender differences in faculty productivity, satisfaction, and salary: What really separates us?* Shaping a National Agenda for Women in Higher Education. Conference Proceedings – University of Minnesota

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work.* New York: Wiley.

Kerr, C. (1963). *The Uses of the University.* New York: Harper & Row.

Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation. *Journal of Higher Education, 71* (4), 454-75.

Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., & Colbeck, C. (1994). Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality. *Change 26*, 10-20.

Paludi, M. A. & DeFour, D. C. (1989). Research on sexual harassment in the academy: Definitions, findings, constraints, responses. *Initiatives, 52* (3), 43-47.

Peters, D. S. & Mayfield, J. R. (1982). Are there any rewards for teaching? *Improving College and University Teaching, 30* (3), 105-110.

Tang, L. T. & Chamberlain, M. (1997). Attitudes toward research and teaching: Differences between administrators and faculty members. *Journal of Higher Education, 68* (2), 212-225.

Thompson, C. J. & Dey, E. L. (1998). Pushed to the margins: Sources of stress for African American college and university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 69* (3), 324-45.

Winston, G. C. (1994), The decline in undergraduate teaching: Moral failure or market pressure? *Change 26*, 8-15.

Table 1. Hagedorn's Conceptual Framework of Faculty Job Satisfaction

Mediators			Triggers
Motivators and Hygienes	Demographics	Environmental Conditions	Change or Transfer
Achievement Recognition Work itself Responsibility Advancement Salary	Gender Ethnicity Institutional type Academic discipline	Collegial relationships Student quality or relationships Administration Institutional climate or culture	Change in life stage Change in family-related or personal circumstances Change in rank or tenure Transfer to new institution Change in perceived justice Change in mood or emotional state

(Hagedorn, 2000a)

Table 2. Institutional responses (percentage)

		Distribution within categories of institutional control		
Institutional control	All faculty	Universities	Four-year colleges	Two-year colleges
Public	58	26	56	19
Private	42	28	77	3

Due to rounding, figures may not add up to 100%.

Table 3. Background characteristics of teaching faculty by institutional type (percentage)

	Universities		Four-Year Colleges		Two-Year Colleges	
Characteristics	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
White	91	92	90	92	94	87
Female	29	28	32	34	43	56
Achieved terminal degree	85	88	73	74	16	26
Tenured	65	61	56	51	60	27
Faculty Rank[1]						
Full Professor	39	36	32	32	29	17
Associate Professor	30	31	27	28	20	18
Assistant Professor	25	26	30	32	18	31
Instructor/ Lecturer	7	7	11	7	32	34

[1] Due to rounding, figures may not add up to 100%.

Table 4. Satisfaction of teaching faculty by institutional type (percentage)

	Universities		Four-Year Colleges		Two-Year Colleges	
Satisfaction measure	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Overall job satisfaction	66	75	67	73	76	76
Faculty rewarded for being good teachers	50	72	57	71	53	63
Satisfaction with work environment	46	53	50	56	51	58
Willingness to be a faculty member again	79	86	80	75	84	84

Table 5. Factor analysis results for thematic scales

Factor	Variables	Reliability alpha
Work Environment	Autonomy and independence Professional relationships with other faculty Competency of colleagues Relationships with administration	.71
Professional Output	# of articles in academic/professional journals # of chapters in edited volumes # of books/manuals/monographs # published/presented in last two years	.69
Student Empowerment	Promote intellectual development of students Help students examine personal values Develop community among students/faculty Facilitate student involvement in community service Help students change American society	.83
Minority representation	Increase minority representation in faculty Increase women's representation in faculty Recruit more minority students Create diverse multicultural campus environment	.85
Institutional Prestige	Increase/maintain institutional prestige Hire faculty "stars" Enhance institution's national image	.76
Caring/Supporting Environment	Faculty interested in students' problems Student affairs staff supported by faculty Faculty committed to welfare of institution Faculty interested in student academic problems Administrators act in good faith	.73
Validity of underrepresented perspectives	Faculty attentive to minority issues Courses include minority perspective Courses include feminist perspective	.71
Interpersonal conflict and fairness w/in institution	People don't respect each other Little trust between minorities and administration A lot of racial conflict here Faculty of color treated fairly Women faculty treated fairly	.71
Personal Philosophy toward student development	Develop moral character Provide for emotional development Prepare for family living Help develop personal values Enhance out-of-class experience Enhance self-understanding	.85

Table 6: Variables used that fit into the Hagedorn theoretical construct

Mediators			Triggers
Motivators and Hygienes	Demographics	Environmental Conditions	Change or Transfer
Academic rank Administrative Title (department chair response only) Academic interests (teaching or research) Salary Hours per week spent in scheduled teaching Hours per week spent on research/writing Hours per week spent in committee work and meetings How many general education courses taught this term How many other BA/BS credit courses taught this term How many non-BA credit (developmental/remedial) courses taught this term Professional output (scale) Number of days off campus for professional activities Received an award for outstanding teaching Developed new course Becoming an authority in their field Obtaining recognition from colleagues in their field	Institutional control (public/private) Institutional type Institutional race (black/white) Institutional sex (male/female/coed/coordinate) Gender Race (white/non-white) Current department	Student empowerment (scale) Minority representation (scale) Institutional prestige (scale) Caring/supporting environment (scale) Validity of underrepresented perspectives (scale) Interpersonal conflict and fairness within institution (scale) Students are well prepared academically Faculty respect each other Sexually harassed at this IHE	Marital status Age Year of appointment at institution Year tenure awarded Considered leaving academe Received at least one firm job offer Number of children

Table 7. Strength of satisfaction models.

	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
Multiple R	.602	.563	.465	.437
R-Square	.362	.317	.216	.191
Adjusted R-Square	.362	.316	.215	.190

Table 8. Regression detail showing the influence of motivator and hygiene variables.

	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
Motivator and hygiene variables	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**
Rank	.020 **	.016 *	-.002	.017 *
Administrative title	.007	-.006	-.002	.010 *
Academic interests (teaching or research)	-.065 ***	-.116 ***	.068 ***	-.070 ***
Salary	.045 ***	.123 ***	.096 ***	.041 ***
Hours per week spent: scheduled teaching	-.048 ***	-.053 ***	-.039 ***	-.017 **
Hours per week spent: committees & meetings	-.004	-.011 *	-.020 ***	.002
Hours per week spent: research & writing	-.006	.031 ***	.002	.047 ***
General education courses taught	.000	-.020 ***	.001	.006
Other BA/BS credit courses taught	-.018 ***	-.028 ***	-.003	.004
Developmental/remedial courses taught	-.003	.000	-.007	-.003
Professional output	.007	.017 **	.016 *	.035 ***
Days off campus for professional activities	.008	.025 ***	.016 **	.025 ***
Received an award for outstanding teaching	.013 **	.026 ***	.036 ***	.037 ***
Developed new course	.006	.008	-.001	.029 ***
Goal: become an authority in their field	-.021 ***	-.010	-.035 ***	.036 ***
Goal: obtain recognition from colleagues in their field	-.009	-.023 ***	.033 ***	.022 ***

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 9. Regression detail showing the influence of demographics.

	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job Satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
Demographic Variables	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**
Institutional control (public/private)	-.057 ***	-.037 ***	.092 ***	.020 ***
Institutional type (university)	.015 **	.007	-.070 ***	-.011
Institutional type (two-year)	-.025 ***	.044 ***	-.004	.034 ***
Institutional race (black/white)	-.016 ***	-.006	-.036 ***	.019 ***
Institutional sex (male)	-.004	-.008	-.004	-.011 *
Institutional sex (female)	-.004	-.002	-.015 **	-.007
Gender	.055 ***	.040 ***	.020 ***	.007
Race (white/non-white)	.008	.021 ***	-.023 ***	.016 **
Discipline				
Biology	.007	-.008	-.009	.014 *
Business	.005	-.006	.002	.019 **
Education	.011	.008	-.015 *	.006
Engineering	-.014 **	-.025 ***	-.009	-.010
Arts and humanities	.026 ***	.000	.034 ***	.026 **
Professional	-.012 *	-.021 ***	-.010	-.007
Physical sciences	.013 *	-.005	.024 ***	.025 ***
Social sciences	.047 ***	.026 ***	.037 ***	.043 ***

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05

Table 10. Regression detail showing the influence of environmental conditions and personal philosophy measure

	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
	Beta	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**
Student empowerment	.076 ***	.098 ***	.085 ***	.044 ***
Minority representation	.061 ***	.037 ***	.049 ***	.018 **
Institutional prestige	.029 ***	.016 ***	-.014 **	-.014 **
Caring/supporting environment	.283 ***	.218 ***	.255 ***	.069 ***
Validity of underrepresented perspective	-.031 ***	-.038 ***	.027 ***	-.040 ***
Lack of conflict: fairness w/in institution	.132 ***	.115 ***	.022 ***	.008
Students well prepared academically	.008	.065 ***	.054 ***	.040 ***
Faculty respect each other	.223 ***	.106 ***	.068 ***	.056 ***
Sexually harassed at this institution	-.054 ***	-.041 ***	-.013 *	-.025 ***
Personal philosophy	-.019 ***	-.007	-.055 ***	.023 ***

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 11. Regression detail showing the influence of changes and transfers

	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job Satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
	Beta	**Beta**	**Beta**	**Beta**
Marital status	.000	-.002	.005	.015 **
Age	.036 ***	.032 ***	.059 ***	.082 ***
Year of appointment at current institution	.016 **	.017 **	.020 ***	-.004
Tenure status	-.015 **	-.001	-.007	.005
Considered leaving academe	-.123 ***	-.246 ***	-.074 ***	-.356 ***
Received at least one firm job offer	.014 **	.027 ***	.017 **	.029 ***
# children 0-4 years old	.005	.003	-.001	-.009
# children 5-12 years old	.012 *	.012 *	-.014 **	-.001
# children 13-17 years old	.000	-.003	-.017 **	.002
# children 18+ years old	.017 **	.017 **	-.011	.024 ***

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 12. Changes to adjusted R-Square in the regressions

Block	Model R^2 with block inclusion			
	Satisfaction with work environment	Overall job Satisfaction	Perception of reward for teaching	Would choose to be a faculty member again
Motivators and hygienes	.021***	.042***	.014***	.019***
Demographics	.031***	.052***	.063***	.029***
Environmental conditions	.347***	.262***	.204***	.075***
Changes or transfers	.361***	.316***	.213***	.189***
Personal philosophy toward student development	.362***	.316***	.215***	.190***

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)