Job Satisfaction
of
Community College Chairpersons

Jutta Green

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Don Creamer, Chair
Bruce Brown
Helen Harvey
Steve Janosik
Kusum Singh

November 2000
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Community College Chairpersons,
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

JOB SATISFACTION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHAIRPERSONS

by

Jutta Green

Committee Chair: Dr. Don Creamer

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was twofold. One, the study was to document facet-specific and general levels of job satisfaction of community college chairpersons in the United States. Two, the influence of selected personal and unit-related characteristics on general job satisfaction was investigated.

A sample of 807 chairs was systematically selected from a population of 9,866 chairs. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (MSQ) was chosen to measure satisfaction levels of 20 job facets and general job satisfaction. A data form was used to collect information about selected personal and unit characteristics.

Frequencies, percentages and appropriate summary statistics were computed for the personal and unit-related characteristics. The reliability and content validity of the MSQ were determined. Cronbach's alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency of the 20 MSQ facet scales and the general job satisfaction scale. A factor analysis was conducted to explore the instrument's content validity. A hierarchy of the 20 facet-specific MSQ scales was constructed. The mean and standard deviation for each facet scale were documented in addition to the frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics for the general job satisfaction scale. A multiple regression model was constructed to describe the relationship between selected personal and unit characteristics and general job satisfaction.

The findings of the study indicated that each of the 21 MSQ scale scores has adequate internal consistency. The results of the factor analysis supported the instrument's content validity. Job facets of relatively greater satisfaction included social service, creativity, and achievement as reflected by respective means of 22.30, 21.28, and 21.26. Job facets of relatively lesser satisfaction included advancement, compensation, and company policies and practices as reflected by respective means of 16.60, 16.27, and 15.75. The mean, median, and mode of the respondents' general job satisfaction were all equal to 78 meaning that community college chairpersons appear to be generally satisfied with their jobs. The overall regression equation was statistically not significant. The independent variables as a set accounted for only 5.2% of the variance in general job satisfaction.

DEDICATION

To Jessica

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The mental, emotional, task, and financial demands of a doctoral program on an individual, combined with his/her life's circumstances, can seem overwhelming at times. A willing and able support group can be the difference between completing a doctoral program and giving up along the way. I am filled with enormous appreciation for my support group that consisted of the dissertation committee, colleagues, friends, and family.

The dissertation process began under the guidance of Dr. Sam Morgan who regrettably became very ill and passed away during the spring semester of 1999. Dr. Don Creamer, who had served until the fall of 1998 as a committee member, stepped into the role of chair by the spring of 1999. As committee members, Drs. Bruce Brown, Helen Harvey, Steve Janosik, and Kusum Singh were instrumental in the writing of the dissertation. A description of the committee as a whole includes the following characteristics: approachable, knowledgeable, and motivational.

Dr. Don Creamer is deeply appreciated because he is the epitome of professionalism to me. He is a master teacher and a time management expert in and out of the classroom. Whether one sent e-mails, voice mails, or delivered hard copies of dissertation chapters, his typical response time can be described as "within a few hours." He always answered all questions. His feedback was constructive. He gave insightful micro lessons on how to use the computer. His "can do" and "let's do it now" attitudes combined with "this is what you should consider" direction led to the writing and completion of the dissertation above any other factors.

Dr. Helen Harvey, a long-time community college division chair and author of a dissertation on job satisfaction, is deeply appreciated not only for her knowledge and expertise, but also for her continuous support and encouragement throughout the whole process. I am still thankful for the book Don't Sweat the Small Stuff…and It's All Small Stuff she gave to me during a time of struggle.

Dr. Kusum Singh is appreciated and respected for her ability and willingness to take one's fear out of statistics. Under her exceptional tutelage, even regression and factor analyses became meaningful.

Because of circumstances such as the termination of the Community and Junior College Education Program, the death of Dr. Sam Morgan, and the sabbatical of another member, the composition of my committee changed several times. Much gratitude is extended to Dr. Steve Janosik, who joined the committee shortly before the prospectus, and Dr. Bruce Brown, who became a member before the defense.

Dr. Steve Janosik contributed to the improvement of my work by making insightful suggestions. Beside his willingness to serve, I especially appreciate his balance between constructive criticism and positive feedback.

Even though Dr. Bruce Brown was the last member to join the committee, he was actually there from the beginning listening, questioning, suggesting, and always encouraging. As a matter of fact, Dr. Brown introduced me to the program many years ago. I value his sharp intellect and appreciate his willingness to serve on the committee.

Very special thank yous are extended to colleagues, friends, and family for their assistance and emotional support. Among the colleagues are Naydine Shenk who helped to get library materials and Monica Carden who compiled information about mailing procedures and who facilitated the actually mailing of the packages to participants. Among the friends (some are also colleagues) are Debbie Bond, Chris Bremer, Nancy Evans, Jessica Green (my daughter), Christine Haimann, Cindy Mullins, and Ray Wurzburger. Chris, Nancy, Jessica, Christine and Cindy helped prepare over 800 packages for the first mailing. Debbie entered over 800 addresses into a file and merged it with the cover letter I had written. She was also the one who gave my data form a professional touch. Ray assisted me for many hours in recording survey responses.

I am also grateful to the community college chairpersons who completed and returned the surveys, to the Virginia Community College System for granting me a Chancellor's Fellowship, and New River Community College for reimbursing me for part of my tuition. The combined efforts and support of many fine people made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The American community college did not exist until the beginning of the twentieth century. Today, community colleges enroll more than five million students; are present in every state; and have developed partnerships with four-year colleges and universities, secondary schools, business and industry, and community service enterprises (Cohen & Brawer, 1994).

Community colleges have been facing several challenges during the last decade of the twentieth century. The Institute for Future Studies (1992) identified some of these challenges as issues of diversity, limitations resulting from available resources and organizational capabilities, a shifting purpose, demands for accountability, an aging faculty, older students with varying educational needs, changes initiated by technology, and the changing workforce.

To meet the challenges effectively and efficiently, community colleges must retain and, when needed, hire talented administrators, faculty, and support staff. Organizations that are successful could be considered healthy. Wood (1976) asserts, "The health of an educational institution depends on the job satisfaction of its employees" (p. 58).

Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992) estimated that more than 5,000 relevant job satisfaction studies have been published during the twentieth century. Many articles and dissertations credit Hoppock's (1935) study of job satisfaction as pioneering work, but his review of other job satisfaction investigations already included 32 studies. Employees from manufacturing, retailing, and service firms; local, state, and federal government agencies; and schools, colleges, and universities have been participants in job satisfaction research.

Why the strong interest in job satisfaction? Roznowski and Hulin (1992) believe that after an individual is hired, knowledge of his or her job satisfaction becomes the most important piece of data a manager or organizational psychologist can have. Robbins (1998) recently concluded that impressive evidence exists concerning the significance of job satisfaction. A satisfied workforce leads to higher productivity because of fewer disruptions such as absenteeism, departure of good employees, and incidences of destructive behavior. The presence of satisfied employees also translates into lower medical and life insurance costs. Society in general benefits too because satisfaction on the job contributes to satisfaction off the job. High job satisfaction as a goal can lead to saving dollars and cents as well as increasing social responsibility.

Significance of the Study

A review of the community college literature reflected that faculty is the group most often researched with respect to job satisfaction. McBride, Munday, and Tunnel (1992) provided a possible explanation for that fact. In their opinion, people are the most significant resources in organizations, and in the community college people means the faculty and not the students, nor the administrators, nor support staff. Some researchers (i.e., McGee, 1991; Vaughan, 1986) have published work that involves the community college president and job satisfaction. However,

little research has been done to explore job satisfaction of community college department or division chairpersons.

This researcher found only one published study (Murray & Murray, 1998) that solely involved community college chairpersons and job satisfaction. The study measured propensity to leave, job satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity for community college division chairs, as well as the relationships among the variables. Based on their findings, Murray and Murray encouraged further research on the subject of chairperson job satisfaction. Specifically, they suggested research determining whether institution size, gender of the chairperson, and the type of the division (transfer or career) affect job satisfaction of chairpersons. The present study is based in part upon the suggestions made by Murray and Murray.

The significance of the chairperson might be expressed using the words of a former president of the American Council on Education, J. W. Peltason. In his opinion, "An institution can run for a long time with an inept president but not for long with inept chairpersons. Given the importance of the chairperson's position, the lack of published material about it is surprising" (Peltason, 1984, p. xi; also cited in Murray & Murray, 1998). Tucker (1993) seemed to agree with Peltason's opinion because he also questioned the survival of an educational institution with outstanding top management but inadequate chairpersons.

The position of a community college chairperson has been compared to a "nut in a nutcracker" (Monroe, 1972) and to a "juggler" (Seagren, Wheeler, Creswell, Miller, & VanHorn-Grassmeyer, 1994). Monroe visualized the nut, the chairperson, being squeezed at the same time by the arms of a nutcracker, which represent the faculty and the administration. Seagren et al. labeled the chairperson as a juggler because, like the juggler, the chairperson has to handle several objects simultaneously that may include, for example, competing priorities and expectations. Not only do faculty and senior administrators require excellent juggling skills from the chairperson, but so do students, businesses and industry, and the community at large.

In the fall of 1992, the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA) conducted an exploratory study that described the personal characteristics, responsibilities, challenges, and strategies of community college chairpersons (Seagren et al., 1994). The results of the study were based on 2,875 usable returns, which represented a 32% response rate.

The information presented showed that almost two-thirds (73.9%) of the chairpersons planned to stay at the same community college for the next five years. Among those who planned to stay, only 54.4% intended to remain in the same position. These figures support the notion that one of the critical issues facing America's community colleges is the expectation that more than half of their employees will turn over during the 1990s (Institute for Future Studies, 1990). Mirvis and Lawler (1984) indicated that the expense of turnover in managerial positions could range from 5 to 25 times an employee's monthly salary (also cited in Glick, 1992; Murray & Murray, 1998). Because turnover can be so costly, organizations need to reduce it to an acceptable level. Job dissatisfaction and economic conditions are the two variables most significantly related to turnover (Cherrington, Nyal, & McMullin, 1989). Knowledge of chairpersons' facet-specific levels of job satisfaction can aid chief academic officers in attracting and retaining effective chairs. Typical examples of job facets or areas are supervision,

advancement opportunities, and compensation. Elements of dissatisfaction, once discovered, can be improved and that in turn can lead to a decrease in turnover. Identified factors of satisfaction can be incorporated in the hiring efforts of qualified individuals for chair positions. Knowledge of chairpersons' job satisfaction might not only be useful to administrators and others who influence the working climate and circumstances in which chairpersons function, but it might also be useful for faculty making personal decisions about their future career plans.

Problem Statement

The management literature provided evidence of relationships between demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education, and tenure, for example, and the criterion of job satisfaction (Robbins, 1998). Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981) reviewed job satisfaction questionnaires and found that the job facets most often investigated were relationships with coworkers, kind of work, pay, personal growth, promotion prospects, and supervision. The procedural problem of this study was to assess the influence of selected personal and unit characteristics on general job satisfaction of community college chairpersons in the United States.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to document job satisfaction based on a sample of community college chairpersons. As noted in the procedural problem, the study linked selected personal and unit characteristics to job satisfaction. Five ancillary purposes were also addressed. The ancillary purposes are the following:

1. to document personal characteristics,
2. to identify unit-related characteristics,
3. to assess facet-specific levels of job satisfaction,
4. to measure general job satisfaction,
5. to examine relationships between selected personal/unit characteristics and general job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The purposes of the research were addressed by answering the following questions:

1. What are selected personal characteristics of chairpersons?
2. What are selected unit characteristics?
3. What level of job satisfaction do chairpersons perceive with each of the twenty job facets as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (MSQ)?
4. What level of general job satisfaction do community college chairpersons perceive as measured by the MSQ?
5. What is the influence of selected personal/unit characteristics on general job satisfaction?

Assumptions

The assumptions listed below were necessary to establish a prudent starting point for the study.

1. The chosen research instrument would reflect an assessment of the participants' perceptions regarding job satisfaction.
2. The selected participants would be representative of the population under examination.

Delimitations

The scope of the population was the first delimitation of the study. The participants involved in the research were community college chairpersons in the United States as identified by the NCCCA database. The second delimitation was the confinement of the study's findings to the individuals who held the position of community college chairperson during the spring semester of 1999.

Limitations

The data for this study was gathered using a questionnaire. Research based on questionnaires depends on the voluntary cooperation of the participants. Participants can differ from non-participants, compromising the interpretation and generalizability of the results (Isaac & Michael, 1990). The measure of job satisfaction was limited by the nature of the MSQ.

Definitions

This study used several terms to utilize the effectiveness of the outcomes. These terms are defined below.

1. A chairperson is "…an administrator who supervises several faculty and reports to the chief academic officer of the community college" (Murray & Murray, 1998, p. 45).
2. General job satisfaction is an overall indicator and is measured by the following facets of the MSQ: ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, compensation, coworkers, creativity, independence, moral values, policies and practices, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety, and working conditions.
3. Personal characteristics are age, gender, highest level degree obtained, annual salary from current position, number of credit hours taught during a semester, average number of hours worked as chair in a typical week, number of years as chair in current position, total number of years as chair, professional plans in the next five years, professional plans of chairpersons who plan to stay in the community college for the next five years.
4. Unit characteristics are main unit focus (academic/transfer, occupational/technical), number of full-time and part-time faculty supervised, number of full-time and part-time staff supervised, number of full-time and part-time students enrolled.

Organization of the Study

This study is structured into five chapters. Chapter one presents the introduction, the study's significance, problem statement, purpose, research questions, assumptions, delimitations, limitations, and definitions. The literature review in Chapter 2 addresses the (a) meaning of job satisfaction, (b) importance of job satisfaction, (c) theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction, (d) measurement of job satisfaction, (e) job satisfaction as criterion variable, (f) job satisfaction as predictor variable, (g) job satisfaction research in the community college, (h) community college chairperson characteristics, and (i) importance of community college chairperson job satisfaction. Chapter 3 explains the research methodology applied. It includes a description of the participants, the instrumentation used, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Chapter 4 contains the findings and their discussion follows in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The general purpose of this study was to document job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. The primary goal of the literature review was to review important information about the construct of job satisfaction and the individuals who serve community colleges as chairpersons. The literature review addressed the (a) meaning of job satisfaction, (b) importance of job satisfaction, (c) theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction, (d) measurement of job satisfaction, (e) job satisfaction as criterion variable, (f) job satisfaction as predictor variable, (g) job satisfaction research in the community college, (h) community college chairperson characteristics, and (i) importance of community college chairperson job satisfaction.

Meaning of Job Satisfaction

People bring mental and physical abilities and time to their jobs. Many try to make a difference in their lives and in the lives of others through working. The reason for wanting a job is often considerably more than just a paycheck. Jobs can be looked at as the means used to achieve personal goals. When a job meets or exceeds an individual's expectation, the individual often experiences positive emotions. These positive emotions represent job satisfaction. Job satisfaction in turn is a major contributor to life satisfaction (Smith, 1992), a personal goal that many find worth pursuing.

Job satisfaction may be compared to another source of life satisfaction—marriage. When people lack marriage satisfaction or experience dissatisfaction in their union, they often get a divorce. It is similar with the relationship between employee and employer. "Take this job and shove it!" is not only a recorded blue-collar anthem by Johnny Paycheck during the 1980s, but also an illustration of the sentiments and actions of many people who are dissatisfied with their jobs overall or with certain aspects of their jobs.

To grasp the meaning of a construct like job satisfaction, it seems logical to look at how it is defined in the literature. The search for a universal definition of job satisfaction is not a difficult one; it is an impossible one. Even though many researchers define job satisfaction, the definitions vary. The three definitions most commonly referred to among researchers are Hoppock's, Locke's, and Vroom's. In the thirties, Hoppock's (1935) response to the question 'What is job satisfaction?' was: "…any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'" (p. 47). Locke's (1976) answer to the same question in the seventies was: "…a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Vroom (1982), who used the terms "job satisfaction" and "job attitudes" interchangeably, defined job satisfaction as "...affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying" (p. 99). Even though the definitions vary, a commonality among them seems to be that job satisfaction is a job-related emotional reaction.

Importance of Job Satisfaction

Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction. First, organizations can be directed by humanitarian values. Based on these values they will attempt to treat their employees honorably and with respect. Job satisfaction assessment can then serve as an indicator of the extent to which employees are dealt with effectively. High levels of job satisfaction could also be a sign of emotional wellness or mental fitness. Second, organizations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees' behavior would be expected to influence organizational operations according to the employees' degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviors and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviors. Third, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organizational operations. Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organizational departments and, therefore, be helpful in pinning down areas in need of improvement. Spector (1997) believed that each one of the reasons is validation enough of the significance of job satisfaction and that the combination of the reasons provides an understanding of the focus on job satisfaction.

Spector, of course, is only one of many researchers, scholars, and writers who addressed the importance of job satisfaction. His reasons appear to be representative of many views on the importance of the concept in other major works (i.e., Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Cranny et al., 1992; Gruneberg, 1976; Hopkins, 1983) dealing with job satisfaction.

Theoretical Frameworks of Job Satisfaction

Three theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction can be identified in the literature. Framework one is based on content theories of job satisfaction. Framework two is grounded in process theories of job satisfaction. Framework three is rooted in situational models of job satisfaction (Thompson & McNamara, 1997).

Framework One: Content Theories

Content theorists assume that fulfillment of needs and attainment of values can lead to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory and Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966) are examples of content theories.

Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory. According to Maslow's (1954) view of individual needs, job satisfaction is said to exist when an individual's needs are met by the job and its environment. The hierarchy of needs focuses on five categories of needs arranged in ascending order of importance. Physiological, safety, belongingness and love are the lower-level needs in the hierarchy. The higher-level needs are esteem and self-actualization. When one need is satisfied, another higher-level need emerges and motivates the person to do something to satisfy it. A satisfied need is no longer a motivator.

Whaba and Bridwell (1976) did an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a

special hierarchy. Even though hardly any research evidence was discovered in support of the theory, it enjoys wide acceptance.

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory. The study of job satisfaction became more sophisticated with the introduction of Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This theory focuses attention upon the work itself as a principal source of job satisfaction. To Herzberg the concept of job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are also known as motivators or satisfiers, and extrinsic factors as hygienes, dissatifiers, or maintenance factors. The motivators relate to job content (work itself) and include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. The hygienes relate to job context (work environment) and involve, for example, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. Motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent. Hygienes are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present.

Before the emergence of the motivator-hygiene theory, only single scales had been used to measure job satisfaction. Scores on the high end of the scale reflected high levels of job satisfaction, whereas scores on the low end represented high dissatisfaction. Research based on the motivator-hygiene theory should apply different scales for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction because the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction (Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 1995).

Assessing the motivator-hygiene theory, Locke, Fitzpatrick, and White (1983) pointed out that Herzberg's theory is method dependent. Herzberg used what is known as the critical incident technique in the development of his theory. This type of research approach has been the only one consistently leading to results confirming the theory. The results of other applied methods have indicated that hygienes indeed can be associated with job satisfaction and motivators with job dissatisfaction.

Framework Two: Process Theories

Process theorists assume that job satisfaction can be explained by investigating the interaction of variables such as expectancies, values, and needs (Gruneberg, 1979). Vroom's expectancy theory (1982) and Adams' equity theory (1963) are representative of the second framework.

Vroom's Expectancy Theory. Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that people not only are driven by needs but also make choices about what they will or will not do. The theory proposes that individuals make work-related decisions on the basis of their perceived abilities to perform tasks and receive rewards. Vroom established an equation with three variables to explain this decision process. The three variables are expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Expectancy is the degree of confidence a person has in his or her ability to perform a task successfully. Instrumentality is the degree of confidence a person has that if the task is performed successfully, he or she will be rewarded appropriately. Valence is the value a person places on expected rewards.

Expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are given probability values. Because the model is multiplicative, all three variables must have high positive values to imply motivated performance choices. If any of the variables approaches zero, the probability of motivated performance also approaches zero. When all three values are high, motivation to perform is also high. Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that both situational and personality variables produce job satisfaction.

Adams' Equity Theory. The primary research on equity theory was done by Adams (1963). Equity theory proposes that workers compare their own outcome/input ratio (the ratio of the outcomes they receive from their jobs and from the organization to the inputs they contribute) to the outcome/input ratio of another person. Adams called this other person "referent." The referent is simply another worker or group of workers perceived to be similar to oneself. Unequal ratios create job dissatisfaction and motivate the worker to restore equity. When ratios are equal, workers experience job satisfaction and are motivated to maintain their current ratio of outcomes and inputs or raise their inputs if they want their outcomes to increase. Outcomes include pay, fringe benefits, status, opportunities for advancement, job security, and anything else that workers desire and receive from an organization. Inputs include special skills, training, education, work experience, effort on the job, time, and anything else that workers perceive that they contribute to an organization.

Framework Three: Situational Models

Situational theorists assume that the interaction of variables such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics influences job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Examples of models are the situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction (Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and Glisson and Durick's (1988) predictors of job satisfaction.

Situational Occurrences Theory. The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction was proposed by Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman (1992). The two main components of the theory are situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Examples of situational characteristics are pay, promotional opportunities, working conditions, company policies, and supervision. Individuals tend to evaluate situational characteristics before they accept a job. Situational occurrences tend to be evaluated after accepting a job. Situational occurrences can be positive or negative. Positive occurrences include, for example, giving employees some time off because of exceptional work or placing a microwave in the work place. Negative occurrences include, for example, confusing email messages, rude remarks from coworkers, and copiers which seem to break down a great deal. Quartstein et al. (1992) hypothesized that overall job satisfaction is a function of a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences. The findings of their study supported the hypothesis. According to the researchers, a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences can be a stronger predictor of overall job satisfaction than each factor by itself.

Predictors of Job Satisfaction. Glisson and Durick (1988) examined simultaneously the ability of multiple variables from three categories (worker, job, and organizational

characteristics) to predict both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They proposed that job tasks would be excellent predictors of job satisfaction, characteristics of workers poor predictors, and characteristics of the organization moderate predictors. Their findings supported the traditional emphasis on job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction, and to a lesser extent, the more recent examinations of organizational determinants.

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Unlike productivity, absenteeism, and turnover, job satisfaction is present only inside an individual's mind and cannot be measured directly. Methods for indirectly measuring job satisfaction include observing employees, interviewing them, and asking them to complete a questionnaire. Many organizations and researchers favor questionnaires because personal observations and interviews are very time consuming (Cherrington, Nyal, & McMullin, 1989). Job satisfaction can be measured using either single-item, general, or facet measures.

Single-Item Job Satisfaction Measure

A description of a single-item measure has been given, for example, by Robbins (1998): "All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job" (p. 151). Response alternatives can range from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997) support the use of a single-item measure unless a study's inquiries or circumstances direct toward selecting a well-constructed scale. Kalleberg (1974) criticized single-items measures based on the measures' assumption that job satisfaction is unidimensional, when in fact it appears to be multidimensional. Evidence points toward an overestimation of job satisfaction when the construct is measured using a single-item measure.

General Job Satisfaction Measure

General job satisfaction scales, like single-item measures, are used to determine the overall level of job satisfaction. An instrument available to measure overall job satisfaction, for example, is the Job in General Scale (JIG) (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). The JIG is made up of a list of descriptive phrases (i.e., "Better than most") or adjectives (i.e., "Rotten") beside which the respondents are asked to mark "Y" for "YES" if it describes their job in general, "N" for "NO" if it does not describe it, or "?" if they cannot decide whether or not the word or phrase describes their job.

Facet-Specific Job Satisfaction Measure

If a study of job satisfaction is conducted to identify areas of dissatisfaction to improve upon them, facet-specific levels of job satisfaction should be assessed. Numerous standardized reliable and valid instruments are available for this type of approach. Normative data has also been documented for the scales of the instruments described in the following paragraphs.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1997) yields an overall satisfaction score and 9 facet-specific scores. The facet-specific scales include pay, promotion, supervision, fringe

benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) measures satisfaction levels of work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers. Participants in studies utilizing the JDI are asked to indicate whether each statement does or does not describe their jobs. "YES" responses are scored +1, "NO" responses -1, and "?" responses 0, indicating the participant cannot decide.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) generates satisfaction scores for 20 facets. The facets are ability, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety, and working conditions. Various combinations of facets generate intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction scores. The MSQ is available in a long and a short version. The long-form MSQ asks participants to respond to 100 items using a Likert response format. The 100 items represent 20 five-item scales. The short-form MSQ asks participants to respond to only 20 items. These 20 items are the items from the long-form MSQ that best represent each of the 20 scales.

Job Satisfaction as Criterion Variable

Originally job satisfaction was studied as a predictor of behaviors such as performance, absenteeism, and turnover. More recently the interest has shifted toward identifying factors that influence or predict job satisfaction. Personal and work-related characteristics can influence job satisfaction Locke (Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997).

Personal Characteristics

Personal characteristics such as age, gender, education and tenure are often included in job satisfaction studies to describe the participants and to determine relationships among the variables. Research evidence often shows the presence of relationships between the personal characteristics and job satisfaction, but the evidence tends to be mixed. Sometimes positive relationships are identified and sometimes negative ones for the same variables.

Age. Mixed evidence exists in the literature concerning the relationship between age and job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1957), after an extensive review of job satisfaction literature, concluded that the association is best described by a U-shaped function. Initially satisfaction is high, then decreases, and eventually, after hitting a low point, increases again with age.

Hulin and Smith (1965) indicated that job satisfaction increases in a positive linear fashion with respect to age. As workers grow older, they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. Older workers have lower expectations than younger workers, and they tend to be better adjusted to the work situation. Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974) claimed that older workers are more satisfied with their work because they move into better work or more desirable positions across their careers.

Saleh and Otis (1964) proposed a positive and linear function between age and job satisfaction until the preretirement period during which job satisfaction significantly declines. They attributed the increasing level of job satisfaction to the general adjustment to life, and the decreasing level of job satisfaction to a decline in health and an obstruction of channels for self-actualization and psychological growth.

Zeitz (1990) adopted a situational perspective of employee attitudes to investigate the relationship between age and work satisfaction among 434 employees of a Federal Government agency. The employees were categorized into three groups: nonprofessionals (mostly clerical personnel), non-elite professionals (not promoted to highest rank), and elite professionals (attainment of grade 13 or above). The results of the study show that the age-satisfaction curves differed among the nonprofessionals, non-elite professionals, and elite professionals.

Iiacqua et al. (1995) did a study to analyze factors that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of faculty in higher educational institutions. Age was among the factors found to affect job dissatisfaction. Younger, less experienced faculty expressed more job dissatisfaction than experienced tenured faculty. Spector (1997) suggested two reasons why job satisfaction might increase with age. One, better benefits such as pension, for example, and rewards, pay, for example, could increase satisfaction. Two, Spector stated that, "…people adapt to the job by adjusting their expectations to be more realistic, so that they are happier with less as they get older" (p. 26).

Gender. Research investigating the relationship between gender and job satisfaction uncovered three possibilities. First, females are more satisfied than males (i.e., Hoppock, 1935). Second, males are more satisfied than females (i.e., Hulin & Smith, 1964; Locke, Fitzpatrick, & White, 1983). Third, no difference exists between males and females with respect to job satisfaction (i.e., D'Arcy, Syrotuik, & Siddique, 1984; Golding, Resnick, & Crosky, 1983; Iiacqua et al., 1995).

Thompson and McNamara (1997) synthesized job satisfaction research findings published in the first 26 volumes of Educational Administration Quarterly. They reported that neither age nor gender was of value in the prediction of job satisfaction.

Gruneberg (1979) presented several reasons for the inconsistent results of the investigations concerning the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. Males and females might occupy different job levels in the same organization. Their promotion prospects might vary, as might pay and the level of need satisfaction in the same job. Women might perceive stronger social satisfaction in a position that requires few skills and offers limited promotion opportunities than men do and thus might experience greater job satisfaction than men.

Smith, Smits, and Hoy (1998) recently also considered the issue of gender-related differences in job satisfaction for employees in small businesses. When the research team initially did not find differences in job satisfaction of men and women, they continued their investigation of the gender-related differences in job satisfaction considering the gender of the

small business owner. The results then indicated a significant difference. The most satisfied females were employed in female owned and managed companies, with up to 25 employees. The most satisfied men were employed in male owned and managed companies, with 50 or more employees.

Education. A review of job satisfaction studies that included education as a variable indicates that the relationship between education and job satisfaction can be negative or positive. Carrell and Elbert (1974), for example, reported negative direct effects of education on job satisfaction. They concluded that younger workers, who have a higher level of formal education, may be dissatisfied with performing the routine tasks required in most jobs. DeSantis and Durst (1996) compared job satisfaction among public and private-sector employees. They identified many similarities between the two groups, but one of the clear differences concerned the education variable. The expected negative relationship between education and overall job satisfaction was much stronger for the private-sector employees than the public sector. DeSantis and Durst offered as a possible explanation that the private-sector individuals might be employed in unchallenging positions and might be experiencing larger gaps between expectations and realities.

Quinn and Baldi de Mandilovitch (1980) analyzed data from 11 studies of American workers. Based on this analysis, they documented a positive relationship between the workers' educational level and overall job satisfaction. The attainment of a college degree resulted in the largest increase in overall job satisfaction.

Tenure. Gruneberg (1979) already pointed out that the relationships between tenure, defined as length of service, and job satisfaction was unclear. It is possible that an increase in job tenure can be associated with a decrease in job satisfaction (DeSantis & Durst, 1996). It is also possible, as evidence provided by Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar (1992) has shown, that tenure and job satisfaction are positively related.

Work-Related Characteristics

Job satisfaction can be affected by the work situation. Any aspect of the job and employing organization is part of the work situation. Based on an extensive review of the literature, Bruce and Blackburn (1992), Locke (1976), and Vroom (1982) identified challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues as main determinants of job satisfaction (also cited in Robbins, 1998).

Challenging work. The work itself is the factor that correlates most highly with overall job satisfaction (Schneider, Gunnarson, & Wheeler, 1992). Employees' preference tends to be jobs that let them apply their abilities and skills and embody a diversity of tasks, freedom, and performance feedback. This preference makes work mentally challenging. Challenge has to be balanced. Not enough challenge can lead to boredom, but too much challenge and employees experience frustration and feelings of failure. An appropriate level of challenge will cause feelings of pleasure and satisfaction (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976; Vroom, 1982).

Equitable rewards. Pay and promotion are rewards employees tend to expect for their efforts. Pay and promotion lead to satisfaction when they are perceived as being fair. For pay to be fair, decisions on the amount to pay should reflect job requirements, people's abilities, and community pay standards. By the same token, employees encounter satisfaction when they perceive that promotion decisions are the result of fair policies and processes (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976, 1983; Vroom, 1982).

Supportive working conditions. People want to be comfortable and safe while they work. Appropriate lighting, temperature, and noise level are several aspects that keep people from being uncomfortable, and, therefore, from experiencing dissatisfaction. People want the tangible items that they need to work to perform their job well. In an office environment examples for tangibles are computers, copiers, fax machines, and phones. Furthermore, people prefer cleanliness to dirt and living close to their jobs over living far away (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976, 1983; Vroom, 1982).

Supportive colleagues. Many individuals' social need can be satisfied through their favorable interaction with both coworkers and managers at work. Sympathetic and helpful coworkers can increase employee job satisfaction. Managers who interact favorably with employees assist in solving problems are aware of employees' challenges and are able to communicate effectively and provide constructive feedback periodically. These managerial behaviors can lead to increased job satisfaction for employees (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Herzberg et al., 1957; Locke, 1976, 1983; Vroom, 1982).

Job Satisfaction as Predictor Variable

The level of employee job satisfaction can have an impact on organizations. Potential organizational consequences of job satisfaction involve performance, absenteeism, and turnover. These consequences have been discussed by many researchers (i.e., Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Gruneberg, 1979; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997; Vroom, 1982) interested in job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction and Performance

During the 1930s-1950s, the notion existed that happy workers are productive workers. Research conducted based on that notion and with the goal to show a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance found little support for such a relationship (Vroom, 1982). Bruce and Blackburn (1992) presented the fact that a positive job satisfaction-performance relationship is possible, but so is the possibility of no relationship as well as a negative relationship. Spector (1997) pointed out the potentiality of a performance-satisfaction relationship in addition to the satisfaction-performance relationship. In his opinion, more evidence exists that better performers experience more job satisfaction because they receive rewards associated with good performance.

Considering the financial performance in terms of annual returns of the 100 best companies to work for in America, Grant (1998) recently asked the question: "Do employees make companies successful, or do successful companies make employees happy?" (p. 21). She

concluded that causation exists in both directions. Interesting was also the presence of happy workers in companies which under performed as indicated by very low annual returns or losses.

Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism

Studies investigating the job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship have documented consistent, significant, but moderate negative relationships (Locke, 1976). Employees who are satisfied are less likely to be absent than employees who are dissatisfied. Absence is influenced by job satisfaction but also by, for example, pressure or lack of pressure to attend. Incentives for attendance or punishment for absence can decrease absenteeism. Liberal sick leave policies can cause employees, including the highly satisfied ones, to be absent.

Job Satisfaction and Turnover

According to Mobely (1982), a weak-to-moderate negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover. High job satisfaction leads to low turnover. In general, dissatisfied workers are more likely to quit than those who are satisfied. But it is also a fact that some dissatisfied workers never leave, and some satisfied workers do take jobs in other organizations.

Both Mobely (1982) and Vroom (1982) advise to administer and readminister facet-specific job satisfaction surveys. Facet-specific instruments allow the identification of dissatisfaction concerning such factors as pay, job content, supervision, coworkers, and working conditions. Readministering instruments can identify changes and facilitate trend analysis.

Job Satisfaction Research in The Community College

Very little information about the job satisfaction of community college chairpersons exists. The preparation of the literature review included a search of the Education Resources Information Clearing House (ERIC) and Dissertation Abstracts Online (DAO) computer data bases.

ERIC, 1982 until present, returned 6,516 entries on a search of the subject job satisfaction; 623 on the combination of job satisfaction and community college; and only eight on the combination job satisfaction, community college, and department chair(s). Substituting the terms “department head(s),” “division chair(s),” “division head(s),” and “chairperson(s)” produced even fewer returns than for “department chair(s).”

DAO results were similar. Job satisfaction has been a subject of 6,772 dissertations. The number of dissertations addressing job satisfaction in the community college decreased to 227. Four dissertations (Grau, 1997; Jackson, 1995; Kellerman, 1996; Williams, 1978) included job satisfaction aspects of community college chairpersons. Substituting “department chair(s),” “department head(s),” and “division chair(s),” again, only reduced the number of returns.

A search for publications in periodicals targeted to the community college yielded 19 studies on job satisfaction. The majority of the studies, twelve (Benoit & Smith, 1980; Coll & Rice, 1990; Diener, 1985; Filan, Morris, & Witter, 1986; Friedlander, 1978; Hill, 1983; Hill,

1986; Hutton & Job, 1985; Konicek, 1992; McBride, Munday, & Tunnel, 1992; McKee, 1991; Truell, Price, & Joyner, 1998), appeared in a periodical formerly known as the Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice and today recognized as the Community College Journal of Research and Practice. The Community College Review presented six articles (Chieffo, 1991; Cohen & Friedlander, 1980; Finley, 1991; Milosheff, 1990; Riday, Bingham, & Harvey, 1985; Wood, 1976;) on the topic of job satisfaction. No study about job satisfaction could be found in the Journal of Community and Junior Colleges. One article (Cohen, 1974) about community college faculty job satisfaction was published in the Research in Higher Education.

The vast majority of the published studies addressed the job satisfaction of faculty (e.g., Diener, 1985; Hill, 1983; Hutton & Job, 1985; Truell, Price, & Joyner, 1998). Benoit and Smith (1980) explored the job satisfaction of certificated employees, a group that included teachers, administrators, counselors, librarians, and media support. Two researchers (Coll & Rice, 1980) examined the job satisfaction of community college counselors. Chieffo (1991) investigated the job satisfaction of community college leadership teams. Friedlander (1978) obtained job satisfaction data from a survey that included nonhumanities division chairs. Only one study (Murray & Murray, 1998) was found that measured the job satisfaction solely of community college chairpersons.

Research conducted in the community college included analyzing the relationships between job satisfaction and specific work-activity satisfaction (Friedlander, 1978), biographical data (Hill, 1983), commitment to or withdrawal from work (Hill, 1986), leadership styles (McKee, 1991), unionization (Finley, 1991), industry-related training assignments (Konicek, 1992), and propensity to leave (McBride, Munday, & Tunnel, 1992; Murray & Murray, 1998).

Research Findings

Truell et al. (1998) determined that their study's participants, full-time and part-time occupational-technical faculty, were satisfied with their jobs. Comparing satisfaction levels of ten satisfaction/dissatisfaction factors, which were based on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, part-timers experienced significantly higher satisfaction levels in the areas of policy and administration, responsibility, supervision, and working conditions. Of the four statistically significant different factors, supervision was the only one that might have been of practical significance. Approximately 9.79% of variance in supervision could be explained by the status of full-time versus part-time. Work itself reflected the highest level of satisfaction for both part-time and full-time faculty.

Murray and Murray (1998) measured the propensity to leave an institution, level of job satisfaction, and perception of role conflict and ambiguity among two-year college division chairs. Furthermore, they investigated the impact of job satisfaction and role conflict and ambiguity on propensity to leave. High levels of job satisfaction and role ambiguity, a medium level of role conflict, and a low level of propensity to leave were identified. The researchers reported these findings to be "somewhat paradoxical" (p. 54) because of the existing evidence of negative relationships between the two role perceptions, ambiguity and conflict, and propensity to leave. The community college chairpersons were most satisfied with the work itself and least

satisfied with salary. The application of stepwise regression showed that the factors included in the study could explain 23% of the propensity to leave.

McBride et al. (1992) examined the effects of 10 job satisfaction factors, role ambiguity, and role conflict on community college faculty's propensity to leave. They discovered that as satisfaction levels of growth opportunities, salary, work, policy and administration, and supervision decreased, turnover intent, an attitude not widely represented, increased. Propensity to leave increased as role conflict increased. Work itself reflected the highest satisfaction level and salary the lowest. The generally satisfied faculty, appeared to experience a moderate amount of role conflict and a very low level of role ambiguity. Age was the only demographic variable that significantly influenced propensity to leave.

Konicek's (1992) random sample included 204 faculty members from 37 community colleges in Texas. The relationship between diversity of workload and job satisfaction was assessed and identified as being not significant. Significant differences were discovered with respect to faculty perceptions of industrial training assignments. An increase in the number of negative statements concerning industry training assignments was accompanied by a decreasing satisfaction level with overall working environment.

McKee (1991) researched the leadership styles of community college presidents based on faculty perceptions, job satisfaction of faculty, and the possibility of a correlation between presidential leadership styles and faculty job satisfaction. McKee concluded that leadership style makes a difference in job satisfaction level. A high relationship/low task leadership style corresponded with high job satisfaction. Another interesting finding was the significantly lower job satisfaction experienced by faculty who had been over 15 years at their institutions.

Chieffo (1991) assessed job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership team members and identified factors that influenced the members' satisfaction and commitment. The participants appeared to be fairly committed to their institutions and they were fairly satisfied with their jobs. Consideration of the position characteristics of role clarity, role overload, and task significance showed significant correlations with commitment. Only role clarity showed a significant correlation with job satisfaction. Role clarity was the key factor in predicting commitment and job satisfaction. Furthermore, with regard to personal characteristics, one labeled "inclusion in decision-making meetings with the president" was identified as being significant in the determination of commitment and job satisfaction.

Finley (1991) compared unionized and non-unionized faculty job satisfaction levels of nine dimensions. The economic dimension, which encompassed salary and benefits, was the only one for which unionized faculty reported a higher satisfaction level, a difference that was not significant. Non-unionized faculty indicated higher satisfaction levels in all other dimensions with a significant difference in three: governance (i.e., involvement in decision-making), support (i.e., clerical and equipment), and convenience (i.e., physical surroundings).

Coll and Rice (1990) were curious about the overall level of job satisfaction of community college counselors. They also wanted to know more about factors influencing job

satisfaction. Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the responses of 66 community college counselors, the following results were obtained.

1. Above average level of overall job satisfaction as indicated by a mean of 3.9 out of five.
2. Least levels of job satisfaction with organizational policies and their implementation (mean: 2.78) and supervisory human relations (mean: 2.84).
3. Highest levels of job satisfaction with opportunities to help others (mean: 4.63) and provision of steady employment (mean: 4.43)
4. Counselor teaching load, formal job title, incompatible demands, clarity of explanations, and conflict of resources significantly correlated with job satisfaction.
5. Formal job title, teaching load, and incompatible demands were identified predictors of job satisfaction.

Milosheff (1990) designed her study to explore job satisfaction of community college faculty. The independent variables included personal and demographic characteristics, professional activities/responsibilities, perceptions of and relationships with students, institutional environment, and departmental environment. Significant variables were discovered among four of the five broad categories. The perception of students was the most significant variable. None of the personal and demographic characteristics was a significant variable. On the average, the participants were satisfied with their jobs.

Hill (1986) set out to identify which facets of job satisfaction (i.e., work, supervision, coworkers, pay, and promotion) would be predictors of commitment to or withdrawal from the work organizations among selected community college faculty in New York state. The independent variable work itself was the best predictor of both dependent variables, commitment and withdrawal. Satisfaction with promotional opportunities and co-workers also had predictive value. The Job Descriptive Index was used to assess facet-specific levels of job satisfaction.

Filan et al. (1986) measured job rewards, job values, achieved social statuses, ascribed social statuses, and job satisfaction of community college faculty. The population of the study included all full-time faculty of a multi-campus community college district located in a metropolitan area in the Southwest. The researchers determined the contribution of job rewards, job values, achieved social status, and ascribed social status to job satisfaction. The results communicated that the positive predictors of job satisfaction were the work itself, job rewards, good supervision, and chronological age. Gender was not significantly related to job satisfaction.

Hutton and Jobe's (1985) study inquired about community college faculty job satisfaction. The respondents were 390 faculty from 14 community colleges in Texas. Teaching itself and relationships with supervisors and colleagues reflected the greatest satisfaction levels. Professional development opportunities, time allocation, and student preparation/motivation were the variables indicating the least job satisfaction. Women seemed to be more satisfied than men overall.

Diener (1985) elicited faculty judgment about their jobs and stressors and job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Student achievement, their own intellectual growth in a discipline and the

world of ideas, working under flexible and relatively autonomous conditions, and association with stimulating peers contributed to job satisfaction. Job conditions (equipment and facilities, inflexible teaching schedules), personal conditions (lack of recognition, heavy teaching load), salary, red tape, and student and colleague apathy presented reasons for job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory was also tested in this study. The findings supported the theory. The work itself provided sources of satisfaction and factors external to the respondents' work led to dissatisfaction.

Riday et al. (1985), using Wood's (1976) Faculty Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Scale, compared the degree of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among teachers from secondary schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges. Overall, the education level did not matter. Teaching appeared to be satisfying and fulfilling for all teachers. The community college faculty was the group expressing the highest level of satisfaction. Four-year college faculty experienced the next highest level.

Hill (1983) set out to examine the extent to which individual characteristics and work-related characteristics influence levels of facet-specific job satisfaction. The participants were 161 faculty members in community colleges in Pennsylvania. Based on factor analysis, Hill identified six facets of job satisfaction: economic, teaching, administrative, associational, recognition-support, and convenience. The predictors included, for example, academic rank, degree level, age, sex, disciplinary affiliation, and involvement in faculty development programs. Results showed that satisfied faculty was likely to be among the older groups, among those with higher ranks, and among those who teach in business and nursing. Women tended to be less satisfied than men on several dimensions. As degree level of faculty increased, so did level of job satisfaction.

Benoit and Smith (1980) studied demographic and job satisfaction characteristics of Florida community college faculty. The term "faculty" included not only full-time and part-time instructors, but also administrators, counselors, librarians, and media support people. The two main reasons given for satisfaction were related to enjoyment of teaching and associating with and helping college-age students. Dissatisfaction was expressed with ill-prepared or unmotivated students. Overall, 95% of the faculty was either satisfied or very satisfied.

Cohen and Friedlander (1980) asked the question: "What do instructors want?" They found that faculty responses could be categorized in two ways. One way was attitudes about the work situation and another way was attitudes about themselves. Considering their work situation, instructors wanted better support services, better students, and better media and materials. For themselves the instructors wanted more time, more interaction with colleagues, and better professional development opportunities.

Friedlander (1978) analyzed job satisfaction data of two-year humanities faculty and nonhumanities chairpersons. In general, participants were satisfied with their jobs but expressed some dissatisfaction with working conditions. Other findings of Friedlander's research included that a general job satisfaction measure was relatively independent of a specific work-activity satisfaction measure and that the general measure was a better predictor of the desire to remain at the college than the specific measure.

Wood (1976) primarily focused in his study on the identification of factors related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The anchor of Wood's inquiry was Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory. The study's participants represented a sample drawn from a population of 56 institutions and 2,352 full-time instructors in the North Carolina community college system. The product of Wood's study, the Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Scale (Wood, 1976), is an instrument suitable for measuring job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of instructors in two-year educational institutions. In the community college environment, Wood's instrument has been used, for example, by McBride et al. (1992), Murray and Murray (1998), Riday et al. (1985), and Truell et al. (1998).

Cohen (1974) followed Herzberg's example by using the critical incident method to ask 222 community college instructors from twelve colleges to relate aspects of their work that led them to feel satisfied and aspects that led them toward feelings of dissatisfaction. More than two-thirds of the group indicated that they gained satisfaction from student learning or from interaction with students, and nearly two-thirds related administrative, collegial, and/or organizational difficulties as leading to dissatisfaction. The study supported the Herzberg's two-factor theory.

Conclusions

Comparing the number of job satisfaction studies conducted in the community college environment to job satisfaction studies in general, one can say the number is sparse. Based on the review of the research conducted in the community college environment, one could get the impression that the community college employs only faculty, not faculty and administrators and support staff. Job satisfaction assessment of administrators and support staff has been neglected.

Generally, community college faculty seem to be satisfied with their job but quite a few appear to be dissatisfied with specific aspects of their job. Sources of discontent include working conditions, administration, salary, student and colleague apathy. Satisfaction is related to the work itself, job rewards, good supervision, student achievement, association with stimulating peers, and flexible working conditions.

Only one reported study, with a 46.5% response rate, dealt solely with job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. The work itself, interpersonal relations, achievement, and responsibility appeared to be sources of satisfaction for chairpersons. Sources of least satisfaction were salary, supervision, and growth. Choice to stay or leave a college was influenced by policy and administration, supervision, salary, and the work itself.

The vast majority of the studies in the community college environment treated job satisfaction as a criterion variable. The main purpose of these studies was to identify variables related to job satisfaction. These variables included demographic characteristics such as academic rank, degree level, age, gender, and length of service. Positive relationships with job satisfaction were identified for academic rank and degree level. The relationship between age and job satisfaction was reported as positive in some studies and as negative in others. Considering gender and job satisfaction, some studies reported more satisfied females than males

and others documented that males were more satisfied than females. A negative relationship was reported between length of service and job satisfaction.

Very few studies treated job satisfaction as an independent variable. The studies that did tried to assess the construct's predictive value of propensity to leave and established a link between the two variables. Job satisfaction was not examined with respect to absenteeism or performance.

Standardized instruments used in job satisfaction research were Wood's (1976) Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Scale, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith et al., 1969), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967). Wood's instrument was the only one used several times in the studies reviewed. Murray and Murray (1998) used the instrument in their study of chairperson job satisfaction, a choice that could be questionable. The researchers did not indicate that they modified Wood's instrument. Quite a few of the items in the instrument address dimensions unique to instructors—the instrument was after all developed to measure faculty and not administrator job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Not all chairpersons teach. As a matter of fact 17.75% of the Murray and Murray study's participants did not teach.

Community College Chairperson Characteristics

According to Linda Luehrs (personal communication, January 26, 1999), associate director of the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA), the number of community college chairpersons totals at least 11,218. This number includes 928 chairs from Canada and 199 from other countries.

In the fall of 1992, the NCCCA in cooperation with the University of Nebraska Center for the Study of Higher and Post-Secondary Education administered a survey to all community chairpersons in the United States and Canada. Out of 9,000 chairs at that time, over 3,000 completed the survey. The results were published in a book titled Academic Leadership in Community Colleges (Seagren et al., 1994). The publication presented a profile of the community college chairpersons.

The community college chairperson is likely to be a Caucasian male between 45-54 years old. The individual tends to hold a Master's degree, has been a chair 6-10 years and a faculty member 11-15 years. The chair tends to have worked in business/industry or another type of educational institution before arriving in the community college environment. The chair is likely to earn an annual salary between $41,000-60,000 for performing 31-40 hours per week in the chair role in addition to his/her teaching load. The chair intends to stay at the same community college, but not necessarily in the position of chair. More specifically, the study's results indicated that of those individuals intending to stay at the same community college (73.9%) for a five year period only 54.4% planned to remain in the position of chair (Seagren et al., 1994).

Smith and Stewart (1998) did a study to develop a profile of 193 department and division chairs appointed during the 1995-96 academic year in community colleges in Texas. They tracked the new chairpersons over two years and discovered that 12% stayed in their position for

only one year and 29% stayed for only two years. Another interesting finding was that 62.7% would not advise others to take on the role of a chair.

Tucker (1993) also described chairpersons. He thought it paradoxical that chairpersons tend to be drawn from faculty with hardly any administrative experience. He identified an annual turnover rate of 15 to 20 percent. Frustrations caused by exasperating encounters with senior administrators, faculty, students, and external parties were to be compensated for by material and psychological rewards. If the compensation for dissatisfactions was not enough, resignations of chairpersons were likely.

Welch (1996) described the demands of the job of an academic chair as being diverse, comical, and often annoying and unrewarding. He saw community college chairs as wearing three very distinct hats assuming the varied roles. As academicians, chairs should be role models for faculty. This requires not only staying current with the body of knowledge in one's discipline but also with new ways of teaching and learning. The most demanding role chairs have to perform is that of a manager. The pieces to the managerial puzzle can be identified as faculty/staff hiring and supervision; responding to student requests; building internal bridges to other areas in the college; building external bridges to high schools, universities, business and industry; budgeting and scheduling; ascertaining that a college's policies and procedures are followed, and processing never-ending paperwork. Chairs also wear the hats of leaders. In their leadership role, chairs are to be motivational, visionary, and capable of moving the department toward the future overcoming internal as well as external barriers and meeting the challenges encountered along the way.

Importance of Community College Chairperson Job Satisfaction

It is common knowledge that a chain is only so strong as its weakest link. In the community college the strongest link has to be the chairperson because of the number of individuals and groups he/she connects. The chairperson, for example, links the faculty (a) internally to other faculty, administrators, staff, and occasionally students; and (b) externally to high schools, four-year colleges and universities, business and industry, and community service organizations.

Dissatisfaction can weaken the chairperson link possibly through disruptive behaviors causing disconnection among individuals and groups. Disconnection in turn can jeopardize the achievement of community college goals. Disruptive behavior might not necessarily involve turnover. As Murray and Murray (1998) asserted, community colleges want to fill chairperson positions with candidates who have doctorates. Only 27.2% of the chairpersons of the Murray and Murray study held doctorates, a finding consistent with the 23.2% of the respondents in the Seagren et al. (1994) investigation. Dissatisfied chairpersons might not leave their positions because they may not be able to get such a position at another institution due to the lack of a doctorate; and if such is the case, they also will not be able to move up to a dean's position. In addition, these individuals may have sought the position of chair to begin with because they had had enough of teaching and thus may not consider returning to a full-time faculty position.

Assuming that overall satisfied chairpersons will stay in their positions can be just as wrong as assuming that dissatisfied chairs will leave. Chairpersons might be satisfied overall but dissatisfied with job facets such as salary, supervision, and growth, for example. Facet-specific dissatisfaction, combined with the marketability of applicants holding a doctorate, and a job market in which demand outweighs supply can cause the loss of an excellent chairperson. Unplanned turnover translates into costs equal to three to five times a person's salary (Costa & Harkins, 1998).

Periodical assessment of the community college chairperson's facet-specific levels of job satisfaction can contribute to strengthening the link that the position represents. The identification and improvement of areas of discontent may help institutions to retain high performance chairs and attract new talented people to the positions when needed. Elimination of sources of discontent can also be followed by increased levels of job satisfaction of chairs who do not have the credentials to seek positions elsewhere even though they have not been happy in the position they are in. The increased job satisfaction level in turn may lead to a decrease in disruptive behaviors and therefore a strengthening of the chairperson link.

Summary

Even though a universal definition of "job satisfaction" could not be found in the literature, a commonality among the definitions seems to be that job satisfaction is an emotional (affective) response to work. Job satisfaction reflects positive work-related emotions, and job dissatisfaction reflects negative emotions.

Job satisfaction is important to individuals, organizations, and society. High job satisfaction levels can be viewed as health indicators. Job satisfaction is one of the micro aspects of the macro concept of life satisfaction. Job satisfaction, viewed as one of the outcomes of organizational operations, can be a reflection of effectiveness and efficiency. Organizations influence individuals' life satisfaction via job satisfaction, which in turn contributes to the well being of society.

The study of job satisfaction is anchored in three basic frameworks known as content theories, process theories, and situation models. Content theorists (i.e., Maslow, 1954; Herzberg, 1966) believe that need fulfillment leads to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Process theorists (i.e., Vroom, 1964; Adams, 1963) find explanations for job satisfaction through investigating the interaction of expectancies, values and needs (Gruneberg, 1979). Situational theorists (i.e., Glisson & Durick, 1988; Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) stipulate that job satisfaction is influenced through the interaction of individual, job, and organizational variables (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Job satisfaction can be assessed using single-item, general, or facet-specific measures. The purpose of the evaluation of job satisfaction directs selection of the appropriate measure. The JDI and MSQ are two widely used, nationally recognized, reliable and valid instruments that measure facet-specific levels of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been studied as a criterion/dependent and as a predictor/independent variable. Personal (i.e., age and gender) and work-related characteristics (i.e., working conditions and challenging work) can influence job satisfaction. When studied as a predictor variable, job satisfaction has been found to affect performance, absenteeism, and turnover.

The review of job satisfaction research in the community college reflects a neglect of chairpersons among participants. The vast majority of studies assessed job satisfaction of faculty. If the health of educational institutions is related to its employees' job satisfaction (Wood, 1976), then all employee groups' (faculty, administrators, and staff) satisfaction levels should be determined. The community college provides a teaching and learning environment for more than five million students in the United States. The position of the chairperson is crucial for the accomplishment of the community college's goals.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The general intent of this descriptive study was twofold. One, the study was to document facet-specific and general levels of job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. Two, personal and unit-related characteristics that might influence community college chairperson job satisfaction were considered. A survey design was used to obtain needed information. Isaac and Michael (1990) stated, "Surveys are the most widely used technique in education and the behavioral sciences for the collection of data" (p. 128). Spector (1997) indicated that job satisfaction research is mostly done with questionnaires. This chapter describes the participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analyses procedures of the study.

Participants

The population for this study was comprised of community college chairpersons in the United States. The Chair Academy, formerly known as the National Community College Chair Academy (NCCCA), has a database that contains contact information of community college chairs. A total of 9,866 mailing labels were purchased from the Chair Academy. Once the mailing labels were received, 1,800 labels were discarded based on the content of their title line. When the title line of a label did not reflect the position of a chairperson, the label was discarded. Title lines that caused the label to be discarded included, for example, "Dean" or "Director of Library." Isaac and Michael (1990) advise a sample size of at least 370 for a population of 10,000. Since the issue of response rate, which tended to be considerably lower than 100% in reviewed studies with community college chairpersons as participants, had to be considered, 807 among the 8,066 mailing labels were selected following a systematic sampling procedure.

Instrumentation

The participants of the study received the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967). Since the MSQ is copyright protected, permission to use was sought from the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota (see Appendix A) and copies had to be purchased. Because of the copyright protection, the MSQ is not presented in the Appendices section following Chapter 5. The basic building blocks of the MSQ are 100 items also known as reinforcers. The 100 items are designed to measure satisfaction with 20 facets of the work environment that correspond to 20 psychological needs.

The 20 facets in alphabetical order are as follows:

1. Ability utilization. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. Achievement. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
3. Activity. Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. Advancement. The chance for advancement on this job.
5. Authority. The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. Company policies and practices. The way company policies are put into practice.
7. Compensation. My pay and the amount of work I do.

8. Co-workers. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. Creativity. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
10. Independence. The chance to work alone on the job.
11. Moral values. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. Recognition. The praise I get from doing a good job.
13. Responsibility. The freedom to use my own judgment.
14. Security. The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. Social service. The chance to do things for other people.
16. Social status. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
17. Supervision-human relations. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
18. Supervision-technical. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
19. Variety. The chance to do different things from time to time.
20. Working conditions. The working conditions. (Weiss et al., 1967, p. 1)

Each of the 20 facets is measured by the sum of five items which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (very dissatisfied, 1; dissatisfied, 2; neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 3; satisfied, 4; very satisfied, 5). The job security facet, for example, is measured by the following five items excerpted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) that was authored and published by the University of Minnesota (1977): (a) My job security, (b) the way my job provides for a secure future, (c) the way my job provides for steady employment, (d) how steady my job is, and (e) the way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job.

A participant indicates being very dissatisfied with an item if that job aspect provides much less than expected. On the other hand, if a job aspect provides much more than expected, a participant indicates being very satisfied with that item (Weiss et al., 1967).

The MSQ was selected for several reasons. One, the MSQ allows the computation of more facet-specific levels of job satisfaction than any other reputable instrument as well as the computation of general job satisfaction. General job satisfaction was treated as the criterion variable of this study. The general satisfaction scale consists of the following twenty MSQ items: 24, 25, 28, 30, 35, 43, 51, 61, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, 100 (Weiss et al., 1967). Measurement of the facet-specific levels of job satisfaction potentially provides knowledge about what aspects of the work environment ought to be changed in an effort to support organizational effectiveness.

The second reason for selecting the MSQ was that the instrument has been used in a variety of settings, is nationally recognized, and has been reported as being reliable and valid (Cook, 1981). For 27 normative groups, the highest documented median Hoyt reliability coefficient was .93 for advancement and recognition and the lowest median was .78 for responsibility. The Hoyt reliability coefficient ranged from a high .97 on the ability utilization scale to a low of .59 on the variety scale. Test-retest correlation of general satisfaction scale scores yielded coefficients of .89 over a one-week period, for seventy-five employees attending night school, and .70 over a one-year period for 115 employees (Weiss et al., 1967).

The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) provides documentation about the instrument's construct, concurrent, and content validities. Construct

validity evidence exists because the MSQ appears to meet conceptual expectations. Satisfaction was expected to be, and given the evidence is, "…a function of the correspondence between the individual's needs and the reinforcer system of the job…A high-need, high-reinforcement group would express most satisfaction and the high-need, low reinforcement group would express the least satisfaction" (Weiss et al., 1967, p. 17). Concurrent validity presence is based on the analysis of data for 25 occupational groups. The analysis includes tests of differences in satisfaction levels and group variabilities. The findings show that the MSQ can distinguish among groups from different occupations. Content validity can be supported by the results of factor analysis. Two factors emerged through the analysis. The first factor is intrinsic satisfaction and second is extrinsic satisfaction. The extrinsic satisfaction factor includes the facets of supervision (human relations and technical), company policies and practices, working conditions, advancement, compensation and security. The intrinsic satisfaction factor includes all other facets.

The MSQ consists of eight pages. Page two seeks answers to questions concerning standard demographic characteristics of respondents. This page was replaced with a data form that was more appropriate for this study (see Appendix B). The data form was stapled on top of the page it replaced. The items included on the data form provided information about the characteristics of the participants and the units that they chaired. The personal characteristics included age, gender, highest degree earned, annual salary, number of years as chair in current position, total number of years as chairperson, credit hours taught, number of hours spent per week as chair, and future plans. Unit-related items inquired about the main focus of the unit chaired, number of students (full-time and part-time) enrolled in the unit, number of faculty (full-time and part-time) supervised, and number of staff (full-time and part-time assistants, secretaries, work-study students) supervised.

Data Collection

Initial Mailing

On April 21, 1999, 807 survey packages were mailed in first class 10x13 envelopes. Each package included a cover letter (see Appendix C); a Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire with a demographic data form stapled to its second page to replace the survey's original demographic items; and a stamped, self-addressed 9x12 return envelope. As an incentive and as a thank you, a 12" flat ruler imprinted with the words "Thank You! Gracias! Merci! Dankeschön!" was also included in each package. To be able to identify non-respondents of the initial mailing, a code number was placed on the demographic data form.

Follow-Up Letter

On May 11, 1999, a follow-up letter (see Appendix D) was mailed to non-respondents of the initial mailing. Individuals were thanked in case they had completed and returned the survey in the meantime; if they had not, they were asked to do so. If an individual had not received the survey by chance, or had misplaced it, he/she was encouraged to make contact via phone or E-mail.

Second Mailing

On June 4, 1999, a second survey package was mailed to individuals in response to their phone calls and E-mail messages requesting another survey. This package included the same enclosures of the first package with one difference. The original cover letter was replaced with another much briefer letter (see Appendix E).

Data Analysis Procedures

The student version 9.0 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1999) was used for the statistical analyses. Categorical variables such as gender and highest-level degree obtained, for example, were coded before they were entered into the computer. Continuous variables were entered into the computer as they had been responded to on the questionnaire. Reliability coefficients were computed for the 20 MSQ facet scales and the general job satisfaction scale. Two factor analyses were conducted to investigate the content validity of the MSQ. The research questions of this study were addressed as described in the following paragraphs.

Research Question 1: What are the personal characteristics of chairpersons?

Frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics were computed and reported. Summary statistics included appropriate measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) and dispersion (standard deviation, range, minimum, and maximum).

Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of the units chaired?

Again, frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics were computed and reported. Summary statistics included appropriate measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) and dispersion (standard deviation, range, minimum, and maximum).

Research Question 3: What level of satisfaction do chairpersons perceive with each of the twenty job facets as measured by the MSQ?

The mean and standard deviation were computed for each job-facet scale. Results were presented in descending order of means to observe facets reflecting relatively greater and relatively lesser satisfaction levels.

Each of the 20 facet scales was based on five items. The five response choices for each item ranged from “very dissatisfied” (VDS) with a scoring weight of 1 to “very satisfied” (VS) with a scoring weight of 5. When the scores of each item of a facet scale were summed, the summed score ranged from 5 to 25, indicating high dissatisfaction to high satisfaction, respectively.

To identify the number and percentages of chairpersons who were very dissatisfied, satisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied, and very satisfied with each of the facets, it was assumed that the five response choices did not indicate an absolute score but the midpoint of

an interval. Therefore, a score between 5 and 7.5 indicated “very dissatisfied” and a score between 7.6 and 12.5 “dissatisfied,” a score between 12.6 and 17.5 “neither dissatisfied nor satisfied,” a score between 17.6 and 22.5 “satisfied,” and a score between 22.6 and 25 “very satisfied.”

Research Question 4: What level of general job satisfaction do community college chairpersons perceive as measured by the MSQ?

The scores of general job satisfaction levels were computed by summing the response weights across the appropriate 20 items for each participant. The results identified the number of chairpersons for each of the five response choices. Scores between 20 and 30, 31 and 50, 51 and 70, 71 and 90, 91 and 100 corresponded to very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied, and very satisfied, respectively.

Measures of central tendency and dispersions were also computed for general job satisfaction. To facilitate a comparison of chairpersons’ general job satisfaction levels with the levels of a norm group consisting of managers, the satisfaction levels of equal to and below the 25^{th} percentile, between the 26^{th} and 74^{th} percentile, and equal to and above the 75^{th} percentile were computed. According to Weiss et al. (1967), these percentiles represent low, medium, and high levels of general job satisfaction, respectively.

Research Question 5: What is the influence of selected personal/unit characteristics on general job satisfaction?

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between selected personal/unit characteristics, the independent variables, and general job satisfaction, the dependent variable. Specified personal characteristics were age, gender, highest degree earned, annual salary, number of years as chair in current position, total number of years as chairperson, credit hours taught, and number of hours spent per week as chair. Unit characteristics were main focus of the unit, number of students enrolled in the unit, and numbers of faculty and staff supervised in the unit. The numbers of students, faculty and staff included full-time and part-time people.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

Survey Responses

On April 21, 1999, 807 survey packages were mailed to community college chairpersons all over the United States. By June 23, 1999, after all follow-up communications, 326 usable and 25 unusable surveys were returned. The usable surveys represented a response rate of 40.3%. In five cases, somebody other than the approached person returned a usable survey. Among the unusable returns were seven undeliverable surveys, five surveys with a message that the recipients had retired, and three surveys with a note indicating that the recipients chose not to participate. One survey was returned because the chair had died. Nine surveys were not usable because they only had been partially answered.

Even though not asked, some respondents felt strongly enough to comment positively or negatively on the survey. A chair from El Cajon, California made the most negative statement. He wrote:

> I started out with every intention to answer the survey items honestly and completely. About a third of the way into it, I became very frustrated, and then angry—100 items asking repeat questions worded in slightly different ways (?To validate the truthfulness of the responses??). I believe you chose a lousy (if well tested) survey and I will not complete it or return it. (Confidential, personal communication, April 29, 1999)

The following statement from a chairperson at a community college in Miami, Florida represented the more positive comments. He wrote: “It is with a great deal of interest that I participate in your survey. Please send me a copy of the results” (Confidential, personal communication, April 27, 1999). To summarize, the negative comments mainly pertained to the repetitiveness of the 100 MSQ items and were made mostly by individuals who did not finish the survey. The positive comments indicated the respondents’ interest in the findings of the study.

To determine if a common theme existed among the reasons for not returning the survey, nonrespondents were contacted via E-mail and phone until 20 individuals shared their reason. Three themes emerged. One, the nonrespondent ($n = 4$) had changed his/her job years ago and was no longer in a chair position. Two, the nonrespondent ($n = 6$) did not remember receiving the survey. Three, the nonrespondent ($n = 10$) placed the survey low on his/her priority list because of more urgent tasks and just never got around to answer the instrument.

The cases of nonrespondents no longer being chairs are a reflection of a lack of quality of the mailing labels purchased. This lack of quality is further supported by the number of surveys ($n = 7$) that were undeliverable, the surveys ($n = 5$) somebody other than the approached person responded to, and the surveys ($n = 5$) that were returned with a message that the recipients had retired. Before the decision was made to purchase the mailing labels from the Chair Academy, a representative from the organization had explained that the mailing list was updated every summer (L. Luehrs Wolfe, personal communication, January 26, 1999). It appears that the

updating process of the mailing labels should be improved. Furthermore, the purchaser of mailing labels should check the quality of the product regardless of the assurances made by the seller.

With respect to all nonrespondents who failed to remember receiving a survey, the mailing process was reviewed. The documentation indicated that a survey and a follow-up letter had been sent to the individuals and that the addresses used had been correct.

One of the ten nonrespondents who just never got around to answer the survey sent the following E-mail message:

> I'll be happy to give you my reasons or "excuses" for not responding to that survey. I use the word excuses because I have tried to follow through on any requests related to other individual's research efforts. I do that because I was very appreciative of other's support of my research.
>
> The primary reason is lack of time. I am Dept Head for Nursing, including ADN and PN programs. I manage the programs with 7 faculty and a secretary. I also Chair the (name omitted) Health Foundation and Co-chair our Healthy (name omitted) Task force in (name omitted) County. I am an Elder at First Presbyterian Church of (name omitted), and recently completed the Institute for Senior Administrators conducted by the (name omitted) CC System. Most importantly, I have a husband and 2 sons who are very active in high school sports. I guess some things get put on the "back burner". That's probably what happened with that survey. (Confidential, personal communication, September 1, 1999)

Description of Respondents' Selected Personal/Unit Characteristics

Personal Characteristics

Age. The frequency distribution, percentages, and summary statistics of the participants' age are shown in Table 1. The majority of the chairpersons, 51.2%, fell within the category of 50-59 years. Almost 15% of the chairs were 60 or older. Assuming a retirement age of 65, these data indicate that approximately two-thirds of the current chairs will have to be replaced in the next 15 years. The youngest participant was 30 years of age and the oldest 72. Two participants declined to report their age.

Gender. Of the 326 participants in this study, 189 or 58% were male and 136 or 41.7 % were female. One participant did not respond to the gender item. Apparently, community colleges are providing leadership opportunities not only for men, but also for women.

Highest-level degree obtained. Data in Table 2 show that the majority of the chairpersons, 57.1% (n = 186), obtained a master's degree and 30.7 % (n = 100) a doctorate. Very few chairs (2.5%, n = 8) earned only an associate degree. Overall, the chairs appear to be highly educated with 88.6% holding a degree beyond a bachelor's.

Table 1

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Participants' Age

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
30 – 39	16	4.9	4.9
40 – 49	94	29.1	34.0
50 – 59	166	51.2	85.2
60 – 69	46	14.2	99.4
70 – 79	2	.6	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics

Mean = 52 Median = 52 Mode = 57

Standard deviation = 7.29

Range = 42 Minimum = 30 Maximum = 72

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Educational Degrees

Degree	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Associate	8	2.5	2.5
Bachelor	21	6.4	8.9
Master’s	186	57.1	66.0
Specialist/CAGS	11	3.3	69.3
Doctorate	100	30.7	100.0
Total	326	100.0	

Annual salary from current position. Table 3 presents salary information. Two respondents did not disclose their annual salary range. Almost half of the respondents (48.8%, n = 159) earned a salary between $40,001 and $60,000. Only 7.1% (n = 23) of the chairs earned more than $80,000.

Number of credit hours taught this semester. The frequency distribution, percentages, and summary statistics of the number of credit hours taught during the semester the survey was administered are shown in Table 4. The computed mean and median were both equal to nine. The mode of zero indicates that chairpersons most commonly did not teach. The maximum number of credit hours taught reported was 54.

Average number of hours worked as chair in a typical week. As shown in Table 5, the average number of hours a chair works in a typical week can be as high as 70 or as low as 2, indicating a range of 68. Four participants did not respond to this survey item. The measures of central tendency reflect a mean of 34, and a median and mode of 40.

Number of years as chair in current position. Many chairs (44%, n = 144) were in their current positions only for five years or less as shown in Table 6. A response of zero, the minimum, to this item indicated that the participant had been in his/her current position less than one year. On the average, a chair had been in his/her current position for eight years.

Total number of years as chair. The total number of years as chair reported by participants ranged from 0 to 35 (see Table 7). Computations showed multiple modes of two and six. Slightly over 36% (n = 118) of the participants had five years or less of experience as chair. For this item, the mean and median were nine and seven, respectively.

Professional plans in the next five years. Almost two-thirds (66%, n = 215) of the participants planned to stay at the same community college for the next five years (see Table 8). Twenty-seven percent (n = 88) among the chairs intended to retire, 2.8% (n = 9) planned to move to another community college, 1.2% (n = 4) planned to move to a 4-year college, and another 1.2% planned to move to a position in the private sector.

Professional plans for chairpersons who plan to stay in the community college for the next five years. Table 9 presents the plans of the participants who intended to stay in the community college. Close to half of the chairs (46%, n = 150) wanted to remain in the chair position, 14.1 % (n = 46) wanted to move to a faculty position, and 8.6% (n = 28) wanted to move to another administrative position.

Unit Characteristics

Main unit focus. Participants were given two choices to indicate the main focus of their unit. Choice one was “academic/college transfer” and choice two was “occupational/technical.” As shown in Table 10, over half (53.4%) of the participants selected “academic/college transfer” as an answer and 41% chose “occupational/technical.” Eighteen participants (5.6%) wrote or otherwise indicated “both” as the main focus of their unit, an option that was not part of the survey.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Annual Salary

Salary range	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
<= $20,000	1	.3	.3
$20,001 - 40,000	28	8.6	8.9
$40,001 - 60,000	159	49.1	58.0
$60,001 - 80,000	113	34.9	92.9
> $80,000	23	7.1	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 4

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Number of Credit Hours Taught During the Semester the Survey was Administered

Credit hours	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
0	44	13.6	13.6
1 – 3	35	10.8	24.4
4 – 6	49	15.1	39.5
7 – 9	65	20.1	59.6
10 – 12	54	16.7	76.3
13 – 15	37	11.4	87.7
16 – 18	21	6.5	94.2
19 – 21	13	4.0	98.2
22 – 24	3	.9	99.1
> 24	3	.9	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics		
Mean = 9	Median = 9	Mode = 0
Standard deviation = 6.59		
Range = 54	Minimum = 0	Maximum = 54

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 5

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Average Number of Hours Worked as a Chair in a Typical Week

Work hours	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
1 – 10	42	13.0	13.0
11 – 20	51	15.8	28.8
21 – 30	37	11.5	40.3
31 – 40	85	26.4	66.7
41 – 50	78	24.2	90.9
51 – 60	14	4.4	95.3
61 – 70	15	4.7	100.0
Subtotal	322	100.0	
Missing value	4		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics

Mean = 34	Median = 40	Mode = 40
Standard deviation = 15.93		
Range = 68	Minimum = 2	Maximum = 70

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 6

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Number of Years as Chair in Current Position

Years	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
0 – 5	144	44.4	44.4
6 – 10	99	30.6	75.0
11 – 15	38	11.7	86.7
16 – 20	19	5.9	92.6
21 – 25	16	4.9	97.5
26 – 30	6	1.9	99.4
31 – 35	2	.6	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics		
Mean = 8	Median = 6	Mode = 2
Standard deviation = 6.84		
Range = 35	Minimum = 0	Maximum = 35

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 7

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Total Number of Years as Chair

Years	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
0 – 5	118	36.4	36.4
6 – 10	104	32.1	68.5
11 – 15	50	15.4	83.9
16 – 20	22	6.8	90.7
21 – 25	18	5.6	96.3
26 – 30	10	3.1	99.4
31 – 35	2	.6	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics		
Mean = 9	Median = 7	Mode = 2 and 6
Standard deviation = 7.07		
Range = 35	Minimum = 0	Maximum = 35

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages for Professional Plans of Chairs in the Next Five Years

Plan	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Stay at the same community college	215	66.0	66.6
Move to another community college	9	2.8	69.3
Move to a 4-year institution of higher education	4	1.2	70.6
Move to a position in the private sector	4	1.2	71.8
Retire	88	27.0	98.8
Other	4	1.2	100.0
Total	326	100.0	

Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages for Professional Plans of Chairs Who Plan to Stay in the Community College

Plan	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Not applicable	98	30.0	30.0
Remain in the chair position	150	46.0	76.0
Move to a faculty position	46	14.1	90.2
Move to another administrative position	28	8.6	98.8
Other	4	1.2	100.0
Total	326	100.0	

Table 10

Frequencies and Percentages for Main Unit Focus

Main unit focus	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Academic/college transfer	173	53.4	53.4
Occupational/technical	133	41.0	94.4
Both	18	5.6	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	4		
Total	326		

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Number of full-time and part-time faculty supervised. As presented in Table 11, chairs supervised between 1 and 200 faculty, a range of 199. Almost one-third of the chairs (32.5%, n = 105) supervised 1 to 10 faculty. The mean, median, and mode were 25, 16, and 8, respectively.

Number of full-time and part-time staff supervised. Almost 65% of the chairs supervised three or less staff members (see Table 12). Responses indicated that participants most commonly supervised one staff member. The average number of staff supervised was five.

Number of full-time and part-time students enrolled in unit. The units that the participants supervised enrolled as many as 11,916 students and as few as two (see Table 13). Slightly over two-fourths of the units enrolled 400 students or less and one-fourth enrolled more than 1,000 students. The average enrollment per unit was 1,013 students.

Reliability of MSQ Scales

The correlation coefficients among the 21 MSQ scales are shown in Table 14. The correlation coefficients were all positive and statistically significant at the .01 level. The correlation coefficients ranged from a low .19 to a high .91, indicating the degree of the relationships between compensation and social service, and supervision-human relations and supervision-technical, respectively. The strong intercorrelation of the two supervision scales suggests that the scales may be measuring the same job facet. Even though one supervision scale is intended to measure an interpersonal component and the other supervision scale a technical component, respondents might feel the same about both aspects of their supervisors. Weiss et al. (1967) reported correlation coefficients of the two supervision scales ranging from .67 to .90 across samples.

Cronbach's alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency of the 21 MSQ scales used in this study. The reliability coefficients ranged from .96 for the recognition scale to .85 for the variety scale (see Table 15). The general job satisfaction scale reflected a reliability coefficient of .91. Given these results, one can infer that the lowest reliable variance of the total scores was at least 85%. Gable and Wolf (1993) advise: "Check the alpha reliability noting that you are looking for at least a .70 but would be most pleased with a value greater than .80" (p. 226). The findings indicate that each of the 21 MSQ scale scores has adequate internal consistency reliability.

Content Validity of MSQ

To determine the content validity of the MSQ, two exploratory factor analyses were computed. Principal component analysis was the method of extraction. The Kaiser rule for number of factors to extract was applied. Only factors, also referred to as components, with eigenvalues greater than one were retained. Varimax was the rotation method.

Table 11

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Supervised

Faculty supervised	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
1 – 10	105	32.5	32.5
11 – 20	97	30.0	62.5
21 – 30	46	14.2	76.7
31 – 40	24	7.4	84.1
41 – 50	16	4.9	89.0
51 – 60	9	2.8	91.8
61 – 70	7	2.1	93.7
71 – 80	7	2.1	95.1
> 80	13	3.9	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics		
Mean = 25	Median = 16	Mode = 8
Standard deviation = 26.81		
Range = 199	Minimum = 1	Maximum = 200

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 12

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Staff Supervised

Staff	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
0 – 3	210	64.8	64.8
4 – 6	56	17.3	82.1
7 – 9	22	6.9	89.0
10 – 12	16	4.9	93.9
13 – 15	3	.9	94.8
16 – 18	3	.9	95.7
19 – 21	2	.6	96.3
22 – 24	1	.3	96.6
25 – 27	2	.6	97.2
28 – 30	5	1.5	98.8
> 30	4	1.2	100.0
Subtotal	324	100.0	
Missing value	2		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics		
Mean = 5	Median = 2	Mode = 1
Standard deviation = 8.56		
Range = 80	Minimum = 0	Maximum = 80

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 13

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics for Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Students Enrolled in Unit

Students	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
<= 200	110	35.8	35.8
201 – 400	47	15.3	51.1
401 – 600	26	8.5	59.6
601 – 800	27	8.8	68.4
801 – 1000	16	5.2	73.6
> 1000	81	26.4	100.0
Subtotal	307	100.0	
Missing value	19		
Total	326		

Summary Statistics

Mean = 1,013	Median = 400	Mode = 300
Standard deviation = 1,597		
Range = 11,914	Minimum = 2	Maximum = 11,916

Note. For the calculation of percentages, missing values were not included in the denominator.

Table 14

MSQ Scales Intercorrelations

MSQ Scales	MSQ Scales																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1. Ability Utilization	1.00	.76	.62	.43	.47	.50	.33	.43	.56	.58	.51	.57	.70	.46	.57	.53	.42	.47	.68	.39	.76
2. Achievement		1.00	.73	.46	.46	.52	.34	.51	.60	.52	.60	.65	.75	.45	.70	.55	.45	.49	.72	.46	.81
3. Activity			1.00	.39	.54	.46	.31	.44	.48	.48	.55	.54	.68	.50	.63	.57	.41	.46	.71	.40	.75
4. Advancement				1.00	.42	.58	.53	.35	.35	.57	.39	.58	.43	.35	.26	.45	.45	.52	.42	.36	.65
5. Authority					1.00	.41	.30	.50	.37	.49	.47	.44	.60	.40	.43	.64	.37	.43	.51	.34	.66
6. Company policies and practices						1.00	.48	.42	.36	.31	.50	.67	.53	.52	.31	.47	.69	.65	.46	.45	.75
7. Compensation							1.00	.27	.25	.20	.37	.50	.37	.42	**.19**	.38	.32	.38	.28	.34	.55
8. Co-workers								1.00	.38	.34	.41	.43	.58	.43	.35	.43	.37	.38	.41	.29	.61
9. Creativity									1.00	.43	.39	.42	.63	.32	.45	.38	.27	.27	.56	.26	.60
10. Independence										1.00	.40	.45	.55	.31	.41	.47	.27	.32	.56	.28	.61
11. Moral values											1.00	.48	.53	.52	.50	.45	.38	.43	.50	.90	.69
12. Recognition												1.00	.58	.39	.35	.52	.64	.64	.53	.43	.78
13. Responsibility													1.00	.51	.60	.58	.45	.45	.68	.38	.82
14. Security														1.00	.47	.40	.44	.44	.47	.38	.65
15. Social service															1.00	.41	.29	.32	.59	.31	.62
16. Social status																1.00	.39	.44	.54	.33	.69
17. Supervision-human relations																	1.00	**.91**	.40	.34	.69
18. Supervision-technical																		1.00	.46	.34	.73
19. Variety																			1.00	.37	.75
20. Working conditions																				1.00	.55
21. General job satisfaction																					1.00

Note. The row labels in the first column of the table show the numbers and names of the MSQ scales. The column labels across the table correspond to the same MSQ scales.

Table 15

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for MSQ Scales

Scales	Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients
Ability utilization	.94
Achievement	.89
Activity	.89
Advancement	.94
Authority	.88
Company policies and practices	.94
Compensation	.94
Co-workers	.90
Creativity	.91
Independence	.92
Moral values	.88
Recognition	.96
Responsibility	.86
Security	.88
Social service	.93
Social status	.91
Supervision-human relations	.95
Supervision-technical	.93
Variety	.85
Working conditions	.95
General satisfaction	.91

Factor Analysis One

Three factors were extracted initially (see Table 16). They each had eigenvalues greater than one. Looking at the column labeled "% of Variance" the first factor accounted for 49.46 % of the total variance explained, the second for 8.77%, and the third for 6.07%. Together, the three factors accounted for 64.29% of the variability of the 20 items. After rotation, converged in six iterations, the percentage of total variance accounted for by the three factors did not change. However, the percentages accounted for by each factor did change. The percentages for factors one, two, and three, now were 30.96%, 21.67%, and 11.66%, respectively.

Communalities and the rotated factor matrix are shown in Table 17. Initial communalities in a principal component analysis are always one (Gable & Wolf, 1993). The communalities after extraction show the proportion of variance explained by the factor solution. For example, .90 or 90% of the variance in working conditions was accounted for by the solution of this factor analysis. In comparison, only 39.1% of the variance in co-workers was reflected by the solution of the factor analysis.

The rotated factor matrix displays correlations, also referred to as loadings, sorted by sizes that relate the items to the three extracted factors. The strongest factor loading for each item is bolded in Table 17. The items that load most heavily on a factor define the factor. By referring to the content of those items, one can discern the nature of the latent variable that each factor represents.

The following items were strongly associated with factor one: ability utilization, achievement, activity, authority, co-workers, creativity, independence, responsibility, social service, social status and variety. Items strongly associated with factor two included advancement, company policies and practices, recognition, supervision-human relations, and supervision-technical. Moral values and working conditions were strongly associated with factor three. The strength of the association between security and each factor appeared to be almost equally low (factor one, .395; factor two, .382; factor 3, .392). In general, for loadings to be meaningful, they should be greater than .40 (Gable & Wolf, 1993).

The proportion of the common variance attributed to factors one, two, and three were 48.2%, 33.7%, and 18.1%, respectively (see Table 17). Factor one appeared to represent intrinsic satisfaction with the exception of co-workers. Factor two reflected extrinsic satisfaction. Factor three presented a problem in the sense that the two items loading on it, moral values and working conditions, represented one intrinsic and one extrinsic satisfaction aspect. Furthermore, to have a meaningful factor, at least three items should load on it (Isaac & Michael, 1990).

Because of the lack of a strong association of the security item with a factor, and the loading of one intrinsic aspect, moral values, and one extrinsic aspect, working conditions, on factor three, a decision was made to repeat the principal component analysis with one difference—the number of factors to be extracted was specified as two. This decision was also supported by the fact that the initial eigenvalue of factor three, 1.123, was close to one. The SPSS Base 9.0 Applications Guide (1990) states: "Often, for real data, there may be one or more eigenvalues close to one, so you may need to request fewer factors than extracted by default"

Table 16

Initial Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance, Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings, and Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings for MSQ Scales

Initial Eigenvalues			
Components	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.891	49.457	49.457
2	1.754	8.769	58.226
3	1.213	6.066	64.292
4	.951	4.753	69.045
5	.847	4.236	73.281
6	.782	3.911	77.192
7	.672	3.362	80.553
8	.548	2.739	83.293
9	.486	2.428	85.721
10	.457	2.284	88.005
11	.390	1.948	89.952
12	.359	1.793	91.745
13	.327	1.636	93.381
14	.313	1.567	94.948
15	.261	1.304	96.251
16	.253	1.263	97.514
17	.218	1.092	98.606
18	.140	.698	99.304
19	.076	.363	99.667
20	.066	.333	100.000
Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			
Components	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.891	49.457	49.457
2	1.754	8.769	58.226
3	1.213	6.066	64.292
Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings			
Components	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.192	30.959	30.959
2	4.334	21.672	52.631
3	2.332	11.661	64.292

Table 17

Rotated Component Matrix, Communalities, Contribution of Components, and Proportion of Common Variance of Each Component

	Components			
MSQ Scales	1	2	3	Communality
Responsibility	**.795**	.324	.173	.767
Achievement	**.784**	.304	.265	.777
Variety	**.783**	.263	.159	.708
Ability utilization	**.748**	.305	.180	.685
Activity	**.740**	.264	.252	.681
Social service	**.738**	.048	.241	.605
Creativity	**.695**	.141	.086	.510
Independence	**.682**	.173	.063	.499
Authority	**.587**	.332	.170	.485
Social status	**.581**	.394	.158	.517
Co-workers	**.502**	.340	.153	.391
Security	**.395**	.382	.392	.456
Supervision-human relations	.201	**.864**	.044	.789
Supervision-technical	.256	**.845**	.070	.785
Company policies & practices	.270	**.762**	.275	.729
Recognition	.420	**.698**	.185	.697
Advancement	.274	**.647**	.197	.533
Compensation	.124	**.526**	.363	.424
Working conditions	.190	.212	**.905**	.900
Moral values	.398	.236	**.839**	.918
Contribution of component	6.192	4.334	2.332	12.858
Proportion of common variance	.482	.337	.181	1.000

(p. 329). The closer an eigenvalue gets to one, the less the likelihood that the factor explains more variance than the average amount explained by one of the original items (DeVellis, 1991).

Factor Analysis Two

The second factor analysis was conducted with the number of factors being specified as two. After rotation, which converged in three iterations, the first factor accounted for 32.99 % of the total variance explained and the second accounted for 25.24% (see Table 18). The rotated factor matrix of the second factor analysis is presented in Table 19. The common variance for factors one and two was now equal to 56.65% and 43.35%, respectively. The association between the security item and factors one and two strengthened as reflected by loadings of .453 and .473, respectively. Moral values loaded with .565 most heavily on factor one and working conditions with .461 on factor two.

The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) contains factor analytic information that suggests that the MSQ consists of two factors. The first factor appears to measure intrinsic job satisfaction and the second factor extrinsic satisfaction. The results of this study's analysis support the two-factor solution.

Facet-Specific Levels of Job Satisfaction

Table 20 presents a hierarchy of the 20 facet-specific MSQ scales. The mean and standard deviation for each scale are documented. Job facets of relatively greater satisfaction included social service, creativity, and achievement as reflected by their means of 22.30, 21.28, and 21.26, respectively. Job facets of relatively lesser satisfaction included advancement, compensation, and company policies and practices as reflected by their means of 16.60, 16.27, and 15.75, respectively.

Considering the job facets of relatively lesser satisfaction and expressing the results using frequencies (see Table 21), 19% (n = 62) of the respondents were dissatisfied with advancement. Over one fourth of the respondents (n = 89, 27.3%) expressed dissatisfaction with compensation. Almost one third of the respondents (n = 102, 31.3%) were dissatisfied with company policies and practices.

Levels of General Job Satisfaction

General job satisfaction levels, as shown in Table 22, reflect that one participant was very dissatisfied, 5 participants were dissatisfied, 68 were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 207 were satisfied and 45 were very satisfied. The mean, median, and mode of the respondents' general job satisfaction were all equal to 78. The minimum and maximum scores were 20 and 100, respectively.

Weiss et al. (1967) suggest looking at the percentile scores when interpreting MSQ scores. A low level of satisfaction is reflected by percentile scores equal to 25 or less, a medium level by percentile scores between and including 26 and 74, and a high level is usually

Table 18

Total Variance Explained

Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings			
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.597	32.986	30.959
2	4.334	25.240	58.226

Table 19

Rotated Component Matrix, Communalities, Contributions of Components, and Proportion of Common Variances

	Components		
MSQ Scales	1	2	Communality
Achievement	**.806**	.356	.777
Responsibility	**.795**	.349	.753
Variety	**.784**	.287	.696
Social service	**.770**	.104	.604
Activity	**.763**	.314	.681
Ability utilization	**.752**	.333	.677
Creativity	**.688**	.150	.495
Independence	**.669**	.174	.477
Authority	**.592**	.359	.479
Social status	**.579**	.414	.507
Moral values	**.565**	.462	.533
Co-worker	**.505**	.363	.386
Supervision-human relations	.159	**.837**	.726
Supervision-technical	.219	**.826**	.730
Company policies and practices	.284	**.805**	.729
Recognition	.413	**.715**	.682
Advancement	.276	**.673**	.529
Compensation	.175	**.607**	.399
Security	.453	**.473**	.429
Working conditions	.379	**.461**	.356
Contribution of component	6.597	5.048	11.645
Proportion of common variance	.567	.433	1.000

Table 20

Hierarchy of MSQ Scales

Scales	Mean	SD
Social service	22.30	2.93
Creativity	21.28	3.99
Achievement	21.26	3.23
Activity	20.94	3.08
Ability utilization	20.80	3.63
Security	20.69	3.53
Responsibility	20.64	3.13
Variety	20.49	2.99
Moral values	20.45	3.17
Co-workers	19.96	3.71
Independence	19.76	3.53
Working conditions	19.22	4.45
Authority	18.88	2.97
Social status	18.45	3.43
Supervision-human relations	18.33	5.34
Recognition	17.95	4.75
Supervision-technical	17.88	4.79
Advancement	16.60	4.44
Compensation	16.27	5.16
Company policies and practices	15.75	5.14

Table 21

Frequencies and Percentages of Dissatisfaction/Satisfaction Ratings of 20 Job Facets as Measured by the MSQ (N = 326)

	Very dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied		Satisfied		Very satisfied	
Job facets	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ability utilization	3	0.9	10	3.1	24	7.4	181	55.5	108	33.1
Achievement	2	0.6	7	2.1	21	6.4	174	53.4	122	37.4
Activity	1	0.3	3	0.9	30	9.2	190	58.3	102	31.3
Advancement	11	3.4	51	15.6	105	32.2	137	42.0	22	6.8
Authority	1	0.3	3	0.9	104	31.9	184	56.5	34	10.4
Company policies and practices	12	3.7	90	27.6	88	27.0	107	32.8	29	8.9
Compensation	18	5.5	71	21.8	74	22.7	135	41.4	28	8.6
Co-workers	4	1.2	11	3.4	43	13.2	182	55.8	86	26.4
Creativity	2	0.6	5	1.5	28	8.6	173	53.1	118	36.2
Independence	1	0.3	10	3.0	61	18.7	176	54.0	78	23.9
Moral value	2	0.6	7	2.1	42	12.9	197	60.4	78	23.9
Recognition	7	2.1	42	12.9	85	26.1	138	42.3	54	16.6
Responsibility	2	0.6	4	1.2	32	9.8	195	59.8	93	28.5
Security	4	1.2	4	1.2	37	11.4	163	50.0	118	36.2
Social service	2	0.6	3	0.9	6	1.8	147	45.1	168	51.5
Social status	2	0.6	9	2.8	118	36.2	154	47.2	43	13.2
Supervision-human relations	15	4.6	37	11.4	60	18.4	138	42.3	76	23.3
Supervision-technical	9	2.8	40	12.3	82	25.1	136	41.7	59	18.1
Variety	2	0.6	4	1.2	29	8.9	211	64.8	80	24.5
Working conditions	7	2.1	27	8.3	43	13.2	179	54.9	70	21.5

Table 22

Frequencies, Percentages, and Summary Statistics of Dissatisfaction/Satisfaction Ratings for General Job Satisfaction

General job satisfaction	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative percent
Very dissatisfied	1	.3	.3
Dissatisfied	5	1.5	1.8
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	68	20.9	22.7
Satisfied	207	63.5	86.2
Very satisfied	45	13.8	100.0
Total	326	100.0	
Summary Statistics			
Mean = 78	Median = 78	Mode = 78	
Standard deviation = 10.97			
Range = 80	Minimum = 20	Maximum = 100	

represented by a percentile score equal to 75 and above. Table 23 shows that approximately one fourth of the participants reported a low satisfaction level, two fourths a medium satisfaction level, and one fourth a high satisfaction level. The score ranges for the low, medium, and high percentiles were <= 71, 72 – 84, and >= 85, respectively.

Multiple Regression Analysis

A multiple regression model was constructed to describe the relationship between specified personal and unit characteristics and general job satisfaction. Personal variables included age, gender, highest degree obtained, annual salary, number of credit hours taught, average number of work hours as chair, number of years as chair in current position, and total number of years as chair. Unit characteristics included unit focus, and number of full-time and part-time faculty, staff, and students enrolled in the unit.

Prior to analysis a correlation matrix was constructed (see Table 24) to aid in the detection of multicollinearity among the variables. Strong correlations were identified between the variables “number of years as chair in current position” and “total number of years as chair” ($r = .90$) as well as the variables “number of full-time and part-time faculty supervised” and “number of full-time and part-time students enrolled” ($r = .79$). Because of the strong correlations, variance inflation factors were computed. Since the highest variance inflation factor (VIF = 5.680) was under ten, high multicollinearity did not appear to be a problem.

The overall regression equation was statistically not significant (see Table 25). The independent variables as a set accounted for only 5.2% of the variance in general job satisfaction. The variable “number of staff supervised” appeared to be the only significant source of variance in general job satisfaction. A possible explanation of the regression results might be found by considering general job satisfaction, the dependent variable.

General job satisfaction was measured based on the sum of 20 MSQ items. As shown in Table 26, the correlation coefficients among the 20 items used to compute general job satisfaction indicate a generally low degree of relationship among the items. Given these low degrees of relationships among the items, it is possible for individuals’ general job satisfaction scores to be relatively high even though the individuals are very dissatisfied with one or more job facets. For example, participants could have responded with “very dissatisfied” to items such as compensation and advancement and with “very satisfied” to all other 18 items. In this example, the participants’ computed general satisfaction scores of 92 would indicate the individuals to be “very satisfied” even though they were “very dissatisfied” with two job facets. When computing general job satisfaction, the possibility that scores reflecting satisfaction can cancel out scores reflecting dissatisfaction offers an explanation of the low variance in the dependent variable and, therefore, the statistically not significant result of the regression analysis.

Table 23

Levels of General Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction level	Percentile	Score range	Frequency	Percent
Low	<= 25	<= 71	83	25.5
Medium	26 – 74	72 – 84	161	49.3
High	>= 75	>= 85	82	25.2
Total			326	100.0

Table 24

Correlation Coefficients Among Person Characteristics, Unit Characteristics, and General Job Satisfaction

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	1.00	-.14	.14	.21	-.01	-.00	.29	.33	-.03	.07	.03	.08	.04
2. Gender		1.00	.05	-.15	-.11	.10	.16	.18	.00	.04	-.13	-.01	.03
3. Highest degree			1.00	.29	.20	.09	-.02	.02	-.23	.26	.03	.26	-.03
4. Annual salary				1.00	-.03	.17	.14	.19	-.03	.19	.10	.26	.09
5. Number of credit hours taught					1.00	-.42	.03	.02	.01	-.37	-.18	-.32	-.04
6. Average number of work hours as chair						1.00	-.01	.01	.06	.30	.22	.18	.04
7. Number of years as chair in current position							1.00	**.90**	.02	-.04	.10	-.03	.10
8. Total number of years as chair								1.00	.00	.01	.12	.02	.11
9. Unit focus									1.00	-.11	.02	-.13	-.01
10. Number of full-time and part-time faculty supervised										1.00	.29	**.79**	.00
11. Number of full-time and part-time staff supervised											1.00	.27	.13
12. Number of full-time and part-time students enrolled												1.00	.07
13. General job satisfaction													1.00

Note. The descriptions of the variables numbered and shown vertically in the first column of the table correspond to the numbers shown horizontally in the table's first row.

Table 25

Multiple Regression Analysis of General Job Satisfaction on Personal and Unit Characteristics

Source of Variation	Df	SS	MS	F-ratio	F-prob
Regression	12	1741.947	145.162	1.320	.206
Residual	289	31788.983	156.850		

Multiple R = .228

R^2 = .052

Variable	b	β	t-ratio	Sig. T
Age	.012	.008	.135	.893
Gender	1.714	.080	1.329	.185
Highest degree obtained	-.782	-.080	-1.246	.214
Annual salary from current position	1.186	.086	1.337	.182
Number of credit hours taught	-.046	-.029	-.434	.664
Average number of work hours as chair	.011	.017	.251	.802
Number of years in current position	.062	.040	.298	.766
Total number of years as chair	.077	.052	.379	.705
Unit focus	-.534	-.030	-.513	.609
Number of faculty supervised	-.069	-.179	-1.822	.070
Number of staff supervised	.149	.123	1.979	.049*
Number of students enrolled	.001	.160	1.668	.096

Note. * Significant at the .05 level of confidence. b = Unstandardized Coefficients β = Standardized Coefficients.

Table 26

Correlation Coefficients Among Items Used to Compute General Job Satisfaction

Item numbers	Item numbers																			
	24	25	28	30	35	43	51	61	66	67	69	72	74	77	82	93	96	98	99	100
24. Independence	1.00	.35	.31	.21	.24	.33	.16	.28	.32	.45	.20	.13	.31	.35	.41	.23	.25	.35	.36	.07
25. Variety		1.00	.38	.19	.26	.46	.34	.43	.31	.47	.25	.22	.29	.46	.53	.22	.25	.38	.45	.48
28. Social Status			1.00	.32	.31	.34	.23	.28	.53	.38	.28	.26	.31	.36	.37	.25	.28	.43	.36	.38
30. Supervision-human relations				1.00	.80	.27	.28	.24	.25	.32	.56	.23	.35	.33	.25	.30	.32	.50	.32	.32
35. Supervision-technical					1.00	.35	.26	.29	.33	.38	.52	.25	.38	.32	.34	.31	.32	.48	.37	.37
43. Moral values						1.00	.38	.48	.34	.40	.38	.14	.20	.47	.52	.22	.33	.30	.40	.46
51. Security							1.00	.34	.24	.35	.30	.30	.29	.40	.34	.29	.31	.24	.34	.44
61. Social service								1.00	.28	.51	.23	.15	.22	.46	.55	.26	.24	.31	.48	.49
66. Authority									1.00	.28	.26	.23	.31	.26	.30	.19	.33	.34	.22	.38
67. Ability utilization										1.00	.39	.29	.31	.53	.64	.40	.33	.47	.64	.46
69. Company policies and practices											1.00	.40	.46	.37	.32	.37	.36	.59	.40	.34
72. Compensation												1.00	.46	.27	.27	.37	.24	.48	.31	.25
74. Advancement													1.00	.24	.30	.36	.30	.49	.39	.27
77. Responsibility														1.00	.70	.27	.38	.40	.45	.46
82. Creativity															1.00	.34	.35	.42	.58	.45
93. Working conditions																1.00	.25	.40	.43	.43
96. Co-workers																	1.00	.28	.31	.28
98. Recognition																		1.00	.60	.42
99. Achievement																			1.00	.52
100. Activity																				1.00

Note. The row labels contained in the first column are the names and numbers of the 20 MSQ items that are used to compute the general job satisfaction scale. The column labels across correspond to the same MSQ items.

Summary of Findings

Research Question 1: What are the personal characteristics of chairpersons?

The typical participant of this study was a 50-59 year old male, who had earned a master's degree. He received an annual salary between $40,001 and $60,000 from his current position. The chair was most likely to teach nine credit hours and spend an average of 34 hours engaging in non-teaching tasks during a typical week. The chair had held his current position an average of eight years and he had an average of nine years total experience as a chair. The future plans of the chairs were to stay in the same position at the same community college.

Research Question 2: What are the characteristics of the units chaired

The typical participant was responsible for an academic/college transfer unit. The chair supervised an average of 25 full-time and part-time faculty and an average of five staff members. An average of 1,013 full-time and part-time students were enrolled in the unit he/she supervised.

Research Question 3: What level of job satisfaction do chairpersons perceive with each of the 20 job facets measured by the MSQ?

Considering the mean score of each facet, the chairpersons appeared to be satisfied with 17 job facets. Job facets of relatively greater satisfaction included social service, creativity, and achievement as reflected by the means of 22.30, 21.28, 21.26, respectively. Job facets of relatively lesser satisfaction included advancement, compensation, and company policies and practices as reflected by their means of 16.60, 16.27, and 15.75, respectively. Among the 326 respondents, and expressed in absolute numbers, 62 (19%) chairs were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with "the chances for advancement," 89 (27%) with "the pay and amount of work they do," and 102 (31%) with the way company policies are put into practice."

Research Question 4: What level of general job satisfaction do community college chairpersons perceive as measured by the MSQ?

In terms of absolute levels of satisfaction within the study group itself, only six among the 326 chairs expressed levels of dissatisfaction, 68 indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 207 were satisfied and 45 were very satisfied. The mean score of the respondents' general job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ was 78. This mean score reflected that chairs were generally satisfied with their jobs.

Research Question 5: What is the effect of selected personal/unit characteristics on general job satisfaction?

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between selected personal/unit characteristics and general job satisfaction. Selected personal characteristics were age, gender, highest degree earned, annual salary, total number of years as chairperson, credit hours taught, and number of hours spent per week as chair. Unit characteristics were main focus of the unit (academic/transfer, occupational/technical), number

of students enrolled in the unit, numbers of faculty and staff supervised in the unit. The overall regression equation was statistically not significant. The independent variables as a set accounted for only 5.2% of the variance in general job satisfaction. The variable “number of staff supervised” appeared to be the only significant source of variance in general job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

Purpose

The general purpose of this study was twofold. One, the study was to document facet specific and general job satisfaction levels of community college chairpersons. Two, the study was to investigate whether a relationship existed between selected personal/unit characteristics and general job satisfaction. The following questions were addressed:

1. What are selected personal characteristics of community college chairpersons?
2. What are selected characteristics of the units chaired?
3. What level of satisfaction do chairpersons perceive with each of the twenty job facets as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (MSQ)?
4. What level of general job satisfaction do chairpersons perceive as measured by the MSQ?
5. What is the effect of selected personal/unit characteristics on general job satisfaction?

Methodology

A sample of 807 community college chairpersons was systematically selected from a population of 9,866 chairpersons. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (Weiss et al., 1967) was chosen to measure satisfaction levels of 20 job facets and general job satisfaction. A data form was used to collect information about selected personal and unit characteristics. Data collection included an initial mailing on April 21, 1999, a follow-up letter on May 11, 1999, and a second mailing on June 4, 1999. The student version 9.0 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1999) was used for statistical analyses. Reliability coefficients were computed for the 20 MSQ job facet scales and the general job satisfaction scale. Factor analyses were conducted to investigate the content validity of the MSQ. Frequencies, percentages, and summary statistics were computed for selected personal characteristics of chairpersons and the units that they chaired. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each job-facet scale. The scores of general job satisfaction levels were computed by summing the response weights across the appropriate items for each participant. Measures of central tendency and dispersion were also computed for general job satisfaction. To facilitate a comparison of chairpersons' general job satisfaction levels with the levels of a norm group consisting of managers, the satisfaction levels of equal to and below the 25^{th} percentile, between 26^{th} and 74^{th} percentile, and equal to and above the 75^{th} percentile were computed. A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between selected personal/unit characteristics and general job satisfaction.

Discussion

Interpretations of this study's findings warrant caution because the sample was not randomly selected but systematically. Even though the return rate of the usable surveys (40.3%) was not high, it compares favorably with return rates of other studies concerning job satisfaction in community colleges (Hill, 1983: 42%; Hill, 1986: 45%; Hutton & Job, 1985: 39%; and Murray & Murray, 1998: 47%).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

The MSQ was selected because it allowed the computation of more facet-specific levels of job satisfaction than any other reputable instrument as well as the computation of general job satisfaction. Furthermore, the instrument has been used in a variety of settings, is nationally recognized, and has been reported as being reliable and valid (Cook, 1981).

After conducting the study and based on feedback of respondents, this researcher cautions the selection of the MSQ for a highly educated group such as chairpersons. Even though not requested, some respondents felt strongly enough to comment positively or negatively on the survey. The negative comments mainly pertained to the repetitiveness of the 100 MSQ items and were made mostly by individuals who did not finish the survey. The positive comments focused on the respondents' interest in the findings of the study.

To investigate the content validity of the MSQ, a factor analysis was conducted. Expectations, based on the factor analytic information in the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), included the emergence of two factors. Factor one was to represent intrinsic satisfaction and factor two was to represent extrinsic satisfaction. Not all items loaded as expected. "Moral values" and "working conditions," representing one intrinsic and one extrinsic satisfaction aspect, loaded on a third factor. Furthermore, "security" lacked a strong association with a factor. Isaac and Michael (1990) suggest that to have a meaningful factor, at least three items should load on it.

A decision was made to repeat the factor analysis with one difference—the number of factors to be extracted was specified as two. This decision was also supported by the fact that the initial eigenvalue of factor three, 1.123, was close to one. The SPSS Base 9.0 Applications Guide (1990) states: "Often, for real data, there may be one or more eigenvalues close to one, so you may need to request fewer factors than expected by default" (p. 329). The second factor analysis strengthened the association between the security item and factors one and two. Moral values now loaded most heavily on factor one and working conditions on factor two. The results of the second analysis support the two-factor solution.

Personal Characteristics of Community College Chairpersons

Two-thirds of the chairs in this study were 50 years old or older. Assuming that individuals retire with 65, community colleges will have to replace a large number of chairs over the next ten to fifteen years. This will present a challenge to community colleges for several reasons. One, there is no career track leading to the chair position (Institute for Future Studies,

1990). Two, traditionally chairs have moved to their positions from the faculty ranks, often without prior administrative experience (Seagren et. al., 1993). The faculty is graying. Since they are retiring in large numbers too, the recruitment pool will shrink further.

In this study, 42% of the participants were female and 58% were male. The community colleges, therefore, seem to provide leadership opportunities to both men and women. The participants appeared to be highly educated with 57% holding a master's degree and 31% holding a doctorate. Almost 50% of the chairs earned a salary between $40,001 and $60,000. Another 35% earned a salary of more than $60,000 but less than $80,000.

Community college chairs taught an average of nine credit hours per semester and spent an average of 34 hours per week on chair-related duties. With respect to credit hours taught during one term, 14% of the chairs did not teach. One-third of the chairs did spend 41 hours or more on chair-related tasks per week. Given the workload information, many chairs' time commitment seems to exceed a standard 40-hour week.

In terms of experience, 44% of the participants were in their current position 5 years or less. With respect to total number of years as chair, slightly over 36% of the chairs had five years of experience or less. The professional plans of the chairs included 66% among them planning to stay at the same community college for the next five years and 27% planning to retire. Among the chairs that planned to stay in the community college, 46% wanted to remain in a chair position. Considering the professional plans of current chairs, 186 out of 326 (57%) positions will have to be filled again within the next five years.

The personal characteristics of the community college chairpersons in this study are very similar to the characteristics identified in the studies by Seagren et al. (1994) and Murray and Murray (1998). In all three studies, almost 60% of the participants were males and approximately 80% were between 40 and 59 years of age. With respect to education, 91.1% of the participants of this study held a graduate degree that compares to 87% in the Seagren et al. study and to 88% in the Murray and Murray study. Considering percentages, more chairpersons (31%) in this study held a doctorate compared to the other two studies that reflected percentages of 24 (Seagren et al., 1994) and 27 (Murray & Murray, 1998). This result is consistent with the community college expectation for chairpersons to hold a doctorate.

Characteristics of Units Chaired

The choices of the variable "main focus of the units chaired" included academic/college transfer and occupational/technical. The majority of the units (53%) focused mainly on academic/college transfer areas and 41% focused on occupational/technical areas. The rest of the units (6%) focused on both areas. The units enrolled as many as 11,916 part-time and full-time students and as few as two. The average enrollment was 1,013 students. The number of faculty, again no distinction between part-time and full-time was made, ranged from 10 or less (33%) to over 80 (4%) with an average number of 25. Over 60% of the units had twenty faculty or less assigned to them. Almost 65% of the units had three or less support staff assigned to them. Only four units had more than 30 support staff and the average number was five.

Job Facet Satisfaction

The community college chairpersons of this study were satisfied with 17 facets of the 20 job facets as measured by the MSQ. The chairpersons were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with three facets. "The chance to do things for other people" (social service) provided the chairpersons with the highest level of satisfaction. This job facet was closely followed by "the chance to try my own methods of doing the job" (creativity) and then by "the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job" (achievement). The chairpersons experienced the least job satisfaction with "the way company policies are put into practice" (company policies and practices). This facet was preceded by "my pay and the amount of work I do" (compensation) and "the chances for advancement on this job" (advancement).

The results of this study's job facet satisfaction levels can be compared to the only other identified study dedicated solely to the job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. Murray and Murray (1998) investigated the levels of ten satisfaction factors based on a job satisfaction scale adapted from Wood (1976). Their findings indicated chairpersons were satisfied with three of the ten facets investigated. The three facets were work itself, interpersonal relations, and achievement. The other seven facets reflected each a "neutral" level of satisfaction that is similar to the MSQ's response choice "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied." The chairpersons in the Murray and Murray study expressed the least satisfaction with policy/administration, growth, and salary, the three facets with which this study's participants also expressed the least satisfaction.

Job facet satisfaction: Chairpersons versus managers. The Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967) provides mean scores for facet level satisfaction of managers. The most important role of chairpersons is that of manager (Welch, 1996). Comparing the mean scores of community college chairpersons with the mean scores of managers from business and industry, it was observed that the mean score for social service was the only mean score higher for chairs than for managers. The managers experienced the highest levels of satisfaction with "being able to do things that don't go against my conscience" (moral values), "being able to keep busy all the time" (activity), and "the way my job provides for steady employment" (security). These three top job facet satisfaction levels for managers differed from the three top levels of chairpersons that were social service, creativity and achievement. On the other hand, the three lowest job facet satisfaction levels for chairpersons—advancement, compensation, and company policies and practices—also reflected the lowest satisfaction levels for managers even though the ranking differed—company policies and practices, advancement, and compensation.

General Job Satisfaction

The findings of this study suggest that community college chairs are generally satisfied with their jobs. This result is congruent with the result of the only other study dedicated solely to the job satisfaction of community college chairs (Murray & Murray, 1998). The chairs' general job satisfaction level appears also similar to levels previously documented for community college faculty (e.g. Chieffo, 1991; McBride et al., 1992; Truell et al., 1998) and community college counselors (Coll & Rice, 1990).

A nationwide employee survey Americans at Work conducted by the Gallup Organization for INC. magazine in 1995 (Seglin, 1996) documented that 71% of its participants rated their level of general job satisfaction with a 4 (satisfied) or 5 (extremely satisfied). The results of this study are similar to the ones of the national survey since 77.3 % of the chairpersons expressed being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their job.

General job satisfaction: Chairpersons versus managers. Even though the chairs' general job satisfaction mean of 78 is lower than the mean of 82 for "managers" (Weiss et al., 1967), both groups appear to be generally satisfied with their job. The mean score of general job satisfaction can also be interpreted in terms of relative satisfaction of chairs compared to managers. Based on this comparison, the chairs' overall job satisfaction was at the 35th percentile. Compared to the managers, only 18% of the chairpersons reported they had a high level of satisfaction; whereas, 38% reported they had a medium level of satisfaction, and 44% reported a low level of satisfaction.

General Job Satisfaction and Personal/Unit Characteristics

Eight personal characteristics and four unit characteristics were considered as possibly influencing chair job satisfaction. Using multiple regression, only one characteristic "number of staff supervised" significantly correlated with job satisfaction. It appears that the more staff a chair supervised, the higher was his/her general level of job satisfaction. This result makes sense because "number of staff supervised" included in this case assistants, secretaries, and work-study students. In a best-case scenario, each of these positions is there to support the position of a chair, making his/her job easier. For example, assistants can aid in course scheduling tasks, secretaries in the development of reports, and work-study students in answering phones and filing documents.

The following characteristics were not related to general job satisfaction: personal characteristics—age, gender, degree, salary, credit hours taught during a semester, average number of hours worked as chair in a typical week, number of years as chair in current position, total number of years as chair; unit characteristics—main unit focus, number of faculty supervised, number of staff, supervised, number of students enrolled.

Previous studies that included as a purpose the identification of predictors of job satisfaction in the community college environment included mostly faculty as participants. The results of this study are consistent as well as inconsistent with the results of several of the previous studies conducted in the community college environment.

Filan (1986) found age to be a positive predictor of job satisfaction among community college faculty. Konicek (1992) reported that older faculty was more satisfied than younger faculty. Hill (1983) determined that age was positively related to the administrative dimension of job satisfaction in a multiple regression analysis. Coll and Rice (1990) found that age was not related to job satisfaction.

Regarding gender, Hutton and Jobe (1985), Konicek (1992), and McKee (1991) found female faculty members to be more satisfied than male faculty members. On the other hand, Hill (1983) discovered the reverse to be true. In his study, women were less satisfied than men among the community college faculty. Consistent with the results of this study are the findings of Coll and Rice (1990), Milosheff (1990), and Filan (1986). They concluded that gender was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Regarding education, Hill (1983) found its level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The higher the degree level of a faculty member, the higher was his/her level of job satisfaction. Konicek (1992) expressed that "…faculty members with doctoral degrees were more satisfied with every aspect of their jobs than those holding a bachelor's or master's degree. This finding was significant" (p. 368). Milosheff (1990) stated, "….type of degree was not found to be significant" (p. 17).

Considering experience, the results of this study are not congruent with the findings of McKee (1991). She articulated in her study that, "A group with significantly lower job satisfaction is the group composed of faculty members who have been at their respective institutions for over 15 years" (McGee, 1991, p. 42).

Conclusions

The findings of this study show that community college chairpersons are generally satisfied with their jobs. A close view of specific job facets indicates the highest satisfaction levels to occur in the areas of social service, creativity, and achievement. Company policies and practices, compensation, and advancement are the facets reflecting the lowest satisfaction levels. Neither selected personal characteristics of chairpersons nor characteristics of the units they chair, with the exception of number of staff supervised, seem to influence the chairpersons' general level of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ. It appears that chairpersons' general level of job satisfaction increases with the number of staff they supervise. Since staff includes assistants, secretaries, and/or work-study students—individuals who can support chairpersons—the result is no surprise.

Recommendations for Practice

Like organizations in business and industry, community colleges want to retain and/or hire valuable, professionally committed chairpersons. Monitoring job satisfaction can aid in the achievement of that goal. Surveys should be administered periodically. Analysis of the feedback identifies areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Areas of satisfaction are reasons for celebration and can be communicated to all stakeholders with pride and ultimately enhance the reputation of the institution. Areas of dissatisfaction are signals for change. Committees can be formed with the assignment to develop action plans that will resolve problem areas if at all possible.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study provides information about the status of general and facet-specific job satisfaction among a systematically selected national sample of community college chairpersons using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form (MSQ). Due to the lack of a previously conducted study using the same methodology, neither changes nor trends could be identified. Therefore, it is recommended that this study be repeated in the future.

The MSQ is a standardized instrument that ranks, for example, how well one is satisfied in terms of one's feeling of achievement. The MSQ does not identify the reason of an individual's feeling of achievement. Because that kind of knowledge might be insightful and could be gained through a qualitative study, one is recommended.

This study identified only one characteristic that possibly influences chairpersons' general job satisfaction—the number of staff a chairperson supervises. It is recommended that future studies continue in the quest to identify factors that influence general job satisfaction of community college chairpersons. For example, it could be determined if a difference exists with respect to job satisfaction among chairpersons who can be classified as the Baby boomers because they were born between 1946 and 1964, and Generation Xers, who include the chairs born after 1964.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(5), 422-436.

Bedeian, A. G., Ferris, G. R., & Kacmear, K. M. (1992, February). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33-48.

Benoit, R., & Smith, A. (1980). Demographic and job satisfaction characteristics of Florida community college faculty. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 4(3), 263-276.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 396-424.

Bruce, W. M., & Blackburn, J. W. (1992). Balancing job satisfaction and performance. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Carrell, M., & Elbert, N. (1974). Some personal and organizational determinants of job satisfaction of postal clerks. Academy of Management Journal, 17(2), 368-373.

Cherrington, D., Nyal, D., & McMullin, B. (1989). Organizational behavior. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Chieffo, A. M. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community leadership teams. Community College Review, 19(2), 15-24.

Cohen, A. M. (1974). Community college faculty job satisfaction. Research in Higher Education, 2(4), 369-376.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1994). Managing community colleges. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, A. M., & Friedlander, J. (1980). What do instructors want? Community College Review, 7(3), 66-72.

Coll, K., & Rice, R. (1990). Job satisfaction among community college counselors. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 14(2), 83-91.

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). The experience of work: A compendium and review of 249 measures and their use. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. New York: Lexington Books.

D'Arcy, C., Syrotuik, J., & Siddique, C. M. (1984). Perceived job attributes, job satisfaction and psychological distress: A comparison of working men and women. Human Relations, 37(8), 603-611.

DeSantis, V. S., & Durst, S. L. (1996). Comparing job satisfaction among public and private-sector employees. American Review of Public Administration, 26(3), 327-343.

DeVellis, R. F. (1991). Scale development: Theory and applications. Newburg Park: Sage Publications.

Diener, T. (1985). Community college job satisfaction. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 9(4), 347-357.

Filan, G. L., Morris A. O., & Witter, R. A. (1986). Influence of ascribed and achieved social statuses, values and rewards on job satisfaction among community college faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10(2), 113-122.

Finely, C. E. (1991). The relationship between unionization and job satisfaction among two-year college faculty. Community College Review, 19(2), 53-60.

Fisher, C. D. (1980). On the dubious wisdom of expecting job satisfaction to correlate with performance. Academy of Management Review, 5(4), 607-612.

Friedlander, J. (1978). The relationship between general job satisfaction and specific work-activity satisfaction of community college faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 2(3), 227-39.

Gable, R. K., & Wolf, M. B. (1993). Instrument development in the affective domain (2nd ed.). Norwell, MA: Kluver Academic Publishers.

Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33(1), 61-81.

Golding, J., Resnick, A., & Crosky, F. (1983). Work satisfaction as a function of gender and job status. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3), 313-317.

Grau, M. R. (1997). An investigation of the job-related stressors of department chairpersons in a selected community college system. (Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 3379.

Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). Understanding job satisfaction. New York: The Macmillan Press, Ltd.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(2), 159-170.

Hammons, J. (1984). The department/division chairperson: Educational leader? Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 54(6), 14-19.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Publishers.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hill, E. A. (1986). Job satisfaction facets as predictors of commitment or withdrawal from the work organization among selected community college faculty in New York state. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10(1), 1-11.

Hill, M. D. (1983). Some factors affecting the job satisfaction of community college faculty in Pennsylvania. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 7(4), 303-317.

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. E. (1996). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hulin, C. L., & Smith, P. C. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49(3), 209-216.

Hulin, C. L., & Smith, P. C. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48(2), 88-92.

Hutton, J. B., & Jobe, M. E. (1985). Job satisfaction of community college faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 9(4), 317-324.

Iiacqua, J. A., Schumacher, P., & Li, H. C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. Education, 116(1), 51-61.

Institute for Future Studies. (1990). Critical issues facing America's community colleges. Warren, MI: Macomb Press.

Institute for Future Studies. (1992). Critical issues facing America's community colleges. Warren, MI: Macomb Press.

Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M., & Paul, K. B. (1989). Constitution of a Job in General Scale: A comparison of global composite, and specific measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(2), 193-200.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1990). Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: EdITS Publishers.

Jackson, M. (1995). Analysis of the role of the division chairperson in the Alabama college system. (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, 2060.

Kellerman, E. A. (1996). The relationship between communication climate and job satisfaction as reported by Florida's community college department chairs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58, 2479.

Konicek, D. G. (1992). Community college faculty who conduct industry training activities: A job satisfaction study. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16(4), 361-372.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), The handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Locke, E. A., Fitzpatrick, W., & White, F. M. (1983). Job satisfaction and role clarity among university and college faculty. The Review of Higher Education, 6(4), 343-365.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

McBride, S. A., Munday, R. G., & Tunnell, J. (1992). Community college faculty and propensity to leave. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16(2), 157-165.

McKee, J. G. (1991). Leadership styles of community college presidents and faculty job satisfaction. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 15(1), 33-46.

Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. Community College Review, 18(1), 12-22.

Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler, E. F. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work life. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 5(3), 197-221.

Mobley, W. H. (1982). Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Monroe, C. R. (1972). Profile of the community college. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Murray, J. P., & Murray, J. I. (1998). Job satisfaction and the propensity to leave an institution among two-year college division chairpersons. Community College Review, 25(4), 45-59.

Peltason, J. W. (1984). Foreword. In A. Tucker, Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers (2nd ed., p. xi). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Quarstein, V. A., McAfee, R. B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. Human Relations, 45(8), 859-873.

Quinn, R. P., & Baldi de Mandilovitch, M. S. (1980). Education and job satisfaction, 1962-1977. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 29(2), 100-111.

Quinn, R. P., Staines, G. L., & McCullough, M. R. (1974). Job satisfaction: Is there a trend? Manpower Research Monograph No. 30, U.S. Department of Labor. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Riday, G. E., Bingham, R. D., & Harvey, T. R. (1985). Satisfaction of community college faculty: Exploding a myth. Community College Review, 12(3), 46-50.

Robbins, S. P. (1998). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Roznowski, M., & Hulin, C. (1992). The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal. In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), Job satisfaction (pp. 123-163). New York: Lexington Books.

Saleh, S. D., & Ottis, J. L. (1964). Age and level of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 17(4), 425-430.

Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S. K., & Wheeler, J. K. (1992). The role of opportunity in the conceptualization and measurement of job satisfaction. In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), Job satisfaction (pp. 53-68). New York: Lexington Books.

Schwab, D. P., & Cummings, L. L. (1970). Theories of performance and satisfaction: A review. Industrial Relations, 9(4), 408-430.

Seagren, A. T., Wheeler, D.W., Creswell, A. T., Miller, M. T., &Van-Horn Grassmeyer, K. (1994). Academic leadership in community colleges. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Seglin, J. L. (1996). The happiest workers in the world. Inc. Magazine. Retrieved November 26, 1997 from the World Wide Web: http:///www.inc.com/incmagzine/archives/27960621.html

Smith, A. B., & Stewart, G. (1998, April). The process of role transitioning of new community college department chairs in Texas. Paper presented at the annual national conference of the Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC), Miami, FL.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Smith, P. L., Smits, S. J., & Hoy, F. (1998). Employee work attitudes: The subtle influence of gender. Human Relations, 51(5), 649-666.

Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

SPSS 9.0 [Computer Software]. (1999). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

SPSS Base 9.0 User's Guide. (1999). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

Srivastva, D., Salipante, P. E., Cummings, T. G., Natz, W., Bigelow, J., & Waters, J. (1975). Job satisfaction and productivity. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve.

Thompson, D., & McNamara, J. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(1), 1-31.

Truell, A. D., Price, W. T., Jr., & Joyner, R. L. (1998). Job satisfaction among community college occupational-technical faculty. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22(2), 111-122.

Tucker, A. (1993). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers (3rd ed.). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

University of Minnesota. (1977). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: Author.

Vaughan, G. B. (1989). Leadership in transition: The community college presidency. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15(2), 212-240.

Weiss, D. J., Davis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.

Welch, G. (1996, February). Seasoned chairs and deans can learn new tricks. In The olympics of leadership: Overcoming obstacles, balancing skills, taking risks. Proceedings of the annual international conferences of the National Community College Chair Academy. Phoenix, AZ.

White, F. L. (1990). Thirteen years later: Perceived effects of collective bargaining on selected faculty-management relationships in California multi-community college districts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1990). Disseration Abstracts International, 51, 2955.

Williams, F. P. (1978). A study of differential perceptions of leadership behaviors of community college deans of instruction and their relationship to the job satisfaction of division/department chairpersons in Texas. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 2017.

Wood, O. R. (1976). A research project: Measuring job satisfaction of the community college staff. Community College Review, 3(3), 56-64.

Zeitz, G. (1990). Age and work satisfaction in a government agency: A situational perspective. Human Relations, 43(5), 419-438.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Letter from the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota granting permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Long Form

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts

Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344
612-625-2818
Fax: 612-626-2079

April 5, 1999

Jutta Green
New River Community College
P.O.Box 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

Dear Jutta Green:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire long form 1977 version for use in your research.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

APPENDIX B:

Data Form

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please respond to each item by checking (X) in the appropriate alternative or by entering the requested information.

1. Age on your last birthday:

2. Gender:
   - ❑ Male
   - ❑ Female

3. Highest level degree obtained:
   - ❑ Associate
   - ❑ Bachelor
   - ❑ Master's
   - ❑ Specialist/CAGS
   - ❑ Doctorate

4. Annual salary from current position:
   - ❑ $20,000 or less
   - ❑ $20,001-40,000
   - ❑ $40,001-60,000
   - ❑ $60,001-80,000
   - ❑ Over $80,000

5. Main focus of your unit (area, department, division):
   - ❑ Academic/College Transfer (AA, AS, AA&S)
   - ❑ Occupational/Technical (AAA, AAS, certificates, diplomas)

6. Number of credit hours you are teaching this semester/quarter: _____

7. Average number of hours you work in a typical week as chair (or comparable position):

8. Number of years as chair (or comparable position) in your **current** position on your last anniversary date: _____

9. Total number of years as chair (or comparable positions) on your last anniversary date:

10. Number of full-time and part-time **faculty** you supervise during a typical semester/quarter:

11. Number of full-time and part-time **staff** (assistants, secretaries, work-study students) you supervise during a typical semester/quarter:

12. Number of full-time and part-time **students** enrolled in your unit for a typical semester/quarter: _____

13. What are your professional plans in the next five years?
   - ❑ Stay at the same community college
   - ❑ Move to another community college
   - ❑ Move to a 4-year institution of higher education
   - ❑ Move to a position in the private sector
   - ❑ Retire
   - ❑ Other

14. If you plan to stay in community colleges, what are your career plans for the next five years?
   - ❑ Not applicable
   - ❑ Remain in the chair (or comparable) position
   - ❑ Move to a faculty position
   - ❑ Move to another administrative position
   - ❑ Other

PLEASE CONTINUE MARKING ON PAGE 4. Code #:

APPENDIX C:

Cover Letter, Initial Mailing

New River Community College
P.O. Box 1127
Dublin, Virginia 24084
April 20, 1999

«FirstName» «LastName»
«JobTitle»
«Company»
«CityStateZIP»

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»:

Your time is precious. Even though your daily allowance of seconds measures only 86,400, I hope that you will consider using some of them to participate in this nationwide survey among chairs and individuals in comparable positions in 2-year colleges. The primary purpose of this research is to assess your facet-specific levels of job satisfaction. Your answers will be valuable to fellow chairs, supervisors of chairs, and people considering chair positions. It will take only a short period to answer the simple questions on the enclosed questionnaire and to return it in the stamped reply envelope.

Through a selective sampling procedure, your name was one of 807 chosen among 8,066 chairs in 2-year colleges all over the United States. Your answers are important to the accuracy of the research. All answers are confidential and will be used only in combination with those of other chairs. A numerical coding system will be used to track responses.

The assessment of facet-specific levels of job satisfaction is the foundation of dissertation research I am currently conducting at Virginia Tech. If you have questions and/or are interested in receiving a report on the findings of the study, please contact me at (540) 674-3600, ext. 287 or via email at nrgreej@nr.cc.va.us. I anticipate completing this research by the end of May 1999 and will be glad to send you a report when ready.

A return of the completed survey by May 2, 1999, would be helpful. Thank you very much in advance for your participation. The enclosed ruler is not meant to be a micro-language lesson but a tiny token of my appreciation.

Sincerely

Jutta Green
Professor of Business Management

Enclosures

APPENDIX D:

Follow-up Letter

New River Community College
P. O. Box 1127
Dublin, VA 24084
May 11, 1999

«FirstName» «LastName»
«JobTitle»
«Company»
«CityStateZIP»

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»:

About three weeks ago a survey was mailed to you seeking input on your facet-specific levels of job satisfaction and some demographics. Please accept my sincere thanks if you have already completed and returned the survey. If not, can you please do so?

Your participation is meaningful. As indicated by your peers' numerous requests for the results of the study, interest exists about the job satisfaction of chairs. Teaching faculty can use the information about your facet-specific levels of satisfaction as a variable in the decision of whether or not to pursue a chair position. Your input might also be valuable to the supervisors of chairs. Knowledge can lead to change. Knowledge based on the input of many can be more powerful than knowledge based on the input of a few.

If by some chance you did not receive the survey, or it got misplaced, please call me at (540) 674-3600, extension 287, or email me at nrgreej@nr.cc.va.us. I will gladly send you another survey.

Sincerely,

Jutta Green
Professor of Business Management

APPENDIX E:

Cover Letter, Second Mailing

New River Community College
P.O. Box 1127
Dublin, VA 24084
Phone: (540) 674-3600, Ext. 4287
E-Mail: nrgreej@nr.cc.va.us
June 4, 1999

«FirstName» «LastName»
«JobTitle»
«Company»
«CityStateZIP»

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»:

Thank you for your recent message about the job satisfaction survey. Enclosed is another booklet. It would be great if you could return it within two to three days. Your help with this research is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jutta Green
Professor of Business Management

Enclosures

VITA

Jutta Green
425 Warrior Drive
Christiansburg, VA 24073

Experience

Professor of Business Management. New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia, since fall 1997.

Associate Professor of Business Management. New River Community College, Dublin Virginia, fall 1994 – spring 1997.

Assistant Professor of Business Management. New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia, fall 1991 – spring 1994.

Instructor of Business Management and Marketing. New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia, spring 1990 – spring 1991.

Instructor of Management. Radford University, Radford, Virginia, fall 1988 – spring 1989.

Instructor of Business Administration. Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, Louisiana, fall 1987 – spring 1988 (full-time), fall 1984 – spring 1987 (part-time).

Instructor of German. Louisiana School for Math, Science and the Arts (a high school for gifted and talented juniors and seniors), Natchitoches, Louisiana, fall 1984 – spring 1987 (part-time).

Instructor of German. Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana, fall 1983 (part-time)

Financial Assistant. Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, Louisiana, spring 1984 – spring 1985 (part-time).

Export-Transportation Specialist. Maizena GMBH (a German subsidiary of CPC International), Heilbronn, Germany, July 1975 – December 1976.

Management Trainee. Goedecke KG (an organization comparable to Kroger), Heidelberg, Germany, August 1970 – November 1973.

Education

Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, fall 2000. Dissertation: *Job Satisfaction of Community College Chairpersons*.

Education Specialist in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, spring 1999, GPA 3.95.

Master of Business Administration. Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, Louisiana, spring 1986, GPA 3.47.

Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration. Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, Louisiana, summer 1982, GPA 3.27.

Honors

Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi. Accepted an invitation to become a member of the Society's Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University Chapter on October 23, 1996.

Chancellor's Fellowship. Received one of the annual fellowships awarded to no more than three outstanding professional educators by the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System for the 1996/97 academic year.

Virginia Phi Beta Lambda Outstanding Advisor of the Year Award. Accepted the award at the Phi Beta Lambda Spring State Leadership Conference in Staunton, Virginia (4/14/96).

Virginia Community Colleges Association (VCCA) Faculty Affairs Commission Showcase. Showcased at the VCCA Convention in Williamsburg, Virginia (1994).

Outstanding Faculty Member. Elected by the faculty of New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia (1993/94).

State Council of Higher Education in Virginia Outstanding Faculty Award Nominee. Nominated by the faculty of New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia (fall 1993).