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Abstract

As athletics continue to become a more significant part of higher education, sport employees have become a focus of job satisfaction in order to improve the overall work environment. Athletic Director satisfaction and perceptions have been deeply explored in research, but not much research has been done regarding media and communications professionals such as Sports Information Directors (SIDs). The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was used to gauge the satisfaction of 109 CoSIDA members at NCAA Division I institutions in the United States. Nine facets of job satisfaction are measured in the JSS, including pay, promotional opportunities, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, co-workers, nature of work, communication, and work conditions. The data from this preliminary study showed that SIDs are satisfied with their job overall, and most satisfied with supervision, nature of work, and co-workers. SIDs were found to be dissatisfied with both pay and promotion.
Introduction

Institutions of higher learning have been established all over the world to train and qualify individuals for a desired profession or career field. While the mission of many colleges and universities is to provide opportunities for intellectual development and mold students into global citizens, there are many other areas and programs within a college or university that ensure these goals are met (George, 2006; Kezar, 1999). Programs and services such as recreational sports, student-affairs, religious life, athletics, and many more are in place to enhance student learning outside of the classroom. These programs have the opportunity to create a positive education experience, teaching respect, responsibility, and other fundamental skills to prepare participants for the future in a diverse and global society.

Athletics

Athletics have become an increasingly significant part of higher education in the United States. Most institutions have an established athletic department that competes against other departments within a conference or region. Among the 2,000+ colleges and universities that offer athletics, the majority belong to one of three organizations: the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Junior College Athletic Association, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Weiner, 2009). Each organization serves as a governing body for the institutions that belong to it.

Athletics have been shown to offer brand equity and widespread recognition for their institution (Bozman, Friesner, McPherson & Chase, 2015), leading to increased student retention and enrollment and providing additional revenue through tuition fees, alumni gifts, and donations (Frye, Bozman, & Stotlar, 2002; Martinez, Stinson, Kang & Jubenville, 2010). In addition,
Johnson & Sack (1996) suggest that collegiate sport programs can impact the perception of the community, appearing more attractive for residency and business opportunity in the area.

Athletic departments were established to manage and maintain an individual school’s athletic programs. The strategic plan of an athletic department exists to motivate student athletes to develop into exemplary student-athletes (“Ohio State University”). Athletic departments are also committed to financial self-sufficiency while contributing to the university’s academic priorities (“Ohio State University”). According to Kihl, Leberman, and Schull (2010), duties and responsibilities of an athletic department include hiring coaches, management of facilities and athletic events, fiscal management, and marketing and promotions for teams and events.

Athletic administrators are perceived as the leaders of athletic departments (Stoldt, 2000). Administrators oversee and direct day-to-day operations to ensure that all the department responsibilities are completed. Administrator titles include Director of Athletics, Director of Game Operations, Director of Marketing and Promotions, Director of Compliance, and Sports Information Director.

Sports Information Director

A Sports Information Director (SID) can have various titles within an athletic department. At many institutions, responsibilities and tasks are dependent upon the size and emphasis on athletics at the institution. Other titles for an SID can include Associate Director of Athletics Communication, Assistant Athletic Director for Communications, and Director of Athletic Communications (“CoSIDA Directory”). College Sports Information Directors Association, or CoSIDA, is an organization made up of public relations, media relations, and communications and information professionals in all levels of intercollegiate athletics.
Sports Information Directors are responsible to manage the input of statistical data for each of their institution’s athletic teams (McGuire, 2011). Once the data from athletic events are collected and organized, the results must be published and communicated to the public. This can be done online using social media or an athletics website, and through television programming or print media. Technical and specialized skills are needed in order to perform these tasks in a timely fashion, thus, there is a need for Sports Information Directors to direct and maintain statistical operations and media communication in university athletic departments.

Job Responsibilities

An SID is responsible for all publicity concerning the athletic department and its constituents, as well as updating the website, statistics, and records. This includes creating media guides and programs for home athletic events, creating news releases and organizing press conferences, and coordinating media service for every sport offered by the institution (Stoldt, 2000; Helitzer, 1996; McGuire, 2011). An SID documents and publicizes the accomplishments of the athletes and teams that they represent, and serves as a primary public relations officer for the athletic department ("Job Profile: Sports Information Director").

The SID can serve as a liaison between the university and the national or local media, and their main objective is to enhance the image of the athletic department among the media and others affiliated with the university, including fans, personnel, future recruits, and alumni of the various programs (Stoldt, Miller, & Comfort, 2001; McGuire, 2011). As Senior Associate Athletic Director for Communications at the University of Utah, Liz Abel directs the public relations and publicity efforts of the athletic department, and manages the smaller communications divisions including new media and broadcast/video ("The Official Athletic Site of the University of Utah"). Rob Bentley, Assistant Athletic Director of Communications for
Challenges

The method by which sports fans consume mass media has rapidly changed with the development and accessibility of new technology. With the rising popularity of mobile devices and increased reliance on the internet for news and information among the general public, journalists and sports writers are transitioning to online forms of publishing to reach their potential consumers. With SIDs being responsible for writing game releases and maintaining the public image of the athletic department, they are now having to increase their emphasis on the department’s online presence, managing the website and social media accounts (Brewer, 2000).

Stoldt (2000), and Brewer (2000) found that sports information personnel feel undervalued by higher management, such as an Athletic Director (AD), in their responsibilities within their organizations, serving a technical role rather than managerial. Due to their perceived limited value, they can also feel left out of senior management teams and meetings. Stoldt found that while the majority of ADs surveyed include their SIDs in all of their senior staff meetings (77.9%), there were still several departments that did not include SIDs in any of their meetings (13.9%). In addition, 90.5% of ADs that included SIDs in their meetings felt that they made substantial contributions. Nevertheless, image and respect among the athletic department remain a point of concern for SIDs (“CoSIDA Workshop Survey Results,” 2000)

Job Satisfaction

The measurement of job satisfaction has been a heavily examined subject in published research (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969; Locke & Latham, 1976; Spector, 1985; Judge &
Church, 2000; Kaltenbaugh, 2009). However, the complexity and ambiguity of the term has led to a dynamic and evolving definition of what job satisfaction entails (Pettit, Goris, & Vaught, 1997). Locke (1976), defined job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences.” This state is the response to a job or the specific aspects of a job by an employee (Locke, 1976; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). According to Locke (1976), there are three major approaches to the cause of job attitudes: discrepancies between what the job offers and what the person expects, the degree to which individual values (desires or wants) are fulfilled, and the degree to which individual needs are met by a job. Job satisfaction was identified as the favorableness or unfavorableness with which employees view their work (Locke & Latham, 1990), and the feelings that employees have regarding their work environment and their expectations towards work (Balzar, Kihm, Smith, Invin, Bachiochi, & Robie, 1997). An examination of this literature suggests that an employee would determine their satisfaction based on their personal view of their work environment and expectations of the job, as well as the degree to which their wants and needs are met by the job.

Job Satisfaction of Sports Information Directors

Athletic Departments have a responsibility to provide a positive work environment for their employees. According to Morrison (2002), work environments can influence the satisfaction that one receives from a job. In a positive environment, employees feel that their work and contributions are valuable to the organization, which can increase the level of satisfaction they receive from the job (Pettit, Goris, & Vaught., 1997; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Rubin (1993) argues that when people’s needs are met through a satisfying work environment, they are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and remain in the position. However, just as a positive environment contributes to increased satisfaction and
retention, a counterproductive work environment can result in dissatisfaction with superiors, job duties and responsibilities, and the organization itself (Jablin & Krone, 1994).

Purpose of Study

Athletics on university campuses have been shown in previous research to impact school and community pride, recruitment, retention, and brand equity (Bozeman et al, 2015; Johnson & Sack, 1996; Frye, Bozeman, & Stotlar, 2002; Martinez et al, 2010). Research exists that examines the job satisfaction of administrators and employees of athletic departments, however, very little research has specifically examined the impact of the workplace environment on overall satisfaction of media and communication administrators, or Sports Information Directors. Given that the work performed by an SID is an important and essential part of the day-to-day operations and communications of the athletic department, the job satisfaction of these professionals should be observed and analyzed to determine what parts of the job they are satisfied or unsatisfied with, and how the results can impact the future of the SID profession.

Methodology

The following research questions were addressed to determine the degree to which Sports Information Directors at Division I NCAA institutions are satisfied with their job:

1. What issues do Sports Information Directors face during their regular course of duty?
2. What facets of their position are Sports Information Directors satisfied or unsatisfied with?
3. Are there ways to improve the satisfaction that Sports Information Directors receive from their job?
Participants and Procedures

The participants in this study were selected from the directory of the College Sports Information Directors of America (CoSIDA). Members from a list of all NCAA Division I schools were selected from the directory, and the first member on the list from each school was selected to participate. The total sample of selected participants was 341 Sports Information Professionals.

The CoSIDA directory contained email addresses for each potential participant, so distributing the survey through an email link was the chosen method of distribution. Once approval was received from the Human Subjects Review Board of Ashland University (Appendix A), a link to the JSS was created using Survey Monkey and sent to the participants of the study. The survey was sent in mid-December 2015 to 341 addresses, and 331 were deliverable. Three follow-up emails were sent at two week intervals to all participants. 118 surveys were returned, resulting in a 36% response rate. Nine participants did not respond to every question in the survey resulting in unusable data. A total of 109 complete data sets were used for this study.

Participants and their responses were kept anonymous and confidential due to the survey design, and demographic information was collected for reporting purposes only. The results of the survey are only available through a secure administrative Survey Monkey login, and the data will be kept for one year after the completion of the study.

Instrumentation

In order to assess the satisfaction of Sports Information Directors, Spector’s (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was distributed to the participants (Appendix B). The purpose of the JSS was to measure nine different facets that Spector believed to be an accurate measure of job
satisfaction for human service, public, and nonprofit organizations. In reviewing the literature, Spector (1985) determined that previous job satisfaction tests were not applicable to human services, nor were they broad enough in scope to cover all areas contributing to job satisfaction.

Spector determined there were nine facets of job satisfaction, including pay, promotional opportunities, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, supervision, co-workers, nature of work, communication, and work conditions. The JSS was developed with 36 statements, four for each facet, using a 6-point Likert-type scale. The six points represent a summated rating scale with responses from 1-6 representing a choice of disagree very much, disagree moderately, disagree slightly, agree slightly, agree moderately, and agree very much, respectively. To further improve the accuracy of the JSS, half of the statements posed in the survey were worded positively, while the other half were worded negatively. Questions written in the negative direction were reverse scored, meaning that the level of agreement with a negatively worded statement would be equal to the same level of disagreement. For scoring purposes in negatively worded statements, a 1 (disagree very much) is equivalent to a score of 6, a 2 gives a score of 5, etc. The four questions for each of the nine facets of job satisfaction allow for a minimum score of 4 and a maximum score of 24 in each. In total, scores can range from 36 to 216 for overall satisfaction.

Reliability

Spector developed the JSS survey to be normed and validated for human service personnel (Spector, 1985). Table 2 contains results of Spector’s norms, which have been used in a range of public and private human services organizations (Spector, 1997). Using a sample of 2,870 participants, internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) was conducted for each subscale, and found to be above the .50 mark suggested by Nunnally (1967). Test-retest data has
also demonstrated a great deal of consistency and reliability in measuring job satisfaction (Spector, 1985).

Validity

To test the validity of the job satisfaction subscales used in the JSS, a multitrait-multimethod analysis was conducted to compare the correlation between the JSS and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The JDI was chosen as a comparison because it is one of the most heavily validated job satisfaction scales, and the equivalent subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, coworkers, and nature of work of both surveys showed correlational values from .61 to .80 (Spector, 1985). The JSS has also been shown to correlate well with other job satisfaction survey instruments that contain similar subscales (Spector, 1997).

Results

Demographic information was collected from each respondent. Males made up 81.70% of the participants, while females were 17.40%. One participant chose not to identify their gender (.90%). In regard to age, 25.70% were between 18-25, 41.30% were age 26-35, 18.40% were 36-45, 12.80% were 46-55, and 1.80% were 60 or older. Most of the participants (35.78%) had been in the position for more than 6 years, with the next largest group (31.19%) between 1-3 years. In regard to time in the position, 25.70% of the participants had held their position for less than a year, and 7.30% were between 4-6 years. Public institutions made up 68.80% of those surveyed, while private institutions were 31.20%. Regarding the student population of the institutions, most schools (33.00%) had between 5,001 and 15,000 students. Institutions with 5,000 or less students made up 18.40% of the sample, while 15,001-25,000 took up 22.00%.
19.27% of the sample had a student population of 25,001-40,000, and 7.30% had over 40,000 students. Table 1 represents the demographic information collected.

Data from the survey was analyzed and descriptive statistics were collected. Mean scores were calculated from each of the nine facets of job satisfaction, as well as overall satisfaction. Satisfaction is determined based on the mean score relative to the mid-point of the scale (3.5). Scores above the mid-point represent satisfaction, while scores below the midpoint are facets that participants are dissatisfied with. Overall, participants were satisfied with their jobs, with an overall mean score of 3.98. Participants were satisfied (above 3.5) with supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. They were dissatisfied (below 3.5) with pay, promotion, and operating conditions. The highest mean score (4.83) came from supervision, with nature of work following closely after (4.80). The lowest mean score was given for pay (2.92), followed by promotion (3.32). Table 2 illustrates the results from each of the nine facets of job satisfaction compared to the norms of Spector’s previous studies. Spector’s norms are taken from over 115 studies that were published using his JSS. Satisfaction measures were determined to be more effective based on the midpoint of 3.5 rather than Spector’s norms due to the range of professions that have used the JSS.

Discussion

As shown in the results of this study, SIDs were highly satisfied with supervision, demonstrating that they generally enjoy the people they work for in their everyday duties. As an agent of the organization they work for, actions taken by a supervisor are regarded as actions taken by the organization itself (Levinson, 1965). A survey of perceived organizational support by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa (1986), demonstrated that employees feel that
Table 1  Demographic Characteristics of Sports Information Directors (N = 109)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sports Information Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not To Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 15,000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 – 25,000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 – 40,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they have a positive relationship with their organization when the organization demonstrates satisfaction with an employee as a member and with the work that they do, as well as demonstrating that they care about the employee’s goals, satisfaction, and concerns regarding their work. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) found that employees with strong positive relationships with their supervisors were likely to remain in their positions longer than those who did not. This research suggests that SID's feel that their supervisors and organizations are supportive of their values, concerns, and duties, and because of this, they are more likely to remain in their positions longer than employees without this level of support.
SIDs were also highly satisfied with coworkers. Typically, SIDs work more than 40 hours per week, and much of that time is spent in a work setting where many coworker interactions take place. High satisfaction with coworkers suggests that SID work together well with other employees and value their opinions and input on important situations. This also implies that SID know how their position fits into the functions of the athletic department in relation to their coworkers, and have a strong understanding of their own job duties, responsibilities, and requirements. Okediji, Etuk, and Anthony (2011) found that employees who felt their coworkers were more involved and conducive to the work environment were more satisfied than employees who did not feel that their coworkers were helpful contributors to the work environment. Based on these findings, high coworker satisfaction shows that SID likely feel that their coworkers are helpful contributors to the athletic department that they work for.

Another facet that SID was very satisfied with was nature of work. Nature of work has been shown to be one of the most important predictors of job satisfaction across different organizations and positions (Judge & Church, 2000). Kovach (1995), found that employees ranked interesting work higher than pay in regard to the most important attributes of a job. In contrast, supervisors and managers believed that good pay would be more important to their employees than having interesting work. This supports the survey data which showed that SID find their work interesting and enjoyable, and helps to explain their overall satisfaction with their job.

Pay and promotion were the only two facets that SID indicated for dissatisfaction with their job. Henne and Locke (1985) stated that employees want fairness in pay compared with those who hold similar positions and complete similar tasks. More recently, the Job Satisfaction and Engagement Report conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (2015)
showed that 57% of employees felt that being paid competitively to the local market was very important, with very important being the highest value on their Likert scale survey. While this study found that SIDs like the work that they do, they may feel that the work they do is underappreciated and they deserve more pay than they receive.

Dissatisfaction with promotion shows that SIDs do not feel that they have enough opportunity to advance in their career. Employees want fairness and clear understanding of how the promotion system works, and to be available for a position if they desire a promotion (Henne & Locke 1985). As Stoldt (2000) identified, SIDs often feel left out of important decision making and managerial tasks, so they may not be earning the right experiences in order to be promoted. This is consistent with the findings of Moore (2012), who found that athletic communications professionals that didn’t hold a managerial role had less strategic influence in their organization, having less opportunity to demonstrate their management abilities. If athletic departments include SIDs more frequently in managerial activities and senior level meetings, SIDs may become more able to demonstrate their value to the athletic department, and therefore be more qualified to hold a higher level management position.

Implications/Recommendations

This paper was intended as a preliminary study, and only identified the descriptive statistics and demographic information of the participants. Further research could examine the relationships between variables to find any significant correlations, as well as looking at job satisfaction in regard to specific demographic groups. This study could be used to affirm or oppose, in regard to SIDs, the findings of Okediji, Etuk, and Anthony (2011), that supervisor support and coworker involvement are strong indicators of employee job satisfaction by completing a regression analysis of the data. Satisfaction of specific groups of individuals can be
compared and contrasted to draw further conclusions for the results of this study, such as job satisfaction for men in this position compared to women, schools with a large student body versus schools with a small student body, and those who have been in the position for several years compared to those who had just started in their positions recently. Job titles could also be examined. For example, studies could hypothesize that employees holding Associate/Assistant Athletic Director positions are more satisfied with areas such as pay and promotion than those with the title of Director of Media Relations/Communications, SID, or other related departmental positions.

Further studies could broaden the scope of this research by using SIDs from all NCAA divisions, or other organizations such as the NAIA and NCCAA, and to draw comparisons between each. Division II and III schools may have smaller athletic departments, creating more work for each of the employees than schools with more positions available. This could have a strong impact on the job satisfaction of these employees if they earn a similar salary to those in comparable positions that have fewer work tasks to do. Different governing bodies from the NCAA may also have different policies and expectations for their athletic departments, creating a different individual work experience, especially in regard to facets such as promotional opportunities, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, nature of work, communication, and work conditions.

Qualitative data could be gathered to build upon the results of this quantitative study. Interviews with SIDs in regard to satisfaction with their jobs could be conducted, and common trends could be gathered and analyzed to add credibility to the results of this study, or to refute them. Open-ended responses could also give opinions from professionals in this field on how to improve the overall satisfaction of these employees, as well as satisfaction with each of the nine
facets. An interview could also be beneficial in receiving an employee’s own perceptions of their job, potentially revealing a different result than was gathered through the survey instrument.

Limitations

There were limitations to this study. The first is that this was an attitudinal study, in which the answers to satisfaction questions could vary based on the individual’s feelings and attitudes at the time of taking the survey. In addition, the 36% response rate could raise concerns in regard to response bias, however, Moore’s (2012) dissertation which had the full cooperation of CoSIDA in reaching their members only received a response rate of 13.2%. With Moore being the only prior study to use CoSIDA members as participants, the 36% response rate from this study appears to be acceptable. Finally, the survey instrument itself could be a limitation, as it was a generalized survey for all human service employees, rather than a survey created specifically for collegiate sport employees.

Conclusion

The results gathered from this study demonstrate that Sports Information Directors from Division I NCAA schools are generally satisfied with their profession overall. SIDs are most highly satisfied with supervision, co-workers, and nature of work, and dissatisfied with both pay and promotion. This study was important for determining how specific positions in athletic departments can be improved in order to create a better work environment for an integral part of campus life at colleges and universities. Further research is needed to determine specific solutions to the problems addressed in this study regarding pay and promotion variables in job satisfaction, and to determine the impact of demographic differences on satisfaction.
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### Appendix B

Items of the Job Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Wording Direction</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Raises are too few and far between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20  2  +  People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.
21  3  -  My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.
22  4  +  The benefit package we have is equitable.
23  5  -  There are few rewards for those who work here.
24  6  -  I have too much to do at work.
25  7  +  I enjoy my co-workers.
26  9  -  I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.
27  8  +  I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.
28  1  +  I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.
29  4  -  There are benefits we do not have which we should have.
30  3  +  I like my supervisor.
31  6  -  I have too much paperwork.
32  5  -  I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.
33  2  +  I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.
34  7  -  There is too much bickering and fighting at work.
35  8  +  My job is enjoyable.
36  9  -  Work assignments are often not fully explained.

*Subscale numbers refer to order in Table 2. Response choices are scored as 1 = disagree very much, 2 = disagree moderately, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = agree slightly, 5 = agree moderately, 6 = agree very much. All items with wording directions marked - should be reverse scored.*
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