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INTRODUCTION

The Morrill Act of 1862 established the land-grant institution system in the United States. The act, and a companion Morrill Act of 1890, resulted in a system of 74 colleges and universities with the three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service. Another act of Congress, the Hatch Act of 1887, established agricultural experiment stations affiliated with the land-grant institutes to carry out research activities related to agriculture (Mooney, 1987). The third action, designed to create an entity to disseminate the teaching and research from the land-grant university to residents of the states, was the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which established the Extension Service (Norland, in press). These four acts have resulted in a system in each state that provides funding sources for faculty of the land-grant universities.

In certain colleges at land-grant universities, faculty members often hold what are known as "split" appointments. Official split appointments are representative of budgetary support for the faculty member's position from at least two sources. The sources of funding are the university's general funds for resident instruction, the state
agricultural experiment station for conducting research, and the Cooperative Extension Service for conducting Extension educational programs. Faculty members with split appointments will have a percentage of their work time assigned to one of the three sources with the expectation that their work output will match those percentages. Faculty may also have 100% appointments in resident instruction, research, or extension. More likely though, are split appointments of resident instruction/research, resident instruction/extension, research/extension, or resident instruction/research/extension. The percentages for each of the budget sources included in a split appointment will vary based on the job description of individual faculty member.

At The Ohio State University, the land-grant institute for the State of Ohio, four colleges have faculty members who commonly hold split appointments. They are the College of Agriculture, College of Biological Sciences, College of Human Ecology, and College of Veterinary Medicine. The budgetary sources for these splits are: the University (resident instruction), the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (research), and the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (extension). In addition to the responsibilities of resident instruction, research, and service that all faculty members at the land-grant university have, individuals with split appointments are
also responsible for balancing their work duties among the organizations that provide budgetary support for their positions. This often means working with multiple organizations that have different administrative goals and policies, separate evaluation and accountability systems and criteria, and different expectations of output for the faculty member.

A potential problem that may exist for split appointment faculty is that the extrinsic reward system (promotion, tenure, salary increases, etc.) is ultimately controlled at the university level. If the evaluation criteria of the university are inconsistent with the job expectations of the other budgetary sources in the split appointment, e.g. OARDC or Extension, the procurement of these extrinsic rewards by the faculty member may be jeopardized.

Perceptions of faculty members as to the inconsistency of universities in rewarding teaching and service activities on an equal basis with research activities have been documented in several studies (Hayes, 1971; Jauch, 1976; Sell and Poirier, 1989; Snively and Odell, 1989). If universities are giving the impression of rewarding efforts in research productivity over and above efforts in teaching and service, faculty members can be somewhat justified if they place more emphasis on these research activities at the expense of teaching and service. But what if the individual
has a split appointment with little or no official research percentage? Is that individual going to be able to find the additional time and resources that will enable him or her to produce adequate research for promotion and tenure or will she or he take time away from teaching and extension efforts to fulfill the perceived research need? If the former situation occurs, the faculty member may feel dissatisfied with a job that doesn't allow him/her to achieve institutional rewards without having to go beyond the efforts of fellow faculty members with no split or a split with a major research component.

If the latter situation occurs, the budgetary sources that are supporting the faculty position may not receive adequate return on their investment in the position or the faculty member may be dissatisfied in not having time to fulfill duties of the official appointment at an adequate level. Jauch (1976) indicated that time is a constraining factor for faculty members as they decide how to allocate their efforts and, depending on the faculty member's own interests and expectations of how efforts will be evaluated, may determine in which areas more or less time is spent.

Working in a split appointment has been posited as contributing to problems for the individual and the organizations involved in the split (Libbin and Catlett, 1983). Newcomb and Clark stated that:

The combination of tight economic times, decreased job mobility, role ambiguity [e.g. split appointment], job
overload, lower job satisfaction, frustration and a need for personal growth make faculty members prime candidates for "burnout."

(Newcomb and Clark, 1985, p. 1)

If split appointments result in role ambiguity and/or role conflict for faculty members, level of job satisfaction may also be influenced. Fisher and Gitelson (1983) identified 42 studies that showed a consistent, negative relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) found negative relationships between both role ambiguity and role conflict and job satisfaction.

**Statement of the Problem**

Split appointments for faculty members at land-grant universities are common within certain colleges and departments. Studies of multiple faculty responsibilities have focused mainly on the apparent conflict or complementarity between teaching and research (Brown, 1982; Dent and Lewis, 1976; Ellerbrock, 1987; Hayes, 1971; Jauch, 1976; Newcomb and Clark, 1985; Sell and Poirier, 1989; Weaver, 1982). Only one of these studies (Newcomb and Clark, 1985) looked at teaching (resident instruction) and research as defined by official appointment to a budgetary source. They studied faculty members in the College of Agriculture at The Ohio State University with resident instruction and/or research appointments and identified a substantial negative relationship between job satisfaction and burnout. They also found significantly higher job satisfaction scores for faculty with 100% resident
instruction appointments than those of faculty with resident instruction (>50%)/research (<50%) appointments.

Those results indicate a potentially serious problem for land-grant institutes with split appointment faculty. Are faculty with two or three budgetary sources supporting their official appointment more apt to experience lower levels of job satisfaction? If so, they may be more likely to also exhibit negative organizational behavior, such as burnout or turnover (Clark, 1981; Igodan, 1984; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Newcomb and Clark, 1985; Porter and Steers, 1973; Steers and Mowday, 1981; Van Tilburg, 1987).

More knowledge of the relationship between type of appointment (split/no split) and job satisfaction of land-grant institution faculty is needed. In addition to looking at teaching and research responsibilities, Libbin and Catlett (1983) argued for the inclusion of Extension activities into the study of resident instruction and research activities of land-grant universities. Knowledge of other factors characteristic of these faculty also need to be examined to investigate potential relationships with job satisfaction and type of appointment.

Need for the Study

An understanding of factors that are related to job satisfaction of faculty with multiple appointments can be important for the land-grant institute in identifying and avoiding potential withdrawal behavior by faculty members.
Reviews of studies investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Porter and Steers, 1973; Steers and Mowday, 1981) have reported a consistent negative relationship between the two variables. Studies of turnover intentions, defined as an individual's predisposition to take action to leave a position, (Clark, 1981; Van Tilburg, 1987) and burnout (Igodan, 1984) among Ohio Cooperative Extension Service field faculty indicated significant negative relationships between each of those two variables and job satisfaction.

The literature dealing with relationships between the budgetary sources found in a land-grant institution and faculty job satisfaction is limited. The Newcomb and Clark (1985) study mentioned earlier found substantial negative relationship between job satisfaction and burnout and significantly higher job satisfaction scores for faculty with 100% resident instruction appointments than those of faculty with resident instruction (>50%)/research (<50%) appointments. The results of that study plus the lack of additional research provide some evidence of need for further study of the relationship between appointment type and job satisfaction.

There exists the possibility of split appointments becoming more prevalent at land-grant institutes beyond the traditional agriculture/home economics/natural resources fields. In a study of future goals for the Cooperative
We believe that administrators and faculty of land-grant universities must place life-long learning on a plane equal to that of research and preparatory education. The opportunity of the public university to have positive impact on society and the economy is limited only by the vision of administrators and the resource providers of the state. A tested system exists for extending knowledge about agriculture, home economics, and natural resources to local communities throughout the nation. Ways must be found to involve other disciplines in the support of this system's established programs. (Extension in the 80's, 1983, p.15)

Others have also called for more use of split appointments at land-grant institutes (Libbin and Catlett, 1983) for the enhancement of the work done through each of the budgetary sources (resident instruction, agricultural experiment station, and Extension). If such calls for expansion of split appointments for additional faculty members are heeded by university administrators, knowledge of how split appointments are related to job satisfaction and other faculty characteristics would be even more important.

Employee output may appear to be high in both quantity and quality (Dreher, 1982). If that is the case, it might seem unnecessary to conduct a study of job satisfaction. But, one misconception related to identifying low job satisfaction among workers is the mistaken belief that low
performance is a sign of low job satisfaction. However, studies have shown that the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction is low (Lawler, 1978).

Dreher (1982) pointed out the importance of recognizing the difference between high performance and high job satisfaction. He indicated that studies showing high performers leaving an organization rather than low performers were conducted in mostly non-business, educational settings, which would have included universities. Dreher suggested that an explanation for this phenomenon was that educational settings were less likely to provide the performance-reward contingency offered in private, business settings. This points out the importance of other variables that interact with the job performance-job satisfaction relationship (Greenhaus and Badin, 1974; Kerr Inkson, 1978; Korman, 1970; Lopez, 1982; Mossholder, Bedeian, Armenakis, 1981; Tharenou and Harker, 1982, 1984).

Corcoran (1966) has stated that studies of faculty members present problems for institutional researchers, especially their justification with administrators. However, Corcoran and Clark (1984) offered their support of such studies because, in their opinion:

Faculty vitality is so central to institutional vitality that colleges and universities do need to understand how their policies impact it.

A major purpose of this study is to examine relationships between faculty characteristics and attitudes toward work
and the organization. The results will be helpful for the university to understand what association organizational variables have with the individuals in faculty positions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe levels of job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceptions of job performance, and perceptions of organizational/personal value match of faculty members in The Ohio State University College of Agriculture and faculty members in The Ohio State University Colleges of Biological Sciences, Human Ecology, and Veterinary Medicine who have split appointments with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC) and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES). The study also sought to describe these faculty members on the following demographic characteristics: type of appointment, main budgetary source, tenure in current position, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. Additionally, the study attempted to describe the relationships that existed between demographic characteristics, job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match.

The following research questions were used to guide the study:
1. What are the demographic characteristics of faculty of the College of Agriculture and faculty from other colleges with OARDC and OCES appointments?

Demographic characteristics:
A. Type of appointment
B. Main budgetary source
C. Tenure in current position
D. Faculty rank
E. Tenure status
F. Gender

2. What are the levels of job satisfaction of these faculty?

3. What are the levels of professional self-esteem of these faculty?

4. What are the levels of perceived job performance of these faculty?

5. What are the levels of perceived organizational/personal values match of these faculty?

6. What are the relationships among faculty demographic characteristics and the variables of job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match?

7. How much of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal value match, and faculty demographic characteristics?
Definition of Terms

Faculty Member

Faculty member was operationally defined in this study as an individual holding salaried, faculty rank appointment in the College of Agriculture of The Ohio State University or individuals in other colleges of The Ohio State University holding a salaried, faculty rank appointment with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Those colleges included the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Human Ecology, and the College of Veterinary Medicine. (See description of population and sample in Chapter III for procedures used to identify faculty members for the study.)

Faculty Demographic Characteristics

Type of Appointment - Type of appointment was defined by the number of budgetary sources that are found in the official appointment of faculty members included in the study. Records in the College of Agriculture office indicated that faculty in this study may have the following types of appointments: a one-way, 100% appointment either resident instruction (OSU), research (OARDC), or extension (OCES); a two-way, split appointment with a combination of any two of the three possible budgetary sources; or a three-way, split appointment with all three budgetary sources included in the official appointment. The percentages for each budgetary source in a two- or three-way split
appointment vary for individual faculty members. The type of appointment for faculty members included in this study was self-reported on an item included in a mail questionnaire.¹

**Main Budgetary Source** - The main budgetary source for faculty members in this study was the budgetary source providing the highest percentage of funds toward the faculty members official appointment. The possible sources for this characteristic were: resident instruction (OSU), research (OARDC), extension (OCES), and a category for those individuals who receive equal amounts from the budgetary sources included in their appointments. Main budgetary source was self-reported on an item in a mail questionnaire.¹

**Tenure in Current Position** - Tenure in current position was the number of years that a faculty member had been in the position held in the university at the time of this study. Tenure in current position was self-reported on an item in a mail questionnaire.¹

**Faculty Rank** - Faculty rank was the official rank of faculty members at the time of this study. Faculty ranks included the following, in order of achievement: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

¹Information on these characteristics were also obtained from the College of Agriculture's database for use in verifying self-reported information from respondents.
Faculty rank of participants in the study was obtained from the faculty listings available in the College of Agriculture office.  

**Tenure Status** - Tenure status represented whether or not the individual faculty member had either achieved a tenured position or not at the time of this study. Tenure status was obtained from the faculty listings available in the College of Agriculture office.  

**Gender** - Gender was the sex, either male or female, of faculty members who participated in the study. Gender was self-reported on an item in a mail questionnaire.  

**Job Satisfaction**  
Job satisfaction has been defined by Locke as:  

The pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. (Locke, 1969, p.316)  

Job satisfaction was operationally defined in this study as the summated, mean score on a 15-item, Likert-type scale developed by the researcher to measure job satisfaction.  

**Professional Self-esteem**  
Self-esteem has been defined by Coopersmith as:  

...the extent to which the individual believes self to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy.  
(Coopersmith, 1967, pp.4-5)  

---  

2Information on these characteristics were also obtained from the College of Agriculture's database for use in verifying self-reported information from respondents.
The addition of the term professional to self-esteem indicates the individual's belief in his or her capability, significance, success, and worth within an identified profession. Professional self-esteem was operationally defined as the summated, mean score on an 8-item, Likert-type scale developed by the researcher to measure professional self-esteem.

**Perceived Job Performance**

Perceived job performance was defined as self-rated perceptions of the individuals' levels of success in the job they held at the time of the study. Perceived job performance was operationally defined as the summated, mean score on a 6-item Likert-type scale developed to measure perceived job performance in this study.

**Perceived Organizational/Personal Value Match**

Perceived organizational/personal value match was defined as the individual's perception of how well the value system of the organization with which she or he best identified matched his or her own personal value system. Operationally, perceived organizational/personal value match was defined as the summated, mean score of a 9-item Likert-type scale developed by the researcher for this study.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study was descriptive and correlational in nature. According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), research of that
nature does not necessarily show cause and effect relationships among variables.

The study included faculty members of the College of Agriculture and other faculty members of The Ohio State University who held appointments with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and/or Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as of August 1, 1990. The results of this study are limited to that population and should not be generalized beyond.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Job satisfaction has been studied in many contexts. Job satisfaction has been called a key work attitude and the most extensively studied job attitude in organizations (Dailey, 1988). Locke (1976) estimated that 3,350 studies of job satisfaction had been completed by the mid 70's. However, only a few studies have been conducted that included job satisfaction of individuals holding faculty positions in land-grant universities (Clark, 1981; Hilliker, 1982; Kittrell, 1980; Newcomb and Clark, 1984; Van Tilburg, 1987). Only one of those studies (Newcomb and Clark, 1985) investigated job satisfaction of university faculty with unique appointment types (multiple budget sources).

This chapter will present a review of literature for the variables included in this study. The review is presented in the following manner: job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, job performance, organizational/personal value match, and faculty demographic characteristics.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important factor in understanding human behavior in organizations. Attitudes
involving job satisfaction have been shown to be related to a number of job behaviors (Berkman and Neider, 1987). Many studies have shown that negative relationships exist between job satisfaction and work behaviors such as absenteeism, turnover, or turnover intentions (Arnold and Feldman, 1982; Clark, 1984; Lee and Mowday, 1987; Motowidlo and Lawton, 1984; Porter and Steers, 1973; Stumpf and Hartman, 1984; Van Tilburg, 1987; Youngblood, Mobley, and Meglino, 1983) and the phenomenon of burnout (Igodan, 1984; Newcomb and Clark, 1985). Employee turnover and burnout are organizational costs that may be avoided if antecedents of those behaviors can be identified, measured, and, if possible, modified.

Job satisfaction has been included as a variable in most current models of turnover. The March and Simon (1958) model included satisfaction with the job as a direct antecedent of the individual's perceived desirability of movement. Mobley's (1977) Intermediate Linkage's Model included experiencing job satisfaction-dissatisfaction as one of the links that appear early in an individual's consideration of whether to quit or stay in an organization. In the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979) employee turnover model, satisfaction is a key factor in the process and interacts with the individual's attraction/expected utility for the present job and for alternative jobs. Steers and Mowday (1981) identified job satisfaction as affective responses to job in their model of voluntary
employee turnover. Jackofsky's (1984) model equates job satisfaction to desirability of movement as an antecedent for the variable intentions to quit. Van Tilburg (1987) modified Jackofsky's model, but still included job satisfaction as a major factor preceding the intention to leave the job. Testing of these models has indicated a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and an individual's intention to leave the organization.

Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975) pointed out that just because an individual still works for an organization does not necessarily mean that the individual is receiving a high level of individual satisfaction nor that the organization is receiving a high level of performance from that individual. It may just mean that the individual does not have a more desirable alternative job available at that time.

Not all employee turnover is bad (Mobley, 1982), as when low performers leave the organization, but the loss of valued employees can result in direct and indirect costs to the organization. Therefore, knowledge of the antecedents of this behavior can be important for organizations. The consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and intentions to turnover and also burnout give evidence to the importance of job satisfaction to an organization. Mitchell and Larson (1987) have proposed two reasons for understanding job satisfaction and factors related to it.
One is, from the organization's point of view, job satisfaction can influence a number of important behaviors, such as tardiness, absenteeism, and turnover. The second reason is that job satisfaction is an important outcome for the individual employee. Job satisfaction, and factors related to job satisfaction, are key variables in this study of faculty of The Ohio State University.

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined by Locke as:

The pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. (Locke, 1969, p. 316)

He goes on to describe job dissatisfaction as:

The unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues. (Locke, 1969, p. 316)

Porter, et al. (1975) defined satisfaction as an affective reaction:

Determined by the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of that outcome he [or she] feels he [or she] should receive. (Porter, et al., 1975, pp. 53-54)

Job satisfaction has been described as a key work attitude determined by an individual's perception of events at work (Dailey, 1988). Steers (1988) indicated that five factors appear to be associated with satisfaction with a job: (1) work itself, (2) pay, (3) promotional opportunities, (4) supervision, and (5) co-workers.
Locke (1976) stated that job satisfaction is related to but distinguishable from the concept of morale. Viteles defines morale as:

An attitude of satisfaction with, desire to continue in, and willingness to strive for the goals of a particular group or organization. (Viteles, 1953, p. 284)

Locke (1976) pointed out that morale is more future-oriented and has a group reference point, whereas job satisfaction is more present and past-oriented and refers to an individual's appraisal of the job situation. Gruneberg (1979) stated that morale refers to a group well-being, job satisfaction to an individual's own emotional reaction to a particular job.

Job satisfaction has been referred to as an attitude. Mitchell and Larson (1987) called job satisfaction a summary attitude about one's job and a good reflection of evaluative feelings about one's job. Attitudes have three components: (1) affective--the feelings and emotions that a person has toward the focus of the attitude, (2) cognitive--the person's thoughts, beliefs, and ideas about the focus of the attitude, and (3) behavioral--one's tendency to behave toward or react to the focus of the attitude in certain ways (Dailey, 1988). Dunham and Smith (1979) pointed out that researchers have primarily referred to job satisfaction within the affective component of attitude toward the job and job environment.
Theories of Job Satisfaction

Studies of job satisfaction date back to the early years of the twentieth century (Locke, 1976). These early studies often concentrated on motivation of employees to increase production (Keffer, 1976). One of the major breakthroughs in job-related studies was the work of Mayo and others in the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939). According to Locke (1976), it was during the Hawthorne studies that researchers first took note of workers' minds and that worker appraisals of the work situation affected their reactions to it. Hoppock (1935) published the first intensive study of job satisfaction a few years later. Hoppock's results emphasized the multiplicity of factors related to job satisfaction, including work condition factors, employee physiological factors, job task factors, supervision factors, and additional factors, which would be emphasized later in the field, related to achievement (Locke, 1976).

Locke (1976) identified three schools of thought that emerged over time related to factors believed to be conducive for job satisfaction:

The Physical-Economic School emphasized the role of the physical arrangement of the work, physical working conditions and pay.... The Social (or Human Relations) School, beginning in the 1930's, emphasized the role of good supervision, cohesive work groups, and friendly employee-management relations.... The contemporary Work Itself (or Growth) School emphasizes the attainment of satisfaction through growth in skill, efficacy, and responsibility made possible by mentally challenging work. (Locke, 1976, p. 1300)
Several current theories have emerged from job satisfaction research. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) classified these theories into two categories, content theories and process theories. Content theories "attempt to identify the specific needs or values most conducive to job satisfaction" (Locke, 1976, p. 1302). Process theories "give an account of the process by which variables such as expectations, needs, and values interact with the characteristics of the job to produce job satisfaction" (Gruneberg, 1979, p. 9).

**Content Theories**

Locke (1976) identified two major content theories that have dominated contemporary job satisfaction thought: Maslow's Need Hierarchy theory and Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene (or Two-Factor) theory. Maslow's theory (1954) assumes a hierarchy of five basic categories of needs, from bottom to top: physiological needs, such as food, water, air, etc.; security needs, such as freedom from physical threats and harm and economic security; social needs, love and belongingness; esteem and reputation needs, including mastery and achievement as well as the recognition and approval of others; and self-actualization needs, defined as "the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming" (Maslow, 1954, pp. 91-92). Maslow argued that needs in the hierarchy are neither desired nor sought until those needs below them are
satisfied or fulfilled. Based on this argument, an
dividual would have no self-actualization needs until all
four of the need levels below self-actualization in the
hierarchy were fulfilled. In a work situation, Maslow's
theory would predict that only after being satisfied with
pay and job security would workers seek satisfaction and
achievement from the work itself (Gruneberg, 1979). Porter,
et al. (1975) argued that there is evidence to support the
claim that unless existence needs are met none of the
higher-order needs will be desired or sought. They also
indicated that unless security needs are satisfied,
individuals will not be concerned with higher-order needs.
However, they pointed out that there is little evidence of a
hierarchy once an individual moves above the security level.
They suggested that it is not safe to assume more than a
two-level hierarchy, with existence and security needs on
the lower level and the remaining higher-order needs on the
higher level. Gruneberg (1979) and Locke (1976) both
indicated that no real evidence existed to support Maslow's
theory.

Herzberg's Two-Factor theory is related to Maslow's
hierarchical theory. Herzberg (1966) suggested two groups
of factors related to job satisfaction. One group, the
motivators, were factors which, if present in a job
situation, lead to satisfaction, but, if absent, did not
lead to dissatisfaction. The motivators included meeting
the need for recognition, achievement, responsibility, and personal growth. These motivators corresponded to Maslow's higher order needs (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

The second group of factors Herzberg identified were called hygienes. When hygienes were inadequately present, the result was dissatisfaction. However, when hygienes were adequately present, they did not lead to satisfaction or motivation. Hygiene factors included pay, supervision, working conditions, and company policies. Hygiene factors corresponded to Maslow's lower order hierarchy needs.

Herzberg's theory assumed that dissatisfaction and satisfaction were two independent dimensions and that the aspects of work that produced dissatisfaction were different from those aspects that produce satisfaction (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Empirical testing of Herzberg's theory have given mixed results. Katz and Kahn (1978) stated that when research results testing a theory are in disagreement, both the methods employed and the statement of the theory need to be examined. Katz and Kahn pointed out that different techniques for collecting data did not confirm earlier results that supported the theory. They suggested that this was because it was much easier for people to attribute feeling bad on external factors rather than ego failures, and conversely to attribute their good feelings to ego successes rather than to objective aspects of the job.
Katz and Kahn (1978) also indicated that they felt Herzberg's theory was stated in too extreme a form. They felt that the idea that hygienic factors were completely non-motivating and that motivators were non-productive of dissatisfaction was "too far-fetched a proposition" (p. 401). Gruneberg (1979) also stated what he felt was a weakness in Herzberg's theory in assessing factors related to job satisfaction:

An important point concerning Herzberg's theory is that he does not say how the motivators and hygienes will be weighted together to give an overall assessment of job satisfaction.... Of course, exactly how individuals weigh up what is satisfying and what is dissatisfying in coming to a decision about overall job satisfaction is a very important issue. Indeed, it might be regarded as the issue in measuring the degree to which an individual is or is not satisfied with his [or her] job. (p. 16)

Having given his criticism of the theory, Gruneberg (1979) went on to conclude that Herzberg did make a significant contribution to the understanding of job satisfaction by emphasizing the importance of the job itself as critical to understanding job satisfaction and shifting away from the human relations school of thought and its concern with human contacts at the job.

Locke (1976) also mentioned criticism of Herzberg for failing to recognize the presence of differences among individual workers and how these differences were related to job satisfaction. These same individual differences have been emphasized in the process theories of job satisfaction.
Process Theories

Process theories of job satisfaction attempt to describe interaction between variables in their relationship to job satisfaction. Gruneberg (1979) stated there are at least three classes of process theories upon which job satisfaction is based: (1) the extent of the discrepancy between what the job offers and what the individual expects, (2) what the individual needs, and (3) what the individual values.

Adams (1965) proposed an equity theory which focused on the importance of values and social comparisons in assessing job satisfaction. In equity theory, an individual's input/outcome ratio was expected to approximate the input/outcome ratio of referent others. When the individual's comparison indicated that those expectations were not met, dissatisfaction occurred. The individual may then decide to adjust inputs to equalize ratios, adjust expectations by selecting different referent others, or begin exhibiting withdrawal behaviors.

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) felt that job satisfaction was comprised of several attitudes. Their Met Expectations model described workers as having a set of expectations about what the job should be like. If those expectations are met, then the workers are satisfied. If expectations are not met, dissatisfaction with their jobs occurs. Locke (1976) pointed out that job expectancy could
influence one's emotional reactions. If a person expected a pleasant event to occur, anticipation of the event and the pleasure it would bring may reach the point of fantasizing about the event or sharing the anticipated rewards with others. If the event would then fail to occur, it may be more disvalued than if it had not been expected at all. Likewise, an individual who expected failure in some event may erect defenses against it or incorporate coping mechanisms that would lessen the disappointment.

Needs theorists have argued that it was the degree to which a job fulfilled or allowed the fulfillment of an individual's needs that determined the degree of job satisfaction. However, the argument has been presented that needs theorists have not provided an adequate definition of the concept of need or distinguished need from related concepts, such as value (Locke, 1976).

Locke (1976) in his review of the nature and causes of job satisfaction pointed out that a number of researchers have stated that job situation in relation to the individual's values is the most direct determinant of job satisfaction. He also states that most of the needs theories are really values theories because the authors used the term needs as if it were synonymous with value. Locke's summary of the discussion of theories was that:

Job satisfaction results from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs. (p. 1307)
It was apparent that an individual's values were perceived to be one of the most important factors to be considered when evaluating job satisfaction. The emphasis of theorists on process theories also indicated the important relationships between individual differences and job satisfaction.

Given the consistent and negative relationship of job satisfaction to organizational behaviors such as turnover, intention to turnover, burnout, and absenteeism as identified by a review of literature, this study sought to examine the levels of job satisfaction of the faculty members included in this study. The study also sought to identify characteristics of those faculty members that differentiate individuals within the context of the faculty job and to determine the relationships of those characteristics with level of job satisfaction. The remainder of this chapter includes a review of the available literature on those characteristics and how they are related to the variable job satisfaction.

Variables Related to Job Satisfaction

Dailey (1988) indicated that job satisfaction is the most extensively studied job attitude in organizations. Most studies of job satisfaction are multivariate, that is, included other variables which were being explored for or hypothesized as having a relationship with job satisfaction. A vast majority of those studies were investigating simple
relationships between variables. Others went so far as to imply causal direction in the relationships being investigated. As shown earlier in this review of literature, job satisfaction has been proposed as a functional antecedent to organizational behaviors such as turnover, intention to turnover, absenteeism, and burnout. There was a consistent, negative relationship between job satisfaction and these behaviors. If one wishes to regard those relationships as functional, then knowledge of an individual's level of job satisfaction becomes very important in understanding the organizational behavior of that individual. What became perhaps even more interesting are the possible relationships between job satisfaction and other variables. Could job satisfaction be a function of other variables? If variables could be identified that possessed sizable relationships with job satisfaction, perhaps the organization could manipulate those variables to improve job satisfaction of individuals in the organization. The remainder of this review of literature will examine variables that have been investigated in relation to job satisfaction. These variables were included in this study as characteristics of land-grant faculty members and which might have a relationship with job satisfaction.

**Professional Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem has been defined by Rosenberg (1965) as an attitude, either positive or negative, toward the
self. High self-esteem expresses the feeling individuals have of self-respect, and self-worth. Low self-esteem implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction, and/or self-contempt. Coopersmith (1967) added that self-esteem is "the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to the self: It expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes self to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy" (pp. 4-5). However defined, self-esteem is derived from a satisfaction with life style, satisfaction of primary psychological needs, and social dispositions which produce social effectiveness and acceptance (Callahan and Kidd, 1986). Other terms commonly used to describe self-esteem include self-acceptance, self-confidence, self-respect, self-satisfaction, self-worth, sense of competence, and self-ideal congruence (Tharenou, 1979). Tharenou (1979) differentiated self-esteem from the term self-concept. Self-concept was defined as conscious perceptions one has of oneself, as opposed to self-esteem being the evaluation of such perceptions (Tharenou, 1979). However, several earlier authors (Fitts, 1972a, 1972b; Gergen, 1971) use the term self-concept interchangeably with self-esteem.

Self-esteem has been a part of organizational behavior study since Maslow's (1943) early theories of human motivation. His hierarchy of needs included esteem needs as
one of the higher levels in the hierarchy. Self-esteem has been an important construct in psychological studies because it has been shown to be related to other individual characteristics. In a review of literature dealing with employee self-esteem, Tharenou (1979) indicated that prior studies showed that low self-esteem individuals, as compared to high and medium, are more likely to exhibit anxiety, depression, and neurotic behavior, perform less effectively under stress and failure, exhibit poor social skills and less sociability, be more persuasible and conforming, lack initiative and assertiveness, and have lower aspirations and expectations of success.

Two models of self-esteem have been found in the literature (Tharenou, 1979). The first approaches an individual's self-esteem as being a relatively stable psychological trait formed by the end of adolescence and susceptible to change mainly through major life changes, but otherwise remaining relatively constant. The other view of self-esteem is that self-esteem can be altered through less dramatic events in the individual's life. Stimuli for altered self-esteem can be "evaluations from, and social comparison with, others, the amount of acceptance from others, persuasive appeals, and events involving success and failure" (p. 318). Those stimuli are often found in work settings.
Two main types of theories were found in the self-esteem literature. The theories most often used in framing the relationship between employee behavior and self-esteem were the self-enhancement theories (Argyris, 1964; French, 1969; Hall, 1971, Maslow, 1954). These theories are based on the premise that a basic human need is enhancement of self-esteem through work. The other theoretical view is self-consistency theory. Korman (1977) proposed that individual behavior will be dependent on the level of self-esteem of each employee. He indicated that high self-esteem employees, when compared to those with low esteem, were more likely to: (1) be more motivated to high levels of performance, (2) have a positive relationship between job performance and job satisfaction, (3) be motivated to perform given the extent of contingency between incentives and performance, (4) perceive as more satisfying those situations where self-perceived needs are being satisfied, and (5) select occupations that match their self-perceptions. Korman (1977) revised that theory by additionally saying that successful job behavior would result in increased self-esteem for individuals with high, but not low, self-esteem if organizational influences are not prominent or, if organizational influences are prominent and consistent with the individual's system of beliefs. If organizational influences are prominent and inconsistent with the individual's beliefs, Korman said that the
individual's self-esteem will change to reflect the environmental influence of the organization.

Another aspect of self-esteem was presented by Simpson and Boyle (1975). They differentiated self-esteem into three more specific types: global, specific, and task specific. Global self-esteem refers to a general evaluation of an individual's overall perceptions of self. Specific self-esteem is defined as that specific to a particular situation or role. Task specific self-esteem is specific to a particular activity.

**Studies of Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction**

A majority of the contemporary literature investigating relationships between self-esteem and job satisfaction has been based on Korman's theory of self-consistency. Those studies have examined the relationship of self-esteem and job attitudes (including job satisfaction) or job behaviors (performance, absenteeism, propensity to leave, etc.). Earlier studies focused more on the self-enhancement theoretical base in examining relationships between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and self-esteem (Tharenou, 1979). Given the nature of this study investigating relationship between job satisfaction and other variables, the studies that examined relationships between self-esteem and job satisfaction were of special interest.

Greenhaus and Badin (1974) studied the relationship between task performance and task satisfaction including the
possible moderating effects of self-esteem using 144 undergraduate university students. The results indicated that task-specific self-esteem served as a significant (p<.01) moderator variable for the task performance-task satisfaction relationship.

Kerr Inkson (1978) studied the moderating effect of global self-esteem on the job performance-job satisfaction relationship of 93 meat-processing industry workers. Kerr Inkson (1978) found a significant relationship (r=.29, p<.01) between self-esteem and work satisfaction. He also found a moderating effect of self-esteem in the job performance-job satisfaction relationship. Workers with higher self-esteem reported higher correlations between job performance and job satisfaction.

Lopez and Greenhaus (1978) investigated relationships between global self-esteem and job satisfaction among 523 school employees. They found a significant (r=.27, p<.01) relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction and a moderating effect for self-esteem on the needs satisfaction-job satisfaction relationship. Individuals with higher self-esteem exhibited a stronger relationship between needs satisfaction and job satisfaction.

In a study of 110 working business students, Adler (1980) found a significant interaction effect between job satisfaction-dissatisfaction and self-esteem on the variable of causal attribution. Those high in self-esteem were more
internal in their attributions for satisfaction than those low in self-esteem. However, Adler (1980) found no difference between the two groups in their attributions for dissatisfaction.

Mossholder, Bedeian, and Armenakis (1981) conducted a study of 161 hospital professional and support personnel to determine the moderating effects of self-esteem and organizational level on relationships between role perceptions, employee satisfaction, and employee performance. They found that individuals in lower organizational levels with higher esteem had higher levels of satisfaction variance explained by role ambiguity and higher levels of performance variance explained by role conflict than did those with high self-esteem in higher organizational levels or those with low self-esteem at either organizational level. These results partially confirmed Korman's self-consistency theory.

Lopez (1982) studied 1,487 Master of Business Administration students who were also employed full time in various organizations. She investigated the self-consistency theory that job performance-job satisfaction relationships were moderated by level of self-esteem. Lopez (1982) found no significant direct relationships between the three types of self-esteem and job satisfaction. She did, however, identify a significant (p<.01) moderating effect for task-specific self-esteem on the performance-overall
satisfaction relationship for all subjects grouped together. A significant (p<.01) moderating effect of global self-esteem for males and a similar moderating effect for social self-esteem for females was also discovered for the performance-overall satisfaction relationship.

Tharenou and Harker (1982) conducted a study of 166 electrical apprentices to determine relationships between self-esteem and a number of organizational variables. Their findings indicated a significant (r=.52, p<.001) relationship between task self-esteem and job satisfaction, but no significant relationship between global self-esteem and job satisfaction. A follow-up study 20 months later used 92 of the electrical apprentices from the 1982 study and investigated the same relationships. Again, task self-esteem was significantly (r=.25, p<.05) related to job satisfaction.

A study of the moderating effect of self-esteem on the needs gratification-work satisfaction relationship of 112 public service organization managers and administrators was reported by Somers and Lefkowitz (1983). Their results again indicated the moderating effect (p<.01) of self-esteem. Subjects with higher levels of self-esteem experienced higher levels of need gratification than did those with low self-esteem.

Blackburn, Horowitz, Edington, and Klos (1986) reported the relationship between job strain and job satisfaction and
the moderating effect of self-esteem for 57 non-academic, high-level administrators and 46 faculty members from humanities and natural science departments at a large, midwestern university. The results of this study indicated a moderating effect (p<.05) of self-esteem on the job strain-job satisfaction relationship. Also, faculty and administrators with higher levels of self-esteem reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

Callahan and Kidd (1986) studied 73 white-collar women working in private companies to determine if a relationship existed between job satisfaction and self-esteem. After categorizing subjects into either a job-satisfied group or a job-unsatisfied group, Callahan and Kidd (1986) found significant (p<.05 to p<.01) differences between the groups on self-esteem measures. Those women who were satisfied with their jobs gave responses indicating high levels of self-esteem.

Given the evidence presented in the review of literature that self-esteem is related to job satisfaction either directly or indirectly as a moderator for other organizational or individual characteristic variable, the inclusion of self-esteem as a variable in this study seemed logical. Prior research has indicated that a role specific type of self-esteem would be a more appropriate choice than global self-esteem (Tharenou, 1979). The subjects in the study are faculty members and professionals. Therefore,
self-esteem will be measured in relation to each subject's role as a professional.

**Job Performance**

Job performance has been defined by Mitchell and Larson (1987) as "the results of behavior as judged against some criterion or standard of excellence" (p. 156). Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975) described performance as an outcome of the dynamics of individual-organizational interaction. Performance is one part of a process they call a model of individual performance in organizations. The model presented by Porter, et al. (1975) includes organizational inputs, characteristics, behavior-outcome contingencies, needs, and goals and the individual's needs, values, and goals, skills and input, valences and expectations, and work behavior. In addition to performance, another outcome in this model is satisfaction.

French, Kast, and Rosenzweig (1985) identified a similar model they called the motivation process. Key variables in that process are effort, performance, and satisfaction of the employee. French, et al. (1985) indicated that, in work organizations, performance is the primary variable of interest. Performance "connotes a degree of excellence as measured by a standing set of expectations. In the French, et al. (1985) motivation process, level of satisfaction follows the level of performance. Level of satisfaction then has an effect on
the amount of effort the individual will put forth in the next round of performance. The three key variables are linked over time periods.

There has been some question as to what the relationship between performance and job satisfaction is both in strength and in causality (Berkman and Neider, 1987). Most organizational researchers agree that performance results in satisfaction (Lawler, 1978, Lawler and Porter, 1975). Lawler (1978) indicated that most empirical studies of the job performance-job satisfaction relationship have found only slight or very low correlations. Several studies have examined the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction both as a direct relationship and as a moderated relationship affected by other personal psychological or demographic characteristics or by organizational characteristics. Most of the studies were included in the prior discussion of self-esteem, as self-esteem is a characteristic often included in studies of performance-satisfaction relationship due to Korman's (1970) theory of self-consistency. Korman (1970) stated that the performance-satisfaction relationship should be significant for high, not for low, self-esteem individuals. Korman (1970) theorized that success and competence are not central to the self-concept of low self-esteem individuals. Therefore, task performance should not have an important impact on their satisfaction. High self-esteem individuals,
on the other hand, receive a greater balance with their self-concept of competence as a result of better performance, and, therefore, receive more satisfaction with the task.

Studies of Job Performance and Job Satisfaction

Greenhaus and Badin (1974) examined the job performance-job satisfaction relationship among college undergraduates. They found a correlation of .50 (p<.01) for high self-esteem individuals and .17 (ns) for low self-esteem individuals. They did not report an overall relationship between the two variables. Greenhaus and Badin (1974) did report a moderating effect on the relationship by self-esteem.

In a study of meat processing industry workers, Kerr Inkson (1978) compared performance scores with job satisfaction sub-scale scores. The correlations ranged from r=.32 (p<.01) down to r=.08 (ns). Kerr Inkson (1978) also found moderating effects by self-esteem on the performance-satisfaction relationship.

Kittrell (1980) studied Ohio Cooperative Extension Service county agents and found a performance-satisfaction relationship of r=.14. He did not conduct an examination of the effects of any moderating variables.

Results of Mossholder, Bedeian, and Armenakis's (1981) study of hospital personnel indicated a correlation of r=.11 (ns) between employee performance and job satisfaction.

Tharenou and Harker (1982, 1984) conducted a longitudinal study of electrical apprentices, taking follow-up measurements 20 months after the original measurements. They found a relationship between supervisor-rated performance and job satisfaction of $r = .11$ (ns) at the first data collection point and $r = .08$ (ns) at the second point. Tharenou and Harker (1984) also used a self-reported performance score for comparison at the second data collection point. Correlations between self-reported performance and job satisfaction were $r = .24$ ($p < .05$) and $r = .48$ ($p < .01$), respectively. Tharenou and Harker (1982, 1984) reported moderating effects for self-esteem for several of the relationships.

In her study of Master in Business Administration students, Lopez (1982) found a total group correlation of $r = .32$ ($p < .01$) between performance and overall satisfaction. The correlation for males was $r = .39$ ($p < .01$) and for females $r = .35$ ($p < .01$). Lopez (1982) also discovered moderating effects on these relationships by three types of self-esteem measures: global, task-specific, and social.

Van Tilburg (1987) studied Ohio Cooperative Extension County Agents and found a relationship of $r = .26$ between self-reported performance and overall satisfaction and $r = .11$
between supervisor-rated job performance. She did find moderating effects on the self-reported performance-job satisfaction relationship by both extrinsic and intrinsic reward contingency scores.

The inclusion of job performance as a variable in this study is based on the models of organizational behavior that have included job performance as a key variable. The many studies cited in the review of literature have indicated a consistent, though low relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. The relationship between those two variables, and any moderating effects by other variables, is an appropriate part of this study. Dreher (1982) pointed out the importance of recognizing the relationship between performance and job satisfaction. He indicated that studies showing high performers leaving an organization rather than low performers were conducted in mostly non-business, educational settings, which would have included universities. Dreher suggested that an explanation for this phenomenon was that educational settings were less likely to provide the performance-reward contingency offered in private, business settings.

Measures of job performance have included rating of an immediate supervisor (Keller, 1984), peer assessment, appraisal by subordinates, appraisal by clients, multi-rater approaches, and self-assessments (Cascio, 1982). Due to the nature of the population being studied (university faculty
members) readily available empirical evaluations of faculty members were not available for this study. Faculty members are evaluated for promotion, tenure, and salary raises on a more qualitative basis. Any quantitative measurement would probably have been developed by and used in the individual's own departmental unit and, therefore, not comparable among all faculty. A university-wide measure, such as the Student Evaluation of Teaching form, would not include faculty who do not have classroom teaching as a part of their responsibilities. Because of these reasons, a self-rating scale for faculty to indicate their own perceptions of job success (performance) was used in this study. Several of the studies cited (Tharenou and Harker, 1982, 1984; Van Tilburg, 1987) utilized self-reported job performance scores. For the most part, self-reported performance scores had a higher correlation with job satisfaction than did the supervisor's rating scores. This should be expected given the fact that for both variables, the subjects are asked for perception of their performance and their satisfaction. That these self-perceptions were more highly correlated should come as no surprise.

**Organizational/Personal Value Match**

Organizational/personal value match has been defined for this study as an individual's perception of how well the value system of the organization with which she or he best identified matched his or her own personal value system.
The term value system of the organization was used as a representation of organizational climate of the organization identified by participants in the study. Organizational climate was defined by Taguiri (1968) as:

A relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization. (p. 27)

Gilmer (1966) wrote that climate "is, in effect, what we react to...the context of stimulation and confusion where we work....Climate affects not only the behavior of individuals but also how organizations themselves interact" (p. 57).

Meyer (1968) arrived at a set of dimensions representing different facets of organizational climate including: responsibility, standards, reward, organizational clarity, and friendly, team spirit.

Locke (1976) pointed out that a number of theorists, including himself, have stated that "it is the (perceived) job situation in relation to the individual's values that is the most direct determinant of job satisfaction" (p. 1304). Locke (1976) goes on to say:

It was not sufficiently stressed in previous articles that: (a) a person is not always conscious of his [or her] values, a fact which makes for severe measurement problems; and (b) a person's values are interrelated in that the reason a person values one thing may be that it is a means of gaining some more fundamental value (e.g., achievement in work brings a sense of efficacy). Thus a given value does not operate independently of the person's total value system. (p. 1304)
Based upon the emphasis placed on values by the cited sources, an individual's perception of how well the organizational values match his or her own might be related to job satisfaction.

**Type of Appointment**

Type of appointment refers to the official allocation of time of a faculty member based on budgetary sources contributing funds to support the individual's faculty position. At land-grant institutes in the United States, faculty with split appointments will have percentages of their job time assigned to resident instruction, the state agricultural experiment station, and/or the Cooperative Extension Service of the land-grant university. Faculty members with splits involving more than one administrative unit may find themselves dealing with separate policies and goals, multiple supervision, different planning, reporting, and evaluation systems, and different criteria for positive performance. These split appointments may lead to a faculty member experiencing role conflict and/or role ambiguity in his or her job.

Katz and Kahn (1978) defined role conflict as:

the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role expectations such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult. (p. 204)

Role conflict usually manifests itself as disagreement between two or more role-senders. Conflict may also be
generated between two or more roles held by the same person (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Faculty with split appointments may experience such disagreement due to demands on time and effort by both, or all three, of the budgetary sources at one time.

Katz and Kahn (1978) identified role ambiguity as "uncertainty about what the occupant of a particular office is supposed to do" (p. 206). They also indicated that there may be uncertainty "about many other aspects of a role, including membership of the role-set, the ends to be served by role enactment, and the evaluation of present role behavior" (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Those situations might present a faculty member with responsibilities to multiple units within the university.

Several studies have examined the relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) studied 290 white-collar workers in a private business to determine the relationship between role conflict and role ambiguity and other organizational and individual variables. Rizzo, et al. (1970) found consistent significant negative correlations between role ambiguity and the seven dimensions of job satisfaction. Role conflict was negatively related to some of the satisfaction dimensions, but not as consistently as ambiguity. Both role ambiguity and role conflict were also
significantly related to other variables representing individual and organizational characteristics.

Fisher and Gitelson (1983) conducted a meta-analysis of 42 past studies in an effort to draw conclusions from the data. For 42 studies, the mean correlation between role conflict and overall job satisfaction was $r = -0.35$. Role ambiguity and job satisfaction had a mean correlation for the 42 studies of $r = -0.25$. Both of these values indicate a consistent, negative relationship with job satisfaction.

Newcomb and Clark (1985) studied faculty members in the College of Agriculture at The Ohio State University who held either 100% teaching appointments, greater than or equal to 50% appointment in research with the remainder in resident instruction, or less than 50% appointment in research with the remainder in resident instruction. Results from that study showed that 100% resident instruction appointees had significantly higher job satisfaction scores than faculty with a less than 50% research appointment plus resident instruction. Newcomb and Clark's (1985) study was the only one found in the review of literature that examined appointment type based on official appointments with budgetary sources within a land-grant university.

Assuming that faculty with split appointments experience similar situations as those used by Katz and Kahn (1978) to illustrate role conflict and role ambiguity, faculty members with two- or three-way splits may experience
lower levels of job satisfaction. Therefore, the variable type of appointment was important to this study.

**Main Budgetary Source**

Main budgetary source represented the university budgetary unit providing the majority of funds to support the faculty member's position. The three possible budget sources for faculty in this study were: (1) general revenue funds from The Ohio State University (OSU) for resident instruction and administration, (2) Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC) funds for research, and (3) Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) funds for Extension work. Another possible source for some faculty members was special grant monies, sometimes referred to as "soft" money. Those funds came from a variety of sources, usually from outside the university, and were used for specific research projects in which faculty members were involved. If those research funds were officially separate from a faculty member's resident instruction and/or extension funds, they were considered to be from a research budget source and included in the OARDC category.

As a variable possibly related to job satisfaction, main budgetary source was assumed to define the organizational identity of faculty members within the land-grant university. A faculty member should be more likely to identify his or her membership in the organization which provides the majority of funds for his or her position. An
individual whose major funding source is the Cooperative Extension Service would likely identify himself or herself as an Extension employee.

Main budgetary source also defined what the official duties of faculty were. Each of the budgetary units involved in a land-grant university has different missions and objectives (Mooney, 1987; Norland, in press). Employees are expected to meet the job expectations of the organization in which they work. Herein lies a problem. Several researchers have identified the increased importance that universities have placed on research as a criterion for success and promotion and tenure (Hayes, 1971; Jauch, 1976; Sell and Poirier, 1989; Snively and Odell, 1989). If duties of a faculty member within an organization do not provide for resources or time to conduct work that is perceived as being foremost in the reward system, that faculty member may experience role conflict or role ambiguity. Rizzo, et al. (1970), Fisher and Gitelson (1983), and Newcomb and Clark (1985) have demonstrated the consistent and negative relationship between role conflict and role ambiguity and job satisfaction.

Knowledge of the relationship between a faculty member's main budget source and the faculty member's level of job satisfaction could lead to the identification of perceived goal and reward incongruities between the faculty member's organizational unit and the university as a whole.
Therefore, main budgetary source was included as a variable of interest in this study.

**Tenure in Current Position**

Tenure in current position was defined as the amount of time a faculty member has been in the position held at the time of this study. Previous studies (Keffer, 1976; Ronen, 1978) have suggested a curvilinear relationship between tenure and job satisfaction. However, Clark (1981) found that in his study of turnover intentions of Ohio Cooperative Extension Service county agents, the relationship between tenure and job satisfaction fit best in linear relationship. Clark (1981) found a low positive relationship ($r=.11$) between tenure and job satisfaction.

Van Tilburg (1987) also included tenure as a variable in her study of Ohio Cooperative Extension Service county agents turnover intentions. She found negligible relationships between tenure and overall satisfaction, self-rated performance, and supervisor-rated performance.

Cooper and Henderson (1989) surveyed 157 women faculty members in colleges of agriculture. They found a low, negative correlation ($r=-.15$) between perceptions of career satisfaction and number of years in current position.

Stumpf and Rabinowitz (1981) investigated the moderating effects of career stage (categories based on length of tenure) on performance-satisfaction relationships.
They found moderating effects by career stage on dimensions of the performance-satisfaction relationships they examined.

Zey-Ferrell and Ervin (1985) studied antecedents of faculty workstyles at a non-land-grant university. Their results indicated that length of employment of faculty was a significant moderator of the relationship between faculty reward expectations and workstyle congruency.

Tenure in the current position was included as a variable in this study because of the nature of faculty positions in relation to length of time in the job. In academic settings, length of time worked is related to the tenuring process by which faculty members are "vested" into the university system after completing a period of time during which the faculty member performs work deemed acceptable by his or her peers. Therefore, length of time in the job should be related to performance.

Tenure in the current job should, logically, be positively related to job satisfaction if alternative job opportunities are available to faculty members. If alternatives are available, the dissatisfied faculty member would probably take them. However, the absence of viable alternative job situations may have a dampening effect on the relationship of tenure and job satisfaction. Given the specific nature of the faculty position within the university, tenure in the current job was included in this
study to determine if a relationship existed in the context of this study.

Faculty Rank

Academic institutions are democratic organizations by nature for their faculty members. Academic freedom is a commonly used phrase that represents the ability of faculty members to, within certain general limits, do what they feel is appropriate. There are, however, within the faculty population, levels representing the achievement of the individual within the context of academia.

For the subjects included in this study, faculty rank included the following levels (ordered from lowest to highest): instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Cooper and Henderson (1989), in their study of women faculty in colleges of agriculture, found no relationship ($r=.06$, ns) between academic rank and perceptions of career satisfaction.

Level of faculty rank may be interpreted as the equivalent of levels within other organizations. Making that assumption, the inclusion of faculty rank would be supported by findings from the study of hospital professional and support personnel by Mossholder, et al. (1981). The results of that study indicated a moderating effect by organizational level on the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction and the relationship of role conflict and performance. By including faculty rank
(level in the organization) in this study, it was hoped to determine what relationships that factor had with job satisfaction as well as other variables in the study.

**Tenure Status**

Tenure status is defined as whether or not a faculty member has been granted tenure within the university setting. The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member is the university's recognition of acceptable performance. However, tenure status was not used as a measure of performance in this study because of two reasons: (1) those faculty members who perform at an unacceptable level are not granted tenure and must leave the university within one year of that decision, thereby reducing the levels of performance based on tenure status to only those who have performed well; and (2) tenure is not only awarded based on performance, but also performance over a period of time. Faculty members who have not received tenure may be performing satisfactorily, but have not been in the system long enough to have been considered for tenure. Together, those reasons make tenure unacceptable as a measure of performance.

Tenure status was assumed to be related to role conflict and role ambiguity for faculty in this study. Untenured faculty members are required to perform at a certain level to be considered for tenure and are judged for tenure by their peers based upon certain criteria. Given
the uncertainty of what faculty feel are acceptable criteria for tenure (Hayes, 1971; Jauch, 1976; Sell and Poirier, 1989; Snively and Odell, 1989), untenured faculty must attempt to clarify the tenuring criteria for their situation and then match their performance to the criteria.

This is not to say that tenured faculty stop performing satisfactorily once tenure has been achieved, but the criteria for performance of tenured faculty are no longer based on the goal of receiving tenure. Obtaining tenure should result in less role conflict and ambiguity on the part of the faculty member as it relates to workstyles.

Zey-Ferrell and Ervin (1985) included tenure status as a variable in their study of faculty workstyles. They found that tenure status was a significant moderator of the reward expectation-workstyle congruency relationship, though not as significant as length of employment.

Cooper and Henderson (1989) did not find a relationship between perceptions of career satisfaction and tenure status among women faculty in colleges of agriculture.

Given the close connection the tenure process has to a university faculty member's job and career and the findings of Zey-Ferrell and Ervin (1985), faculty tenure status was included as a variable in this study.

**Gender**

Gender as a variable in examining relationships with job satisfaction has been included in several studies.
Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) pointed out that women have been undervalued and more poorly paid than men. Bardwick (1971) posited that self-esteem of women is lower than men's. However, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) summarized 14 studies indicating no significant differences between genders in self-esteem. Another difference in gender related to the workplace was found by Havighurst (1982), who noted that men stress extrinsic rewards such as company policies, practices, and working conditions, while women emphasize intrinsic rewards such as coworker relationships and types of supervision.

Henderson and Cooper (1987) noted an increase in the number of women entering fields of science. They also surveyed land-grant colleges of agriculture to determine the number of women scientists employed in agricultural sciences. They found 514 women employed as faculty members in agricultural sciences at land-grant colleges of agriculture. That number represented 4.6% of the total agricultural scientists employed at that time. It should be pointed out that the survey conducted by Henderson and Cooper (1987) did not include faculty from fields of home economics or faculty who may have been in agricultural sciences, but not located in colleges of agriculture.

Cooper and Henderson (1989) studied career perceptions of a sample of women faculty in colleges of agriculture. Results showed that 93% of the women indicated a great deal
of satisfaction in their careers. Cooper and Henderson (1989) recommended that future studies compare career perceptions of women and men agricultural faculty.

Based on Henderson and Cooper's (1987) indication that women are increasing in number in scientific careers, including the agricultural sciences, and Cooper and Henderson's (1987) call for studies comparing perceptions of women and men agricultural faculty, gender has been included as a variable in this study. The population being studied included not only agricultural faculty, but also faculty from the fields of home economics and those housed in colleges other than the College of Agriculture.

Summary

The review of literature provided a theoretical basis for the construct of job satisfaction and variables related to job satisfaction. The review included summaries of prior studies on the variables of interest in this study and major findings from those studies. Based on the review of literature, the following variables were included in this study of faculty members at a land-grant university:

Independent variables

A. Type of appointment
B. Main budgetary source
C. Tenure in current position
D. Faculty rank
E. Tenure status
F. Gender
G. Professional self-esteem
H. Perceived job performance
I. Perceived organizational/personal values match

Dependent variable

A. Job satisfaction

The independent variables, type of appointment, tenure in current job, faculty rank, tenure status, gender, self-esteem, and job performance, have been included in prior studies of job satisfaction and were shown to be related, at different strengths, to job satisfaction. These variables were included in this study based on the prior research cited in this chapter and the appropriateness of these factors, especially the demographic factors, to the population being studied, faculty members in colleges within a land-grant university.

The independent variable, main budgetary source, was a demographic variable representative of the subjects specific to this study. The three budgetary sources of resident instruction, research, and Extension are unique to faculty members in certain colleges of land-grant universities. Because of this uniqueness, this variable was not found in prior studies. However, main budgetary source was assumed for this study to be a possible source of role conflict.
and/or role ambiguity for faculty members in the university setting.

Perceived organizational/personal value match was a variable not found specifically in the literature, but a variable representative of a facet of organizational climate, values. This variable has been posited by several of the authors identified in this chapter as being an important part in relationship to job satisfaction and was, therefore, included in this study.

Job satisfaction is a variable of importance to those studying organizational behavior. Job satisfaction has been linked to behaviors such as employee turnover and burnout. Because of this linkage, knowledge of antecedents to job satisfaction has been an important area of inquiry. It was the purpose of this study to explore relationships between job satisfaction and the independent variables identified in this chapter for the specific population identified in this study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes discussion of the design of the study, the population and sampling methods used in the study, the instrumentation used to gather data addressing the research questions in the study, the data collection procedures used, and the data analysis methods used.

Research Design

This research was a descriptive-correlational study designed to identify and describe variables and the nature and strength of relationships among variables. According to Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1985), correlational studies are designed to determine the extent of relationships between variables and to measure the extent to which variations in one variable are associated with variation in another variable.

Two methods of data collection were used in this study. Face-to-face interviews were used to elicit qualitative data for use in the development of items for quantitative instruments. A mail questionnaire was used to collect data representing the variables in the study. Additional data were collected from a review of personnel records located in the College of Agriculture office. The population for the
study included all salaried-appointment faculty members in the College of Agriculture of The Ohio State University (OSU), including faculty from other OSU colleges with partial, salaried appointments in the College of Agriculture through the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The study examined the following variables:

Independent variables

A. Type of appointment
B. Main budgetary source
C. Tenure in current position
D. Faculty rank
E. Tenure status
F. Gender
G. Professional self-esteem
H. Perceived job performance
I. Perceived organizational/personal values match

Dependent variable

A. Job satisfaction

Internal Validity

In research involving survey methods, measurement error has been a major threat to internal validity. Measurement error is related to issues of validity and reliability of data (Kerlinger, 1986). Validity and reliability issues have been discussed in the instrumentation section of this
chapter. In an attempt to reduce measurement error, the quantitative instrument used in the study was reviewed by a panel of experts (see Appendix A) to determine content validity and pilot-tested to determine reliability. Items in the instrument were developed based on responses from face-to-face interviews with selected individuals to insure that items were appropriate for the population in the study.

**External Validity**

The external validity of research conducted using survey methods can be affected by four sources of possible error. Sampling error is the result of using some method other than a probabilistic method of selecting subjects for the sample, resulting in a non-representative sample. Selection error is the possibility that some subjects may have a greater chance of being selected than others. Frame error is a discrepancy between the intended target population and the actual population from which the sample is drawn. Non-response error occurs when subjects selected to participate do not respond or refuse to participate, thereby raising the question of the results being representative of the entire sample (Miller, 1990; Fowler, 1988).

Sampling error and selection error were not problems in the study because the entire accessible population, not a sample, was included in the study. Frame error was addressed through the use of the most current list of
faculty members possessing the characteristics needed to be a part of the population of this study. This list was made available by the College of Agriculture and is the official listing of faculty in the College and those other faculty members with partial appointments with the Ohio Agricultural and Research Development Center and the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Possible chances for frame error might have been through the addition of new faculty members since the list was printed or faculty members leaving the University after the list was printed. However, using the most current faculty list was felt to be a reasonable method to control for potential frame error.

Possible non-response error was addressed by comparing late respondents to early respondents. According to Miller and Smith (1983), late respondents are similar to non-respondents. If no significant differences existed between responses of late respondents compared to those of early respondents, then the responses may be deemed representative of the entire sample, in this case, the accessible population. Procedures used to address non-response error are discussed further in the data collection section of this chapter.

Population

The target population for the study consisted of all faculty members holding salaried appointments in The Ohio State University (OSU) College of Agriculture and faculty
from other colleges holding salaried appointments in the College of Agriculture through the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC) and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES). Other OSU colleges that had faculty members holding partial OARDC and/or OCES appointments were the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Human Ecology, and the College of Veterinary Medicine. Faculty from those three colleges who held such appointments were also included on the College of Agriculture's faculty list used to develop the frame for the study.

The frame contained all faculty members who possessed the characteristics mentioned above as of August 1, 1990. Due to the accessibility of the population, a census was conducted rather than a sample. The accessible population size was 335 faculty members. Because the frame was felt to be representative of the target population, the assumption was made that the accessible population and the target population were identical. Therefore, the results of the study, after addressing possible non-response errors, would be assumed to be describing the target population. Each subject was assigned an identification number for use throughout the study.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was designed by the researcher to gather data for the following variables: job satisfaction,
professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal value match, and the demographic variables of: type of appointment, main budgetary source, tenure in current position, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender (see Appendix B).\(^3\) Separate multi-item Likert-type scales were developed to measure job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match. Individual items were written to measure each of the faculty demographics variables.

To develop items for the Likert-type scales that were representative of the constructs being measured, as well as to be sure that the items were appropriate for the contextual situations of the subjects of the study, face-to-face interviews were conducted with purposefully selected members of the population. Interviewees were selected based on characteristics that would be reflective of the subjects in the study. Of the 14 interviewees, there were 12 men and 2 women. Three individuals had 100% Extension appointments, 3 had 100% resident instruction appointments, 4 had research/Extension split appointments, 2 had resident instruction/Extension split appointments, and 2 had resident/instruction/Extension splits. Ten of the interviewees were

\(^3\)Additional variables were measured with the questionnaire to provide data for a staff study being conducted by the Department of Agricultural Education.
located on the Columbus campus of OSU and 4 were located at the OARDC campus in Wooster, Ohio.

The interview schedule used to collect responses during the interviews (see Appendix C) was developed using what Patton (1990) called a combination of a standardized, open-ended approach and an interview guide approach. Using this approach:

A number of basic questions could be worded quite precisely in a predetermined fashion, while permitting the interviewer more flexibility in probing and more decision-making flexibility in determining when it is appropriate to explore certain subjects in greater depth, or even to undertake whole new areas of inquiry that were not originally included in the interview instrument. (Patton, 1990, p. 287)

Questions on the interview schedule were developed based on definitions and terms found in literature describing the constructs of job satisfaction, self-esteem, job performance, and organizational and personal values. The questions were written in such a fashion that the interviewees could respond to those constructs in terms of their own job and organizational situations.

The interviews were conducted in the offices of the interviewees. Duration of the interviews ranged from 40-75 minutes. The interviews were tape recorded and transcripts of the interviews were used in the development of items for the quantitative, Likert-type scales.

---

4Additional constructs were discussed in the interviews as a part of the Department of Agricultural Education staff study.
Likert-type Scales

The variables of professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational/personal value match were measured using separate multi-item Likert-type scales (see Appendix B). Likert-type scales measure attitudes, are relatively easy to construct, can achieve high reliability coefficients, can be used with all types of populations, are easy for respondents to complete, and are easy to score and analyze when compared to other scales (Norland, 1990; Mueller, 1986). The Likert-type scales consisted of statements to which the respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement using the following six-point scale:

1 = Very strongly disagree
2 = Strongly disagree
3 = Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree
6 = Very strongly agree.

Scores for each scale were the mean value of the individual respondent's scores on all of the items in each scale. For example, for a seven item scale, the values for the seven items were added together and then divided by seven to arrive at a mean score for the scale.
Items in the scales were worded both positively and negatively to avoid having respondents fall into a response set (Dillman, 1978; Mueller, 1986; Sudman and Bradburn, 1982). During analysis of data, the weighting of response categories for the negatively-worded items were reversed. For example, the item "My job is frustrating." was considered to be a negative statement in the overall measurement of job satisfaction. Therefore, a response of "Very strongly agree" would receive a score of 1 rather than 6.

The Likert-type scales were tested for reliability using an index of inter-item consistency, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Cronbach's alpha is an internal-consistency coefficient that identifies similarity of measurement across items (Mueller, 1986). Test data were collected by means of a pilot test of the instrument using 15 individuals thought to be somewhat similar to the population of the study. Individuals in the pilot test included individuals holding administrative and professional positions in the College of Agriculture, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, and the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and graduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education who, prior to graduate school, had held professional positions in the Cooperative Extension Services of other states. An acceptable minimum Cronbach's alpha level for the scales was set a priori at .60 based on
the work of Nunnally (1967). Reliability coefficients were calculated using the pilot test data. Obtained Cronbach's alpha's are reported in Table 1.

Table 1.
Summary of Reliability Analysis of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Variable</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Self-Esteem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational/Personal Value Match</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content validity of the Likert-type scales was determined using a panel of experts composed of eight individuals within the College of Agriculture judged to be experts in the content areas of the scales, the context of the study, and instrumentation development (see Appendix A). Members of the panel of experts were also asked to evaluate the suitability, clarity, and wording of items in the scales given the nature and population of the study. Except for minor structural changes in the placement of instructions and re-wording of transition statements, the scales were
judged by the panel of experts to be content valid and suitable for use in the study. A discussion of the individual scales follows.

**Professional Self-Esteem**

The professional self-esteem scale, Part V of the questionnaire, included 8 items which together represented the individual's feeling of capability, significance, success, and worthiness (Coopersmith, 1967) in his or her profession. A higher score represented a higher level of professional self-esteem. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale from the pilot test was .79. The items, with how they were scaled, negatively (-) or positively (+), were:

- (+) Within my profession, I have more insight than most.
- (-) I have had little impact on my profession.
- (+) I provide original concepts and ideas to my profession.
- (-) What I do is considered to be of little value in the profession.
- (-) I do not think that I get much recognition within my profession.
- (+) I contribute a great deal to my profession.
- (-) I do not feel very significant within my profession.
- (+) I feel that I am a positive role model for others in my profession.
**Job Performance**

An individual's perception of how successful she or he is in the duties of his or her job and perception of how that job performance is perceived by colleagues, clientele, and others was measured by a six-item scale in Part VII of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). A higher score on the scale represented a perceived higher level of job performance. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient from the pilot test of that scale was .92. Items and their scaling were:

(+) I am a creative worker.

(-) I am not recognized by colleagues as being a success.

(+) I am perceived as being successful by people outside of my organization.

(+) Generally speaking, the results of my work are considered by others as being valuable.

(+) What I do in my job, I do well.

(+), Feedback from my clientele indicates that I have been successful.

**Job Satisfaction**

Overall job satisfaction was measured by a 15-item scale in Part VII of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). This scale included items measuring the five main facets of job satisfaction (Steers, 1988): promotion, pay, the work itself, co-workers, and supervision. A higher score on the
scale represented a higher level of job satisfaction. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for this scale from the pilot test was .84. Items and their scaling were:

(+) I enjoy the freedom to do what I want in my job.
(+) I am rewarded with an equitable salary for my work.
(+) My job allows me to grow professionally.
(-) My job responsibilities are too broad for one person to accomplish.
(-) There are too many non-productive aspects of my job.
(+ ) I generally have good relationships with my supervisors.
(+ ) I have an interesting job.
(-) My job does not allow me to do things I want to do.
(+ ) I enjoy working with my colleagues.
(-) I need more resources to do my job.
(-) There are very few opportunities for advancement in my present job.
(-) I quite often get discouraged with my job.
(+ ) I am generally satisfied with my job.
(-) My job is frustrating.
(+ ) It is a pleasure to do my job.
Organizational/Personal Value Match

A respondent's perception as to the match between his or her organization's operationalized value system and the individual's own set of values was measured by a 9-item scale in Part IX of the questionnaire (see Appendix B) with items addressing the organization's philosophy and values, treatment of employees, ethics, and general actions and how these match with the individual's values. A higher score on the scale represented a perception of a closer match between the organization's values and the individual's values. Reliability testing through the pilot test produced a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .94. Items and scaling were:

(+) The philosophical values of the organization are similar to my own.

(-) The way the organization operates does not match my own value system.

(+) The organization supports many of the concepts that I personally value.

(-) I am bothered by the way in which the organization operates.

(+) I feel good about the way the organization treats its employees.

(+) The organization's attitude toward ethical conduct matches my own.
(+): I feel that the organization values many of the same things that I do.

(-): I have experienced instances when the organization acted in ways that went against my own value system.

(+): The organization is a good role model for its employees in terms of ethical conduct.

Faculty Demographic Characteristics

Faculty demographic characteristics were identified by two methods. Faculty length of tenure in current position, rank, and tenure status were determined using the faculty database of the College of Agriculture. Other faculty characteristics were self-reported in the questionnaire used in the study. The remaining demographic characteristics (type of appointment, main budgetary source, and gender) were determined by responses to items in Part X (see Appendix B). The College of Agriculture database provided a basis for checking the validity of these reported characteristics if responses deviated from the provided categories or were left blank.

Items in both the Likert-type scales and the individual demographic items were written using the guidelines of Sudman and Bradburn (1982) and Dillman (1978) to insure clarity and understanding by respondents. Following testing of the scales, the questionnaire was put into a booklet format. The layout also utilized suggestions by Sudman and
Bradburn (1982) and Dillman (1978) so as to improve chances of response by subjects in the study. The questionnaire included an appropriate design and space for respondent identification number on the cover and space after the final items for the respondent to offer any additional comments related to the questionnaire or the study.

Data Collection

The method of data collection used in this study was a mail questionnaire. Additional data were collected using a faculty information database in the College of Agriculture (See discussion in Instrumentation discussion). Strengths of a mail questionnaire that made the method appropriate for the study included: it is relatively inexpensive, it is fairly easy to organize, it is possible to collect a wide scope of information from a large population, and the format is conducive to code responses for ease in statistical analysis (Norland, 1990; Miller, 1990; Dillman, 1978).

Approval of the study by The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Board was given on July 13, 1990. The protocol number assigned to the study by the review board was #90B0107 (see Appendix D). Approval to directly contact faculty members in the College of Agriculture, College of Biological Sciences, College of Human Ecology, and College of Veterinary Medicine was obtained from the deans of the four colleges prior to the data collection process (see Appendix D).
The 14 face-to-face interviews were conducted between June 14 and July 11. Researchers traveled to Wooster on July 6 to interview those selected faculty members whose work location was the OARDC campus at Wooster. Transcripts of the interviews were used to develop a mail questionnaire.

The questionnaire was mailed via the campus mail system of The Ohio State University to all subjects on August 8, 1990. Included in the mailing were: a cover letter (see Appendix D) explaining the purpose of the study, the need for the subject's input, notice of the deans' approvals for contacting the faculty member, assurances of confidentiality, and instructions to complete and return the questionnaire; a copy of the questionnaire; and a self-addressed, campus mail envelope in which to return the completed questionnaire. The deadline for returning the completed questionnaire was indicated in the cover letter as August 15, 1990.

On August 16, 1990, a second letter (see Appendix D) was sent to those individuals who had not yet responded. The letter indicated that they should have received the packet the week before and, if they had not done so, would they please complete the questionnaire and return it. The second letter also offered to send a second questionnaire to those who no longer had the original questionnaire or, for some reason, had not received the original packet.
A week later, on August 23, 1990, another packet containing another follow-up letter (see Appendix D) was sent to remaining non-respondents reminding them of the importance of their responses and urging them to complete and return the questionnaire. A final deadline for data collection was set for August 30, 1990.

From an original population of 335, the total number of respondents was 151 for an accepting sample of 45.1%. One of those was not usable due to high levels of incomplete responses. The loss of that response resulted in a data sample of 44.8% (n=150). The data collection process took place during the last half of the Summer Quarter, 1990. Even though most of the faculty members in the study population held 12 month appointments, many were out of their offices during the data collection period attending professional meetings, on vacation, or conducting off-campus research activities. The result was a less than expected response rate for the study.

As discussed in the Design section of this chapter, non-response was addressed using Miller and Smith's (1983) suggestion that late respondents are similar to non-respondents. August 20, 1990 was established prior to data collection as the cut-off point for early respondents. Any responses after that date were coded as late respondents. Scores from early respondents on the Likert-type scales measuring professional self-esteem, job performance, job
satisfaction, and organizational/personal value match were compared to the scores of late respondents using t-tests and an a priori .05 level of statistical significance. No significant differences were found between the two groups. Therefore, using the logic of Miller and Smith (1983), the responses from the data sample can be assumed to be representative of those of the accessible population and, therefore, the target population.

Data representing faculty length of tenure in current position, rank, and tenure status were collected directly from the faculty database. These characteristics were printed out alphabetically by faculty members' names for ease of data entry.

Due to the lower than expected response rate, available demographic data from the faculty database for the entire population in the study was compared to demographic data collected from the data sample to further address potential non-response error (Miller and Smith, 1983). The sample data were found to be very similar to the demographic characteristics of the population as a whole (see Appendix E). This provided additional evidence that the respondents in this study were representative of the population.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected from this study were analyzed using the personal computer version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+), Version 3.0 (Norusis, 1988a,
1988b) provided by the Instruction and Research Computing Center (IRCC) of The Ohio State University. Descriptive statistics were used since the study was a census. The results reported should be considered representative of the population.

The scales of measurement of the variables influence the appropriate statistical analyses (Hair, Anderson, and Tatham, 1987; Hopkins, Glass, and Hopkins, 1987). The main budgetary source and gender were treated as nominal scale data. The variables tenure status, type of appointment, and faculty rank were treated as ordinal scale data. The remaining variables in the study including variables measured by the Likert-type scales were treated as being represented by interval scale data (Adams, Fagot, and Robinson, 1965).

Statistics used to describe nominal data were modes and frequency distributions. Ordinal data were described by the median and frequency distribution among levels of the variables. Interval data were described using means and standard deviations. Differences between groups on variable scores were determined by comparing group scores. Any differences represented true differences within the population.

Relationships between the non-dichotomous nominal variable, main budgetary source, and other variables were described using Cramer's V as a measure of association.
between variables in a contingency table. Interval scale variables were converted to nominal scale variables for that analysis. Cramer's V was also used to explore associations between the two dichotomous variables and the ordinal scale variables.

Relationships between dichotomous variables and interval scale variables were analyzed using the point biserial correlation coefficient. Associations between ordinal data variables and interval data variables were determined after converting the interval data to ordinal categories and calculating Kendall's tau b or Kendall's tau c for the variables in a contingency table.

Relationships between interval scale variables were identified by calculating a Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient to represent the strength and direction of any relationship found.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to determine how much variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction could be explained by the independent variables in the study. As explained by Cohen and Cohen (1983), the independent variables were entered into the regression equation using a conservative causal priority strategy. Those variables that were temporally prior to and unlikely to be affected by other variables were entered into the equation initially and followed by variables representing more transitory variables.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The findings of the study were organized into seven major headings: (1) demographic characteristics of faculty of the College of Agriculture and faculty from other colleges with OARDC and OCES appointments; (2) levels of job satisfaction of these faculty; (3) levels of professional self-esteem of these faculty; (4) levels of perceived job performance of these faculty; (5) levels of perceived organizational/personal values match of these faculty; (6) relationships among faculty demographic characteristics and the variables of job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match; and (7) variance in job satisfaction explained by professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal value match, and faculty demographic characteristics. Each of these headings addresses one of the research questions posed in Chapter I.

Demographic Characteristics of Faculty

Faculty demographic characteristics included in this study were: (1) type of appointment, (2) main budgetary
source, (3) tenure in current position, (4) faculty rank, (5) tenure status, and (6) gender.

**Type of Appointment**

Type of appointment was defined as the number of splits in a faculty member's official university appointment. Levels of appointment splits were a one-way split (representing no split), a two-way split, and a three-way split. The distribution of types of appointments of faculty members in the study is shown in Table 2. The type of faculty appointment held by 68.7% of faculty members was a two-way split appointment. A one-way appointment was reported by 23.3% of the faculty members, while only 8% reported having a three-way appointment.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way split</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way split</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way split</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median = 2 (Two-way split)

Coding: One-way = 1, Two-way = 2, Three-way = 3
Main Budgetary Source

Main budget source was the source of the majority funds for a faculty member's position. The possible sources were: resident instruction, research, Extension, and those faculty who receive equal amounts from more than one source. Resident instruction was reported most often (32.7%) as the main budget source of faculty members (see Table 3) followed closely by research (30%). Eighteen percent of the faculty members held appointments with equal budget percentages from two sources. The remaining 19.3% of the faculty received their main budget contribution from Extension.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Instruction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Split</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode = 1 (Resident Instruction)

Coding: Resident Instruction = 1, Research = 2, Extension = 3, Equal Split = 4
Tenure in Current Position

Tenure in current position was determined by examining faculty information records in the College of Agriculture. Years of tenure in the current position ranged from less than 2 months to more than 31 years. As shown in Table 4, faculty members with 5 or less years of tenure in their current position represented 42.7% of the group. The mean tenure was 8.48 years with a range of 31 and standard deviation of 6.65.

Table 4

Tenure in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or Less</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 to 10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 to 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; than 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 8.48  
Standard Deviation = 6.65  
Range = 31.00
Table 5

**Faculty Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median = 3.00

Coding: Instructor = 1, Assistant Professor = 2, Associate Professor = 3, Professor = 5

**Faculty Rank**

Faculty rank at The Ohio State University consists of four levels: instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Table 5 contains the distribution of faculty by rank. Professors (40%) made up the largest group of faculty members by rank. Only two individuals (1.3%) held the rank of instructor.

**Tenure Status**

Tenure status represented whether or not faculty members had yet received official university tenure status. Records in the College of Agriculture office showed that
73.3% of the faculty members were tenured. This was more than twice the number of untenured faculty (see Table 6).

**Gender**

Table 7 indicates the distribution of faculty members by gender. Male faculty members were by far the most prevalent in the population of the study (88% males to 12% females).

**Table 6**

**Tenure Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median = 1.00

Coding: Untenured = 0, Tenured = 1

**Professional Self-Esteem**

Professional self-esteem was represented in this study by the individual's mean score on an 8-item scale. The response categories for this scale ranged from 1 to 6. A score of 1 indicated strong disagreement with an item in the scale; a score of 6 would represent very strong agreement. Negatively-worded items were reverse-coded so that an individual's mean score would indicate either high or low
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode = 0 (Male)
Coding: Male = 0, Female = 1

esteem. The higher the mean score, the higher the individual's professional self-esteem.

To aid in interpretation of results, the response scale was modified as shown in Figure 1. Levels of disagreement were indicated by scores from 1.00 to 3.50. Levels of agreement were represented by scores in the 3.51 to 6.00 range. The scales used to measure the variables job performance, organizational/personal values match, and job satisfaction used the same response categories and were interpreted using the scale shown in Figure 1.

Table 8 shows the distribution and average score of faculty members on the professional self-esteem scale. The mean self-esteem score was 4.55 with a range of 4 and a standard deviation of .75. Faculty members overall had a high level of self esteem, 93.8% had mean scores in the agreement range of the scale.
Job performance was measured by responses on a 6-item Likert-type scale. The mean score of the items in the scale represented the individual's perceived level of job performance. The higher the mean score, the higher the individual perceived his or her job performance. The distribution of job performance scores are shown in Table 9. Again, faculty members felt that they performed well. All responses were in the agreement portion of the scale. The mean job performance score was 4.75 with a range of 2 and a standard deviation of .65.
Table 8

**Professional Self-Esteem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51 - 5.50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51 - 6.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.55  Standard Deviation = .75  
Range = 4.00

**Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match**

A 9-item Likert-type scale was used to measure faculty members' perceptions of the match between the value system of the organizations for which they work and their own value systems. Faculty were asked to respond to the items based on how the organization operationalized its value system. A higher score represented a perception of a closer match.

Table 10 shows the distribution of scores on the values match scale. The mean score for the scale was 4.03 with a range of 5 and standard deviation of 1.07. On the values
### Table 9

**Perceived Job Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51 - 5.50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51 - 6.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.75  
Standard Deviation = .65  
Range = 2.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51 - 5.50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51 - 6.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.03

Standard Deviation = 1.07

Range = 5.00
match scale, 27.1% of the faculty scores were in the disagreement end of the scale.

**Job Satisfaction**

Faculty job satisfaction was represented by the mean score on a 15-item Likert-type scale. Items included aspects of the job such as the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, coworkers, and supervisors. The higher the score, the more satisfied the individual was with his or her job. The distribution of scores on job satisfaction are found in Table 11.

Faculty indicated satisfaction with their jobs with a mean satisfaction score of 4.21, a range of 5 and standard deviation of .84. In the distribution, 85.1% of the scores fell in the agreement portion of the scale.

**Relationships Between Variables**

The sixth research question addressed the strength and nature of the relationships between the faculty demographic variables and professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal values match, and job satisfaction. The following section will discuss the findings related to that research question.

Cramer's V was the statistic used to represent associations between the nominal variable main budgetary source and all other variables. Associations between gender and other non-dichotomous, ordinal variables were also represented by Cramer's V. The association between the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51 - 4.50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51 - 5.50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51 - 6.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 4.21
Standard Deviation = .84
Range = 5.00
dichotomous variables, gender and tenure status, was represented by a phi coefficient. The relationships between the ordinal variables type of appointment, tenure status, rank, and their relationships with interval variables were represented by Kendall's tau. Tau b was used for relationships with square contingency tables, tau c for those with rectangular tables. Interval data was converted into categories for construction of contingency tables.

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients represented the relationships between interval variables. Point biserial correlation coefficients were used to represent the relationships between interval variables and the dichotomous variables, gender and tenure status.

The strengths of associations examined in this study were described using the scale reported by Davis (1971). Those categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very Strong Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency tables were used in conjunction with the phi coefficient, Cramer's V, and Kendall's Tau c and b to examine the relationships. In order to develop interpretable contingency tables, some categories were
collapsed in order to get representative cell numbers in the tables. Because only two individuals were at the rank level of instructor, for purposes of the study of relationships among variables they were combined into the assistant professor level. This was done because the similarity of the two levels of rank was thought to be sufficient to allow the combination without affecting interpretation of relationships. Likewise, when the interval data were collapsed into categories, some categories had few scores. Those scores were combined into the next category for analysis purposes.

**Type of Appointment and Main Budgetary Source**

The association between type of appointment and main budgetary source can be found in Table 12. There was low relationship (Cramer's $V=.29$) between type of appointment and main budgetary source. Faculty members with resident instruction as the main budgetary source were the most frequent faculty with one-way and three-way splits. Two-thirds of the respondents with three-way appointments had resident instruction as the main budget source. The most faculty members with two-way splits had research as the main budgetary source.

**Type of Appointment and Tenure in Current Position**

Data in Table 13 reported the association between type of appointment and tenure in current position. There was a negligible, negative relationship (Kendall's Tau $c=-.06$).
Table 12

Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Main Budgetary Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-Way Split</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal Split</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Years</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-Way Split</td>
<td>Two-Way Split</td>
<td>Three-Way Split</td>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or Less</td>
<td>12 34.3</td>
<td>48 46.6</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>64 42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 to 10</td>
<td>5 14.3</td>
<td>18 17.5</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>27 18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 15</td>
<td>10 20.0</td>
<td>20 19.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>30 20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 to 20</td>
<td>4 11.4</td>
<td>9 8.7</td>
<td>2 16.7</td>
<td>15 10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; than 20</td>
<td>4 11.4</td>
<td>8 7.8</td>
<td>2 16.7</td>
<td>14 9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 100.0</td>
<td>103 100.0</td>
<td>12 100.0</td>
<td>150 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau c = -0.06
between type of appointment and tenure in current position. The highest number of responses for each level of appointment type was for faculty with 5 or less years of tenure. A greater percentage of faculty with two or three-way splits had ten years or less tenure in current position (64.1% and 66.6%, respectively) than faculty with one-way splits (48.6%).

**Type of Appointment and Faculty Rank**

The association between type of appointment and faculty rank is shown in Table 14. There was a low relationship between type of appointment and faculty rank (Kendall's Tau \( \tau_b = .15 \)). The highest percentages of faculty members with two or three-way split appointments were for professors (36.9% and 75%, respectively), while assistant professors had the highest percentage (42.9) for faculty members with one-way splits.

**Type of Appointment and Tenure Status**

A negligible association was found between type of appointment and tenure status (Kendall's Tau \( \tau_c = .01 \)). As shown in Table 15, the majority of faculty members in each level of appointment type had achieved tenure. Those faculty members with three-way splits reported the highest percentage of tenured status (91.7%), while two-way split faculty had the lowest tenured percentage (69.9%).
Table 14

Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Faculty Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Three-</th>
<th></th>
<th>Two-Way</th>
<th></th>
<th>Way</th>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau b = .15
Table 15

**Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Tenure Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>Three-Way</th>
<th>Two-Way</th>
<th>One-Way</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>31 30.1</td>
<td>1 8.3</td>
<td>40 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 77.1</td>
<td>72 69.9</td>
<td>11 91.7</td>
<td>110 73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 100.0</td>
<td>103 100.0</td>
<td>12 100.0</td>
<td>150 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kendall's Tau c = .01*
Table 16

Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Three-Way</th>
<th>One-Way</th>
<th>Two-Way</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .13
Type of Appointment and Gender

Table 16 contains the data for the association between type of appointment and gender. There was a low relationship between type of appointment and gender (Cramer's V=.13). The highest percentage of females (17.1%) was found in the one-way split category. No female faculty were found at the three-way split level.

Type of Appointment and Professional Self-Esteem

The association between type of appointment and professional self-esteem can be found in Table 17. There was a negligible relationship (Kendall's Tau c=.07) between type of appointment and professional esteem. At all three levels of appointment type, the majority of faculty members' scores were in the 3.51-4.50 range or the 4.51-5.50 range, both in the agreement portion of the professional self-esteem scale.

Type of Appointment and Perceived Job Performance

Data presented in Table 18 reported the association between type of appointment and perceived job performance. There was a low relationship (Kendall's Tau b=.10) between type of appointment and perceived job performance. Faculty members with two or three-way splits had higher percentages of scores in the 4.51-5.50 range than did faculty with one-way splits. No faculty with a three-way split had scores in the top range of 5.51-6.00.
Table 17

Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Professional Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>One-Way</th>
<th>Two-Way</th>
<th>Three-Way</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Mean</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-3.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau c = .07
**Table 18**

**Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Perceived Job Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Job Performance</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-Way Split</td>
<td>Two-Way Split</td>
<td>Three-Way Split</td>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau $b = .10$
Type of Appointment and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match

The data in Table 19 indicate a negligible, negative relationship (Kendall's Tau $c=-.02$) between type of appointment and perceived organizational/personal value match. The percentage of faculty members in the middle categories of values match scores were similar across all levels of appointment type.

Type of Appointment and Job Satisfaction

Information presented in Table 20 showed the relationship between type of appointment and job satisfaction. A negligible relationship (Kendall's Tau $b=.03$) was found between type of appointment and job satisfaction. The percentages of faculty members at each category of job satisfaction score were similar across levels of type of appointment. Over 80% of faculty members across levels of appointment type were in the agreement portion of the job satisfaction scale.

Main Budgetary Source and Tenure in Current Position

Table 21 contains data indicating the association of main budgetary source and tenure in current position. A low relationship (Cramer's V=.22) was found between main budgetary source and tenure in current position. A higher percentage of faculty with either Extension as the main budget source or with two budget sources providing equal support were found in the lower tenure category (5 years or
Table 19

Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Match Mean</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>Three-Way Split</th>
<th>Two-Way Split</th>
<th>One-Way Split</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-2.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau $c = -0.02$
### Table 20

**Relationship Between Type of Appointment and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Type of Appointment</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>One-Way Split</th>
<th>Two-Way Split</th>
<th>Three-Way Split</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kendall's Tau b = .03*
Table 21

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Tenure in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Years</th>
<th>Resident Instruction</th>
<th>Resident Research</th>
<th>Resident Extension</th>
<th>Equal Split</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or Less</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 to 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 to 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; than 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .22
less) than in the resident instruction or research budget source categories. Faculty with research funds as the main budget source had a higher percentage of individuals in the high tenure category (more than 20 years) than any of the other categories. There were no faculty with Extension as the main budget source in the high category.

Main Budgetary Source and Faculty Rank

The association between main budgetary source and faculty rank is shown in Table 22. A low relationship (Cramer's $V = .21$) was found between main budgetary source and faculty rank. For faculty with main budget sources of resident instruction, research, and equal split between budget sources, the highest percentage of individuals is found at the professor level of rank. However, for faculty with Extension as the main budgetary source, the highest percentage of individuals is found at the assistant professor level. The percentage of Extension faculty at the professor level is less than half of the other categories of main budget source.

Main Budgetary Source and Tenure Status

Data in Table 23 show the association between main budgetary source and tenure status. There was a low relationship (Cramer's $V = .14$) between main budgetary source and tenure status. As with main budgetary source and faculty rank, the Extension category of main budget source differs from the other budget categories. A smaller
Table 22

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Faculty Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V = .21$
Table 23

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .14
percentage of faculty with Extension as their main budget source were at the tenured level than were faculty in the other categories.

Main Budgetary Source and Gender

Table 24 contains data illustrating the relationship between main budgetary source and gender. A moderate relationship (Cramer's V=.30) was found between main budgetary source and gender. A higher percentage of faculty reporting Extension as the main budget source were female. The Extension percentage of female faculty was more than twice as much as the percentage of females over all cases. The percentage of females with research as the main budget was less than half of the overall percentage of females over all cases. There were no female faculty found in the equal split category of main budgetary source.

Main Budgetary Source and Professional Self-Esteem

The association between main budgetary source and professional self-esteem is shown in Table 25. A low relationship (Cramer's V=.13) was found between main budgetary source and professional self-esteem. Faculty with Extension as the main budget source had a higher percentage of scores in the disagree portion of the scale than did faculty members in the other categories. However, faculty with research as the main budget source, who had the most scores in the upper half of the scale, also had the highest percentage of scores in the lowest category.
### Table 24

**Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V = .30$
Table 25

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Professional Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Professional Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Instruction</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4.2</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 43.7</td>
<td>11 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 45.8</td>
<td>24 54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 6.3</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 100.0</td>
<td>44 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .13
Main Budgetary Source and Perceived Job Performance

A low relationship (Cramer's V=.14) was found between main budgetary source and perceived job performance. Data in Table 26 indicate that relationship. There was a higher percentage of faculty with Extension as the main budgetary source and with equal support from two budget sources in the lower category of perceived job performance (3.51-4.50). However, it should be noted that all job performance scores, regardless of main budgetary source, were in the upper (agreement) portion of the job performance scale.

Main Budgetary Source and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match

Table 27 contains data illustrating the relationship between main budgetary source and perceived organizational/personal values match. There was a low relationship (Cramer's V=.13) between main budgetary source and organizational/personal values match. Faculty with two equal budgetary sources had the highest percentage of scores in the disagreement portion of the scale of all the levels of main budgetary source. The other three main budgetary source levels had similar percentages of scores in the upper portion of the scale.

Main Budgetary Source and Job Satisfaction

The association between main budgetary source and job satisfaction is shown in Table 28. A low relationship (Cramer's V=.13) was found between main budgetary source and
Table 26

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Perceived Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Job Performance</th>
<th>Main Budgetary Source</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Resident Instruction</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .14
Table 27

Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Match Mean</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-2.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .13
### Table 28

**Relationship Between Main Budgetary Source and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean Score</th>
<th>Resident Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Equal Split</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00-3.50</td>
<td>9 19.1</td>
<td>4 9.3</td>
<td>3 10.7</td>
<td>5 21.8</td>
<td>21 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>20 42.6</td>
<td>21 48.8</td>
<td>17 60.7</td>
<td>11 47.8</td>
<td>69 48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-6.00</td>
<td>18 38.3</td>
<td>18 41.9</td>
<td>8 28.6</td>
<td>7 30.4</td>
<td>51 36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47 100.0</td>
<td>43 100.0</td>
<td>28 100.0</td>
<td>23 100.0</td>
<td>141 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .13
job satisfaction. A majority of job satisfaction scores were in the agreement portion of the scale for all levels of main budgetary source. However, faculty with resident instruction as the main budget source and faculty with an equal split between two budget sources reported higher percentages of scores in the disagree portion of the scale than faculty with either research or Extension as the main budget source.

Faculty Rank and Tenure in Current Position

The relationship between faculty rank and tenure in current position is shown in Table 29. A moderate relationship (Kendall's Tau c=.34) was found between faculty rank and tenure in current position. The highest percentage of faculty members with 5 years or less tenure in current position were at the assistant professor level. Conversely, the lowest percentage for that tenure category was for professors. Professors also had the highest percentages for both of the highest tenure in current position categories (more than 15 years to 20 years and more than 20 years).

Faculty Rank and Tenure Status

A substantial relationship (Kendall's Tau c=.60) was found between faculty rank and tenure status. Data illustrating this relationship are found in Table 30. A much higher percentage of faculty members in the assistant professor level were untenured than those faculty at the associate professor and professor level. Likewise, a high
Table 29

Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Tenure in Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Years</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or Less</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; than 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau c = .34
Table 30

Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau $c = .60$
percentage of associate professors and professors were tenured.

**Faculty Rank and Gender**

Table 31 includes data pointing out the relationship between faculty rank and gender. There was a moderate association (Cramer's $V = .31$) between faculty rank and gender. As level of faculty rank increased from the assistant professor level to the professor level, the percentage of females dropped for each level. There were no females at the professor level.

**Faculty Rank and Professional Self-Esteem**

The association between faculty rank and professional self-esteem is shown in Table 32. A low relationship (Kendall's $\tau_c = .18$) was found between faculty rank and professional self-esteem. Faculty at the professor level had a higher percentage of scores in the higher categories of self-esteem than did assistant professors and associate professors. However, most of the professional self-esteem scores for all faculty members were in the agreement portion of the scale.

**Faculty Rank and Perceived Job Performance**

A low relationship (Kendall's $\tau_b = .18$) was found between faculty rank and perceived job performance. Data in Table 33 indicate that relationship. Faculty members at the professor and associate professor level had higher percentages of scores in the high job performance score.
Table 31

Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .31
Table 32

Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Professional Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-3.50</td>
<td>4 8.3</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>22 45.8</td>
<td>21 53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>20 41.7</td>
<td>15 38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>2 4.2</td>
<td>2 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48 100.0</td>
<td>39 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau c = .18
Table 33

**Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Perceived Job Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Job Performance</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau b = .18
category (5.51-6.00) than faculty at the assistant professor level. Faculty at the assistant professor level had a higher percentage of responses in the low category (3.51-4.50) than faculty in the other two levels. It should again be noted that all of the job performance scores were in the agreement portion of the job performance scale.

**Faculty Rank and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match**

Data indicating the relationship of faculty rank and perceived organizational/personal values match are found in Table 34. There was a low relationship (Kendall's Tau c=.10) between faculty rank and perceived organizational/personal values match. A higher percentage of faculty at the associate professor level had scores at both the lowest category (1.51-2.50) and the highest category (5.51-6.00). The professor level of faculty rank had a smaller percentage of scores in the disagree portion of the scale than either the assistant professor or the associate professor level.

**Faculty Rank and Job Satisfaction**

Table 35 shows the association between faculty rank and job satisfaction. A low relationship (Kendall's Tau b=.15) was found between faculty rank and job satisfaction. A lower percentage of scores in the high job satisfaction category (4.51-6.00) were found for faculty at the assistant
### Table 34

**Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51-2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51-3.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.51-5.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51-6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau c = .10
Table 35

Relationship Between Faculty Rank and Job Satisfaction

| Mean Score | Assistant Professor | | Associate Professor | | Professor | | All Cases |
|:-----------|---------------------|:|---------------------|:|----------------|:|---------|
| 1.00-3.50  | 8 16.7              | 8 22.3                  | 5 8.8                  | 21 14.9     |
| 3.51-4.50  | 29 60.4             | 12 33.3                 | 28 49.1                | 69 48.9     |
| 4.51-6.00  | 11 22.9             | 16 44.4                 | 24 42.1                | 51 36.2     |
| Total      | 48 100.0            | 36 100.0                | 57 100.0               | 141 100.0   |

Kendall's Tau b = .15
professor level than for either the associate professor or professor level. Professor level faculty had a smaller percentage of scores in the disagree portion of the scale than either of the other two levels.

Gender and Tenure Status

The relationship between gender and tenure status is illustrated by the data in Table 36. There was a low relationship (Phi coefficient=.20) between gender and tenure status. Over three quarters of the male faculty had achieved tenure status, while 50% of the female faculty were tenured.

Dichotomous and Interval Variables

Relationships between the dichotomous variables, tenure status and gender, and the interval variables, tenure in current position, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal values match, and job satisfaction are shown in Table 37. There was a very strong correlation (r=.70) between perceived organizational/personal values match and job satisfaction. There was also a substantial correlation (r=.64) between professional self-esteem and perceived job performance. Moderate correlations were found between tenure status and tenure in current position ($r_{pb}=.45$), professional self-esteem and job satisfaction ($r=.43$), professional self-esteem and perceived organizational/personal values match ($r=.33$), job performance and job satisfaction ($r=.33$). Low
Table 36

Relationship Between Gender and Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi Coefficient = .20
Table 37
Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations between both Tenure Status and Gender and other variables are point biserial correlations. All other correlations are Pearson product moment correlation coefficients.

Key for Variables: TS = Tenure Status, G = Gender, T = Tenure in Current Position, PS = Professional Self-Esteem, JP = Perceived Job Performance, VM = Perceived Organizational/Personal Value Match, JS = Job Satisfaction
correlations were found between gender and tenure in current job \((r_{pb} = -.25, \text{males}=0, \text{females}=1)\), gender and job performance \((r_{pb} = -.12)\), gender and perceived organizational/personal values match \((r_{pb} = -.11)\), gender and job satisfaction \((r_{pb} = -.11)\), tenure in current position and perceived organizational/personal values match \((r = .10)\), and job performance and perceived organizational/personal values match \((r = .21)\). The remaining relationships were negligible.

**Variance Explained in Job Satisfaction by Other Variables**

The seventh research question in this study was related to how much variance in job satisfaction could be explained by the other variables in the study. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to address this question. The independent variables in the regression analysis were: (1) gender, (2) tenure in current position, (3) faculty rank, (4) appointment type, (5) perceived organizational/personal values match, (6) professional self-esteem, and (7) job performance. Tenure status was dropped from the regression analysis due to the substantial relationship between tenure status and rank \((\text{Kendall's Tau } \tau_c = .60)\) and the conclusion that those two variables were probably measuring the same underlying construct related to seniority and achievement.

The interval variable, main budgetary source was dummy coded with the equal split level being the comparison group. This resulted in three dummy coded variables representing main budgetary source. The remaining variables were entered
into the regression analysis as coded or scored as recommended by Cohen and Cohen (1983). Summary data for the regression of job satisfaction on the other variables of interest are presented in Table 38.

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the amount of variance in job satisfaction score explained by the variables of interest. The order of entry of the independent variables was based on Cohen and Cohen's (1983) suggestion of first entering variables based on causal priority. Candidates for causal priority entrance into the equation were demographic variables because those were temporally prior to and unlikely to be affected by the more transitory psychological variables. The non-demographic variables were entered into the equation based on the strength of their correlations with job satisfaction. The data reported in Table 39 summarized the results of the regression of job satisfaction on gender, tenure in current position, faculty rank, main budgetary source, type of appointment, perceived organizational/personal values match, and professional self-esteem.

The regression model with gender was loaded first and explained 1.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. The addition of tenure in current position explained an additional .4%. Faculty rank was next entered into the equation and resulted in an additional 1% of explained variance. The three dummy coded variables representing main
### Table 38

**Summary Data: Regression of Faculty Job Satisfaction and Selected Variables (n=150)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>X₃</th>
<th>X₄</th>
<th>X₅</th>
<th>X₆</th>
<th>X₇</th>
<th>Yᵢ</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (X₁)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (X₂)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (X₃)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment Type (X₄)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Match (X₅)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Self-Esteem (X₆)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance (X₇)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (Yᵢ)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Coded: Male=0, Female=1

*b Coded: Assistant Professor=1, Associate Professor=2, Professor=3

*c Coded: One-way split=1, Two-way split=2, Three-way split=3
budgetary source were entered as a set in the next step. Together they explained an additional 5.3% of the variance in job satisfaction. The variable type of appointment was entered next into the equation adding only .1% explained variance. At that point, the five demographic variables entered into the equation accounted for a total of 7.9% of the variance in job satisfaction.

The next variable into the regression equation was perceived organizational/personal values match. That variable accounted for 52.6% of additional explained variance in job satisfaction after controlling for the demographic variables already in the equation. Professional self-esteem was the next variable entered into the analysis and accounted for an additional 3% of variance in job satisfaction. The final variable into the equation was perceived job performance which added another .3% of explained variance to the model. The total $R^2$ of .638 indicated that the total variance explained by the optimal linear relationship of the dependent variable, job satisfaction, with the independent variables in the full model was 63.8%.
Table 39

Regression of Faculty Job Satisfaction on Demographic Characteristics, Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match, Professional Self-Esteem, and Job Performance (n=150) (Hierarchical Entry)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Budgetary Source</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Personal Values Match</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Job Performance</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe levels of job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceptions of job performance, and perceptions of organizational/personal value match of faculty members in The Ohio State University College of Agriculture and faculty members in The Ohio State University Colleges of Biological Sciences, Human Ecology, and Veterinary Medicine who have split appointments with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC) and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES). The study also sought to describe these faculty members on the following demographic characteristics: type of appointment, main budgetary source, tenure in current position, faculty rank, tenure status, and gender. Additionally, the study attempted to describe the relationships that existed between demographic characteristics, job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match.
Research Questions

The following research questions were used to guide the study:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of faculty of the College of Agriculture and faculty from other colleges with OARDC and OCES appointments?
   Demographic characteristics:
   A. Type of appointment
   B. Main budgetary source
   C. Tenure in current position
   D. Faculty rank
   E. Tenure status
   F. Gender

2. What are the levels of job satisfaction of these faculty?

3. What are the levels of professional self-esteem of these faculty?

4. What are the levels of perceived job performance of these faculty?

5. What are the levels of perceived organizational/personal values match of these faculty?

6. What are the relationships among faculty demographic characteristics and the variables of job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match?
7. How much of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, perceived organizational/personal value match, and faculty demographic characteristics?

Limitations of the Study

This study was descriptive and correlational in nature. According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), research of that nature does not necessarily show cause and effect relationships among variables.

The study included faculty members of the College of Agriculture and other faculty members of The Ohio State University who held appointments with the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and/or Ohio Cooperative Extension Service as of August 1, 1990. The results of this study are limited to that population and should not be generalized beyond.

Research Design

This research was a descriptive-correlational study designed to identify and describe variables and the nature and strength of relationships among variables.

Population

The target population for the study consisted of all faculty members holding salaried appointments in The Ohio State University (OSU) College of Agriculture and faculty from other colleges holding salaried appointments in the College of Agriculture through the Ohio Agricultural
Research and Development Center (OARDC) and/or the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES). Other OSU colleges that had faculty members holding partial OARDC and/or OCES appointments were the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Human Ecology, and the College of Veterinary Medicine.

Due to the accessibility of the population, a census was conducted rather than a sample. The accessible population size was 335 faculty members. Because the frame was felt to be representative of the target population, the assumption was made that the accessible population and the target population were identical. Therefore, the results of the study were assumed to be describing the target population.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was designed by the researcher to gather data for the study. Separate multi-item Likert-type scales were developed to measure job satisfaction, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, and perceived organizational/personal value match. Individual items were written to measure each of the faculty demographics variables.

To develop items for the Likert-type scales that were representative of the constructs being measured, as well as to be sure that the items were appropriate for the contextual situations of the subjects of the study, face-to-
face interviews were conducted with purposefully selected members of the population. The interviews were tape recorded and transcripts of the interviews were used in the development of items for the quantitative, Likert-type scales. The College of Agriculture faculty information database provided a basis for identifying faculty demographic variables and for validating characteristics reported in the mail questionnaire if responses deviated from the provided categories or were left blank.

Instruments were determined to be valid by means of a review by a panel of experts. Reliability of the Likert-type scales was determined by calculating Cronbach's alphas using data collected in a pilot test. Alpha's ranged from .79 to .94.

Data Collection

The face-to-face interviews were conducted in June and July, 1990. Fourteen interviews were conducted during that time.

Data were collected using the mail questionnaire during the month of August, 1990. The total number of respondents was 151 for an accepting sample of 45.1%. Data from 150 respondents were usable for a data sample of 44.8%.

Early respondents were compared to late respondents in order to determine if non-respondents would be similar to respondents (Miller and Smith, 1983). There were no significant differences between early and late respondents.
at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, results are assumed to be representative of the population of the study.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the personal computer version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+), Version 3.0 (Norusis, 1988a, 1988b) provided by the Instruction and Research Computing Center (IRCC) of The Ohio State University. Descriptive statistics were used since the study was a census. The results reported should be considered representative of the population.

Statistics used to describe data included means and standard deviations and medians, modes and frequency distributions. Differences between groups on variable scores were determined by comparing group scores. Any differences represented true differences within the population.

The nature and strength of relationships between variables were described using Cramer's V, point biserial correlation coefficients, Kendall's tau B and Kendall's tau C, and Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients to represent the strength and direction of any relationship found.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to determine how much variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction could be explained by the independent variables in the study.
Summary of Findings

Type of Appointment

Faculty with two-way split appointments made up the largest group based on appointment type (68.7%). One-way splits were the next most common at 23.3% of the faculty members. Only 8% of faculty members held a three-way appointment.

Main Budgetary Source

Faculty members with resident instruction as the main budgetary source were the largest percentage (32.7%). Research followed at 30.0%. Extension represented 19.3% of the cases, followed by the equal split category at 18%.

Tenure in Current Position

The mean years of tenure in current position was 8.48 years (sd=6.65). The largest percentage of faculty were in a group with 5 or less years of tenure in the current position. The smallest group was in the over twenty years group.

Faculty Rank

The highest percentage (40.0%) of faculty members are at the rank of professor. Only 1.3% of the faculty were at the instructor level.

Tenure Status

Faculty who had achieved tenured status made up 73.3% of the cases. The remaining faculty were untenured.
Gender

There were more males than females in the study. Males made up 88.0% of the faculty, females 12%.

Professional Self-Esteem

The mean professional self-esteem score was 4.55 out of a possible scale of 1 (Low) to 6 (High). The majority of faculty scores were in the above the 3.51 level in the agreement portion of the scale.

Perceived Job Performance

Using the same scale of responses as that for self-esteem, all of the faculty job performance scores were in the agreement portion of the response scale. The mean job performance score was 4.75 (sd=.65)

Perceived Organizational/Personal Values Match

The mean score on the values match scale was 4.03 (sd=1.07). Over one-quarter (27.1%) of the faculty members' scores were in the disagreement portion of the scale.

Job Satisfaction

Faculty job satisfaction was also, for the most part, in the upper, agreement portion of the response scale. Only 14.9% of job satisfaction scores were in the disagreement portion of the scale. Mean job satisfaction score was 4.21 (sd=.84).
Associations Between Variables

Type of Appointment and Other Variables

There were low relationships between type of appointment and main budgetary source, faculty rank, gender, and perceived job performance. Faculty members with resident instruction as the main budget source held slightly higher percentages of the one-way and three-way splits. The most two-way splits were held by faculty with research as the main budget source. The highest percentage for both two- and three-way splits were professors. Assistant professors held the greatest percentage of one-way appointments. The highest percentage of women held one-way appointments. There were no females with three-way splits. All other relationships between type of appointment and other variables were negligible.

Main Budgetary Source and Other Variables

Main budgetary source had a moderate relationship with gender. More than twice the percentage of females found in the study overall were found in the Extension category of main budgetary source. The percentage of females with research as the main budgetary source was half of the overall percentage of females in the study. There were low relationships found between main budget source and faculty rank, tenure status, professional self-esteem, perceived job performance, organizational/personal values match, and job satisfaction.
Faculty Rank and Other Variables

A substantial relationship was found between faculty rank and tenure status. Faculty at the assistant professor level were more likely to be untenured, as opposed to associate professors and professors, were more likely to be tenured. A moderate relationship was found between faculty rank and tenure in current position. The highest percentage of faculty with lower tenure (5 years or less) were at the assistant professor level. The higher the level of tenure, the more likely the individual will be an associate professor or professor.

A moderate relationship was also found between faculty rank and gender. As level of faculty rank increased from the assistant professor level to the associate professor and professor levels, the percentages of females at each level drops. All relationships between faculty rank and the other variables in the study were low relationships.

Gender and Other Variables

In addition to the relationships mentioned with the variables earlier, gender also was found to have low associations with tenure status, tenure in current position, job performance, organizational/personal values match, and job satisfaction. In all cases female faculty were found to be at slightly lower levels of the other variables than males.
Interval and Dichotomous Variable Relationships

There was a very strong relationship between perceived organizational/personal values match and job satisfaction \((r = .78)\). There was a substantial relationship between professional self-esteem and perceived job performance \((r = .64)\). Moderate relationships were found between tenure status and tenure in current position \((r_p = .45)\), professional self-esteem and job satisfaction \((r = .43)\), professional self-esteem and organizational/personal values match \((r = .33)\), and job performance and job satisfaction \((r = .33)\).

Variance in Job Satisfaction Explained by Other Variables

The regression model with gender included accounted for 1.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. The addition of tenure in current position, faculty rank, main budgetary source, and type of appointment added .4%, 1.0%, 5.3%, and 0.1%, respectively to the total explained job satisfaction variance. Perceived organizational/personal values match explained an additional 52.6% of the variance in job satisfaction when added to the model. Professional self-esteem added another 3% to the total explained variance. The last variable, perceived job performance, contributed 0.3% to the final total of variance explained in job satisfaction. The final \(R^2\) value of .638 indicates that 63.8% of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by the variables in the regression equation.
Conclusions, Discussion, and Implications

The following conclusions are derived from the research findings. Following each conclusion is a discussion of the findings and an implication based on each conclusion.

1. A majority of faculty members in the College of Agriculture and its associated units (OARDC and OCES) hold official appointments with multiple splits. This means that funds from more than one budgetary unit are used for most faculty positions in those organizations. A two-way split was the most common type of appointment.

This finding confirms the common occurrence of split appointments for faculty members in the Colleges studied at this land-grant university. The presence of split appointments at that level indicates that faculty members are often responsible to more than one organizational entity.

Administrators in resident instruction, the agricultural experiment station (OARDC), and Cooperative Extension Service need to realize the potential conflicts that faculty who serve more than one master must often face. Cooperation is needed among the funding units to reduce unnecessary duplication of administrative tasks and loss of productive time for the faculty members. Combining reporting systems for accountability and evaluation
into one format that could be used by all of the organizations to whom a faculty member reports is an example of how the organizations might be able to reduce the burden of multiple administrative duties. The coordination of committee activities, meetings, and/or other service activities could also be implemented to avoid the loss of faculty time to duplicate meetings or service activities in each of the faculty member's organizations. A clear understanding among administrators and faculty members as to what are the expectations for the multiple-appointed faculty member may also prove helpful in reducing potential role ambiguity and role conflict.

2. Resident instruction and research are the main budget sources for most faculty members in the College. This finding supports Libbin and Catlett's (1983) premise that Extension appointments are not as widespread as appointments in teaching and research. That finding may also be indicative of a university-wide emphasis on teaching and research rather than Extension. This interpretation would support the findings of Hayes (1971), Jauch (1976), and Snively and Odell (1989) on the importance of research and teaching in university settings.

The implication is for the budgetary sources who are the minority partner in the split appointment. If
faculty members are more prone to working in the facets of their jobs that provide the most rewards, than the budgetary source providing the main revenue may also become the source of the individual's identity and the recipient of more output from the individual. Again, cooperation between organizational units and clear role identities can help avoid potential conflicts by seeing that the reward system in the university matches the expectations of faculty performance in the organizational unit.

3. By a large percentage, faculty members in the organizations in this study were male.

That finding was somewhat higher than that found by Henderson and Cooper (1987), but that study included only women in agricultural sciences. This study also included fields outside of agricultural science such as home economics and youth development. However, Henderson and Cooper (1987) pointed out that the number of women who are entering fields of agricultural sciences is increasing.

An implication for organizations is to not only increase efforts to encourage qualified female candidates to apply for positions, but also to make the organization itself sensitive to removing gender stereotyping and male dominated organizational
behaviors such as those reported by Callahan and Kidd (1986) and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974).

4. A majority of faculty with Extension as the main budgetary source appear to be at lower levels of faculty rank than faculty with resident instruction or research as the main budgetary source or faculty with equal splits between two sources.

This finding lends support to the findings of Hayes (1971), Jauch (1976), and Snively and Odell (1989) on the emphasis of research and teaching in the reward systems of universities. However, it should be pointed out that the findings could also be a result of Extension personnel having less tenure, although the tenure status of faculty with Extension as the main budget source was found to be similar to tenure status for the other categories of main budget source.

It is important for Extension administrators to determine if lower rank is a result of systematic bias against Extension faculty within the university reward system or if there are other factors related to the discrepancy in faculty rank.

5. Faculty members in this study have high levels of professional self-esteem. Scores on the professional self-esteem instrument were almost entirely in the upper end of the scale representing agreement with high professional esteem. Faculty with high professional
self-esteem feel that they are significant and of value in their profession, contribute to the profession, and are successful in what they do as a professional.

There were negligible to low relationships found between professional self-esteem and the demographic characteristics: type of appointment, main budgetary source, faculty rank, tenure status, gender and tenure in current position. However, there were moderate relationships found between professional self-esteem and perceived organizational/personal values match and between professional self-esteem and job satisfaction. A substantial relationship was also found between professional self-esteem and perceived job performance.

The moderate relationship between professional self-esteem and job satisfaction found in this study was similar to that found by Kerr Inkson (1978), Lopez and Greenhaus (1978), and Tharenou and Harker (1984).

Given the positive relationships found in this study between professional self-esteem and job performance, organizational/personal value match, and job satisfaction, the nurturing of faculty professional self-esteem would appear to be warranted by the organizations involved in administering the faculty member's position. Support of professional self-esteem might take the form of leave time and funding for professional meetings, encouragement to take a
leadership role in professional organizations, opportunities to present topics related to the profession within the organization or to groups outside the organization. Professional activities may be especially rewarding if they are given value within the university reward system.

6. Faculty members in this study perceived themselves as doing good jobs in their work. Job performance scores were all in the positive end of the response scale. As self-reported evaluations of faculty performance, those values may have been higher than the job performance evaluations made by the organization, as found by Tharenou and Harker (1982, 1984) and Van Tilburg (1987).

Low relationships were found between perceived job performance and the demographic characteristics: type of appointment, main budgetary source, faculty rank, tenure status, gender, and tenure in current position. Perceived job performance and professional self-esteem were substantially related in this study. There was a low relationship between perceived job performance and perceived organizational/personal values match. A moderate relationship was found between perceived job performance and job satisfaction.

The moderate relationship between self-reported job performance and job satisfaction supports the
results found by Kerr Inkson (1978), Tharenou and Harker (1982, 1984), Lopez (1982). The relationship found in this study was higher than those found by Kittrell (1980), Mossholder, Bedeian, and Armenakis (1981), and Van Tilburg (1987). The relationship between job performance and job satisfaction reported by Greenhaus and Badin (1974) was higher than that found in this study.

It should be pointed out that the relationship between perceived job performance and job satisfaction in this study was similar to the relationships found in other studies when measuring high self-esteem subjects and was higher than the job performance-job satisfaction relationships found for low self-esteem individuals. The faculty members in this study had a high level of professional self-esteem, as measured by the self-esteem scale. This finding supports the self-consistency theory of Korman (1970) that high self-esteem individuals will demonstrate a stronger job performance-job satisfaction relationship than those individuals with low levels of self-esteem.

The relationships between job performance and professional self-esteem and job satisfaction found in this study indicate that faculty members who feel that they are doing a good job are likely to feel good about themselves in their work situation (professional self-
esteem) and their job (job satisfaction). The implication for administrators and department heads is that opportunities should be taken to make faculty members feel good about their performances. These opportunities may be not only for recognition of outstanding performances through awards and externally visible rewards, but also for a faculty member who does a good job on a consistent basis.

7. The results of this study indicate that there is variance in the way people feel about how the organization's value system matches their own value system. Negligible to low relationships were found between organizational/personal values match and the demographic variables: type of appointment, main budgetary source, faculty rank, tenure status, gender, and tenure in current position. Perceived organizational/personal values match was moderately associated with professional self-esteem and had a low relationship with job performance. Perceived organizational/personal values match was very strongly related to job satisfaction and was the best predictor of job satisfaction in this study, accounting for 52.6% of the job satisfaction variance when added to the regression model.

This result indicates that how their organization operationalizes its value system is important to the
faculty members in this study in relation to how they feel about their work situation. The finding also provides empirical support of Locke's (1976) contention that the job situation in relation to the individual's values is the most direct determinant of job satisfaction.

Implications for the organizations included in this study are for the need to understand the value systems of both the organization and the members of that organization. Understanding the difference between having an identified organizational value system and actually operationalizing that same value system on a day-to-day basis is also important. The mission of each organization needs to be examined and either confirmed or adapted. Values identified by the organization as being important need to be operationalized and openly adhered to.

Individuals need to be made aware of the values system of the organization, both as written and as operationalized, when they enter the organization. The organization also needs to be aware of the values system of individuals wishing to join the organization. The presentation of values systems needs to be honest and realistic on both sides. The match of the individual's values system and that of the organization
may be a key to that individual's job satisfaction and continued participation in the organization.

8. There does not appear to be any personal or job-related demographic characteristic of the faculty members in this study that is related to job satisfaction in a meaningful way. Negligible relationships were found between job satisfaction and type of appointment, tenure status, and tenure in current position. Low relationships were found between job satisfaction and main budgetary source, faculty rank, and gender. The best predictor of job satisfaction among the demographic variables was main budgetary source which explained 5% of the job satisfaction variance.

The negligible relationship between job satisfaction and type of appointment and the low relationship between job satisfaction and main budgetary source indicate that the faculty members in this study are not experiencing meaningful levels of role conflict or role ambiguity as a result of split appointments or the organization to which they are responsible. This finding does not support the results of Newcomb and Clark (1985) that type of appointment is related to job satisfaction.
The negligible relationship found between tenure in current position and job satisfaction is similar to that found by Van Tilburg (1987).

The implication of these findings for administrators and organizations is how similar faculty members are in terms of job satisfaction in relationship to personal or job-related demographic characteristics. The results indicated that little job satisfaction differences existed between the levels of the demographic variables for the faculty members in this study. Demographics are often used to categorize individuals into groups representing different characteristics and needs, but the faculty members in this study appear to be quite similar based on the demographic characteristics studied. As administrators work with faculty members in the areas of job performance, self-esteem, or job satisfaction, they may not need to differentiate between individuals based on faculty rank, who they work for, what type of appointment they may hold, gender, or other demographic differences.

9. Job satisfaction is related to other non-demographic variables. As mentioned in earlier conclusions in this study, job satisfaction was found to be moderately related to professional self-esteem and perceived job performance. A strong relationship
was found between job satisfaction and perceived organizational/personal values match.

For administrators, these findings indicate that other factors can possibly be indicators of level of job satisfaction for faculty members. Given the low relationships between job satisfaction and demographic variables, knowledge of variables that are related to job satisfaction can be helpful for administrators in identifying individuals who may be experiencing low levels of job satisfaction. Such knowledge could help administrators to intervene in such situations and avoid subsequent turnover or burnout behavior on the part of the faculty member.

**Recommendations**

1. Based on the predictive strength of the variable perception of organizational/personal values match on job satisfaction found in this study, the College of Agriculture, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC), and the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) should examine their missions, policies, and day-to-day operating guidelines in order to discover any discrepancies between organizational values and actual operation.

2. Those same organizations should conduct studies to identify values that are important to members of the organization. Based on those results, organizational
values can be established to better match values held by those in the organization or possibly adapted if they already exist to reconcile differences.

3. Given the fact that a majority of faculty members are currently holding split appointments, the organizations involved in split faculty appointments should develop a system of coordinating administrative activities for faculty members to avoid incompatibility or duplication of evaluation and accountability activities for the multiple organizations.

4. In order to encourage the development of professional self-esteem, the College of Agriculture, OARDC, and OCES should institute policies and programs to allow faculty members to more easily participate in professional activities including opportunities within the organization to demonstrate professional competence.

5. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, working with The Ohio State University provost's office, should investigate why Extension faculty appear to be behind faculty with resident instruction or research as their main budgetary source in terms of faculty rank.

6. Interviews of potential employees should include discussion of personal and organizational value systems by both the organization and the individual joining the organization. Potential employees should be informed
of the organizational values and climate in an open and honest manner. Such a realistic preview of organizational climate would allow the individual to more accurately assess the organization in terms of meeting his or her needs and matching his or her values.

Individuals interviewing for positions in the organizations should also be encouraged to openly identify their own value systems and needs during the interview process in order to allow the organization to assess the possible organizational/personal values match. A more comprehensive and "openly honest" selection process would be needed to incorporate this additional factor in the employment decision-making process. In-service training should include sessions related to values of the organization and the individual.

7. The university needs to examine its reward system (promotion and tenure, as well as pay increases) to insure that the system rewards faculty members based on the accomplishments within the descriptions of their position. If the reward system does not match the job descriptions of faculty members in the organizational units within the university, then either the reward system needs to be restructured to match the job expectations of the faculty members or the job
descriptions of faculty members need to be brought in line with the reward system. This would mean an open and honest policy of rewards would need to be established clearly indicating to faculty members what the university considers to be important in order for faculty members to achieve the rewards of promotion, tenure, and/or salary increases. If research is the most important component of the land-grant mission at a university, then faculty members should be aware of this fact rather than being told that teaching or Extension is equally important.

8. New faculty members should be made aware of organizational lifestyles early in their careers by colleagues and peers. Again, the information received from colleagues needs to be factual and reflective of the "real" situations that exist within the organizational unit and the university. A mentoring system, either formally or informally, could be instituted for new faculty members. Faculty members serving as mentors should be encouraged to present organizational lifestyles and values to the new faculty members openly and honestly to help them become acclimatized in the organization.

Recommendations for Further Study

Job satisfaction is a well-studied construct. However, job satisfaction and its related variables have not been
thoroughly investigated in the context of the land-grant university system. The following recommendations are made for further research in this area:

1. Replications should be done of this study at other land-grant universities across the country to determine if relationships found in this study are consistent in different contexts.

2. Further studies looking at the construct of organizational/personal values match should also be conducted to determine what specific values are important to faculty members.

3. Additional studies should be conducted to include the variable perception of organizational/personal value match in tests of job satisfaction models, turnover models, and burnout models.

4. Results from exploratory studies like this study should be used to develop hypothesized relationships for testing in confirmatory studies.

5. Studies should be conducted of job satisfaction using a measure of job performance that is not self-reported.

6. This study should be conducted using support staff members in the land-grant university organizations to determine if similar relationships exist for non-faculty populations.
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APPENDIX B

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE
A STUDY OF
RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS
IN THE COLLEGES OF
AGRICULTURE, BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES,
HUMAN ECOLOGY, AND
VETERINARY MEDICINE AT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
An individual's profession is often called something different than his or her job title. A profession is often defined by general terms which might describe the goals of the individual in a career or the professional associations and professional peers with which the individual is associated. For example, a high school art teacher may perceive his/her profession as being that of an artist, with the profession of being a teacher thought of as being less descriptive. A medical doctor may think of his/her profession as being that of a neurologist more so than as a doctor.

Your responses below will involve two steps.

For STEP 1, please indicate on line A, under PROFESSION, what term you would use to most accurately describe your profession. (YOUR PROFESSION, NOT NECESSARILY YOUR JOB TITLE)

For STEP 2, go to the EXTENT scale to the right of line A and indicate by circling one number that best represents the extent to which that profession describes you as a professional.

**EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1.</th>
<th>STEP 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSION</td>
<td>EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Artist</td>
<td>Slight Some Great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual above has indicated that his/her profession is an ARTIST and that this profession describes him/her to a GREAT EXTENT.

Are there any other terms that you might sometimes use to describe your profession other than that listed above? If so, repeat STEPS 1 & 2 on lines B, C and/or D for these terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1.</th>
<th>STEP 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSION</td>
<td>EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Slight Some Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Slight Some Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Slight Some Great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

When the term PROFESSION is used later in this instrument, please use the term from answer A. to represent PROFESSION.
PART II. ORGANIZATION

All of the individuals in this study work for The Ohio State University. However, the University is an umbrella for many different sub-units.

Q1. As you think of the organization for which you work within The Ohio State University, which one of the following BEST represents for whom you work?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE)

A. DEPARTMENT OF  
   (Fill in Department name if A is circled)
B. OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
C. OHIO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
D. COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
E. COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
F. COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
G. COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
H. SCHOOL OF NATURAL RESOURCES
I. OTHER (Specify if circled):

NOTE:
When the term ORGANIZATION is used later in this instrument, please use the name of the organization circled above as representing ORGANIZATION.
PART III. JOB

Think about the job that you currently hold at The Ohio State University.

Q1. What is the official title of your job?

(Write Official Title)

Q2. How long have you held this job? ______ YEARS

(No.)

Q3. As you think about what you do as a part of the job listed above, indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the following job tasks by placing the appropriate number on the space next to each task. If you only do the task during a certain part of the year (such as a certain quarter), indicate the frequency during that period. Use the following scale for your responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DAILY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TWO OR THREE TIMES A WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ONCE A WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ONCE A MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TWO OR THREE TIMES A YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMPLE:

5

EX. Group/classroom teaching

Placing a 5 next to this item indicates that the individual performs group/classroom teaching two or three times per week during the quarter(s) in which the individual teaches.

A. Department/college/university meetings
B. One-on-one consulting/teaching/advising
C. Group/classroom teaching
D. Preparation for teaching/programs
E. Course/program administration (grading, evaluation, etc.)
F. Planning research
G. Developing educational materials
H. Writing articles/reporting research
I. Conducting research in laboratory/field
J. Organization paperwork/reports
K. Department/college/university public relations work
L. Write proposals for research
M. Provide service to organizations/individuals from outside of the University
N. OTHER
(Indicate):_________________________________

NOTE:

When the term JOB is used later in this instrument, please use the job indicated above, and its tasks, as representing JOB.
PART IV. MATCH OF JOB, PROFESSION, AND TASKS

Think about your PROFESSION that you identified in PART I and the JOB and associated tasks that you identified in PART III. For the following items, circle the number that best represents your response to each item.

Q1. To what extent do your perceptions of what you should be doing as a ________________________, match with what you have described in PART III as the tasks that are actually a part of your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT A MATCH</th>
<th>MATCH</th>
<th>A FAIRLY CLOSE</th>
<th>ALMOST AN EXACT MATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT ALL</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Circle only one response)

1 2 3 4

Comments on the discrepancy (if any):

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Q2. To what extent do your perceptions of what a person in ______________________ should do, match with the job tasks you identified in PART III?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT A MATCH</th>
<th>MATCH</th>
<th>A FAIRLY CLOSE</th>
<th>ALMOST AN EXACT MATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT ALL</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Circle only one response)

1 2 3 4

Comments on the discrepancy (if any):  

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
PART V. PROFESSIONAL ESTEEM

In the following space, write in the term that you used to describe your profession in PART I.

(Profession)

Keeping in mind what you have identified as your PROFESSION, for the following items please circle the number that best represents your level of agreement with each item. Use the following scale:

1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=STRONGLY DISAGREE
3=DISAGREE
4=AGREE
5=STRONGLY AGREE
6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

*******************************************************************************
EXAMPLE:  
EX. I consider myself to be a professional.

(CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER)

1 2 3 4 5 6

By circling the number four (4), the respondent indicates that s/he AGREE with the statement.

*******************************************************************************

PROFESSIONAL ESTEEM:

(CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER)

Q1. Within my profession, I have more insight than most.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q2. I have had little impact on my profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q3. I provide original concepts and ideas to my profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q4. What I do is considered to be of little value in the profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q5. I do not think that I get much recognition within my profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6
RESPONSE SCALE:

1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  4=AGREE
2=STRONGLY DISAGREE      5=STRONGLY AGREE
3=DISAGREE                   6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

PROFESSIONAL ESTEEM: (CONT.)

Q6. I contribute a great deal
to my profession.

Q7. I do not feel very
significant within my
profession.

Q8. I feel that I am a
positive role model for
others in my profession.

PART VI. ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS AND SATISFACTION

In the following space, write the name of the organization
that you circled in PART II as representing the organization for
which you work.

(Organization)

Keeping in mind what you have identified as your
ORGANIZATION, for the following items please circle the number
that best represents your level of agreement with each item. Use
the following scale:

1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  4=AGREE
2=STRONGLY DISAGREE      5=STRONGLY AGREE
3=DISAGREE                   6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS:

Q1. My organization sees me as
being successful.

Q2. I have not advanced in the
organization like I think
I should.
RESPONSE SCALE:
1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  4=AGREE
2=STRONGLY DISAGREE      5=STRONGLY AGREE
3=DISAGREE                6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS: (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.</td>
<td>The organization provides me with adequate resources.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.</td>
<td>The organization recognizes my contributions.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.</td>
<td>Others in my organization, who do not do as good a job as I, have received more recognition.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6.</td>
<td>The organization is supportive of my work.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7.</td>
<td>I am not getting anywhere in my organization.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8.</td>
<td>Working in this organization provides me with many opportunities.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9.</td>
<td>Sometimes I think that my organization doesn't even know I exist.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10.</td>
<td>The organization recognizes my abilities.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11.</td>
<td>I have never really felt like I was a part of my organization.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12.</td>
<td>My organization treats me as a success.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13.</td>
<td>What I do is not valued by the organization.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14.</td>
<td>There aren't many other places I would rather work.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE SCALE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>4 = AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 = STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>5 = STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = DISAGREE</td>
<td>6 = VERY STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL SATISFACTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>VERY STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15. I often feel frustrated working in this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. The organization treats employees fairly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Sometimes I'm embarrassed to tell people that I work for this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. My experiences with this organization have generally been more negative than positive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. I feel good about working for this organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. The organization does not care about me as an individual in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. The organization's goals differ from my own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART VII. JOB SUCCESS AND SATISFACTION

In the following space, write the official title of your JOB that you indicated in PART III.

_____________________________
(Official Title)

Keeping in mind your JOB and the tasks that are associated with it, for the following items please circle the number that best represents your level of agreement with each item. Again, use the following scale:

1 = VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  
2 = STRONGLY DISAGREE  
3 = DISAGREE  
4 = AGREE  
5 = STRONGLY AGREE  
6 = VERY STRONGLY AGREE

### JOB SUCCESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. I am a creative worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. I am not recognized by colleagues as being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a success.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. I am perceived as being successful by people outside of my organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Generally speaking, the results of my work are considered by others as being valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. What I do in my job, I do well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Feedback from my clientele indicates that I have been successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE SCALE:
1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  2=STRAONGLY DISAGREE  3=DISAGREE
4=AGREE  5=STRONGLY AGREE  6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

JOB SATISFACTION:

Q7. I enjoy the freedom to do what I want in my job.  (CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER)
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q8. I am rewarded with an equitable salary for my work.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q9. My job allows me to grow professionally.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q10. My job responsibilities are too broad for one person to accomplish.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q11. There are too many non-productive aspects of my job.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q12. I generally have good relationships with my supervisors.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q13. I have an interesting job.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q14. My job does not allow me to do things I want to do.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q15. I enjoy working with my colleagues.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Q16. I need more resources to do my job.
1 2 3 4 5 6
**Response Scale:**

1 = Very Strongly Disagree
2 = Strongly Disagree
3 = Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree
6 = Very Strongly Agree

**Job Satisfaction: (Cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17. There are very few opportunities for advancement in my present job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. I quite often get discouraged with my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. I am generally satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. My job is frustrating.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. It is a pleasure to do my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART VIII. ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT OF PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Think again about the PROFESSION __________________ (Your Profession)
you identified in PART I and the ORGANIZATION __________________ which you identified in PART II. (Your Organization)

For the following items please circle the number that best represents your level of agreement with each item as it pertains to your perceptions of the organization's support of your professional identity. Again, use the following scale:

1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE 4=AGREE
2=STRONGLY DISAGREE 5=STRONGLY AGREE
3=DISAGREE 6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY SUPPORT:

Q1. The organization gives me adequate resources to conduct the work that provides me with my professional identity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q2. I receive little support from the organization for professional improvement activities.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q3. The organization approves of the professional work that I do outside of the organization.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q4. The organization does not recognize my involvement in my professional organizations as being relevant.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q5. My profession is perceived by the organization as important.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q6. The organization does not allow me time to do those things that would increase my recognition in my profession.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Q7. My job duties in the organization do not match what I consider to be my professional identity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
PART IX. ORGANIZATIONAL/PERSONAL VALUES MATCH

Now, think about some of the things that are a part of your personal value system. These might include such things as: honesty, trust, hard work, teamwork, loyalty, etc. An organization also possesses a system of values. Some of the ways that an organization operationalizes its value system could be how it treats its employees, how it treats clientele, and how it operates on a day-to-day basis. For the following items, circle the number of the response that best reflects your level of agreement with each item as it relates to how the operationalized values of your ORGANIZATION match your personal values. Again use the following response scale:

1=VERY STRONGLY DISAGREE  2=STRONGLY DISAGREE  3=DISAGREE
4=AGREE                 5=STRONGLY AGREE                 6=VERY STRONGLY AGREE

VALUES MATCH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. The philosophical values of the organization are similar to my own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. The way the organization operates does not match my own value system.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. The organization supports many of the concepts that I personally value.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. I am bothered by the way in which the organization operates.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. I feel good about the way the organization treats its employees.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. The organization's attitude toward ethical conduct matches my own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. I feel that the organization values many of the same things that I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. I have experienced instances when the organization acted in ways that went against my own value system.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. The organization is a good role model for its employees in terms of ethical conduct.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART X. FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

The following items are characteristics of faculty members. Respond to each item by circling the letter of the response that best describes you on each characteristic.

(CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM)

Q1. What is your tenuring unit?
   A. COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
   B. COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
   C. COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
   D. COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE
   E. OTHER (Specify): ________________________________

Q2. Which one of the following best describes your OFFICIAL appointment with the University?
   A. 100% RESIDENT INSTRUCTION (OSU)
   B. 100% RESEARCH (OARDC)
   C. 100% EXTENSION (OCES)
   D. TWO WAY SPLIT
   E. THREE WAY SPLIT
   F. OTHER (Describe): ________________________________

Q3. If your answer to Q2. above was D or E, indicate the percentages of your OFFICIAL appointment for the appropriate categories below:

   ___% RESIDENT INSTRUCTION
   ___% RESEARCH (OARDC)
   ___% EXTENSION (OCES)
   ___% OTHER (Specify): ________________________________

If not, continue to Q4.
Q4. Where is your work station located?
   A. COLUMBUS CAMPUS
   B. LIMA CAMPUS
   C. MANSFIELD CAMPUS
   D. MARION CAMPUS
   E. WOOSTER (OARDC)
   F. OTHER OARDC BRANCH

Q5. What is your gender?
   A. FEMALE
   B. MALE

Q6. Think of yourself in terms of being a scientist. Which of the following terms would best describe you as a scientist?
   A. NATURAL SCIENTIST
   B. SOCIAL SCIENTIST
Are there any additional comments that you would like to make related to the topics covered in the preceding items or the study in general?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND RESPONSES
YOUR ASSISTANCE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED
Please return the completed instrument via CAMPUS mail in the enclosed self-addressed return envelope to: Emmalou Norland, Dept. of Agricultural Education, Room 204, Agricultural Administration Building, 2120 Fyffe Road, CAMPUS by August 15, 1990.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

2. THE STUDY IS A STAFF STUDY BEING SUPPORTED BOTH IN PRINCIPLE AND MONETARILY BY THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION.

3. YOU HAVE BEEN PURPOSEFULLY SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE INTERVIEW TODAY BECAUSE YOU ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF A SEGMENT OF THE FACULTY IN THE STUDY BASED UPON CERTAIN DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.

4. YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS INTERVIEW IS STRICTLY VOLUNTARY ON YOUR PART. YOU MAY CHOOSE WHETHER OR NOT TO CONTINUE WITH THE INTERVIEW AT ANY POINT IN TIME. YOU MAY ALSO CHOOSE NOT TO RESPOND TO PARTICULAR QUESTIONS DURING THE INTERVIEW. YOUR IDENTITY AS THE SOURCE OF THE INFORMATION IN THIS INTERVIEW WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE. YOU HAVE ALSO BEEN PROVIDED WITH A CONSENT FORM. BY SIGNING THIS FORM, YOU HAVE INDICATED YOUR AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

5. AN AUDIO TAPE WILL BE MADE OF THE INTERVIEW IN ORDER TO ASSURE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION. YOUR NAME WILL NEVER BE ASSOCIATED WITH THE RESPONSES AND ANY REFERENCES THAT MIGHT INDICATE YOUR IDENTITY WILL BE ALTERED. THE ONLY INDIVIDUALS WITH ACCESS TO THE TAPES WILL BE THE TWO RESEARCHERS IN THE STUDY AND THE TRANSCRIBER OF THE TAPES. AT THE COMPLETION OF THIS STUDY, ALL TAPES WILL BE DESTROYED.

6. THE RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS WILL BE USED TO HELP DEVELOP QUANTITATIVE INSTRUMENT TO COLLECT INFORMATION IN A SECOND PHASE OF THE STUDY. A SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE STUDY WILL BE AVAILABLE TO DEPARTMENTS AND FACULTY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY.

7. DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY BEFORE WE BEGIN?
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The following questions are associated with your feelings about your profession, your job, the organization that you work for and how these things interact with one another. As we go along in our discussion, please let me know if you need any clarification of the questions.

PROFESSION:

I WOULD LIKE TO START BY TALKING ABOUT YOU AS A PROFESSIONAL.
WOULD YOU CALL YOURSELF A PROFESSIONAL?

WHAT WOULD YOU SAY YOUR PROFESSION IS?

ARE THERE ANY OTHER PROFESSIONS THAT WOULD DESCRIBE WHO YOU ARE?

***OPTIONAL***

(If response is a job title rather than a profession, ask the following:)

DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF IN TERMS OF A PROFESSION RATHER THAN A JOB? IF SO, WITH WHAT PROFESSION WOULD YOU IDENTIFY YOURSELF?

(PROBE: would you describe yourself in one of the following terms: teacher, educator, faculty member, researcher, Extension professional, veterinarian, etc.?)

WHY DO YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF IN THIS WAY?
PROFESSION: (Cont.)

IF MORE THAN ONE DESCRIPTOR IS GIVEN

IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY YOU FIRST IDENTIFIED, HOW WOULD YOU DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THE TERMS YOU'VE USED TO DESCRIBE YOU AS A PROFESSIONAL?

(How would you rank the descriptors of your professional identity in relation to each other?)

YOUR OFFICIAL APPOINTMENT INCLUDES FUNDING FROM (RESIDENT INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, EXTENSION). DO YOU EVER THINK OF YOURSELF AS A(N):

EDUCATOR
TEACHER
EXTENSION PROFESSIONAL
RESEARCHER
OARDC PROFESSIONAL

PART OF YOUR SUPPORT COMES FROM FUNDS PROVIDED BY (OSU RESIDENT INSTRUCTION, OARDC, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE). WOULD YOU EVER DESCRIBE YOURSELF IN RELATION TO THESE TERMS WHEN YOU IDENTIFY YOUR PROFESSION?

WHY?/WHY NOT?

ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY:

NOW I WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO THINK ABOUT WHO YOU WORK FOR. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION THAT BEST REPRESENTS WHO YOU WORK FOR?

(EXAMPLES: OSU, Extension, College, Department, State of Ohio, Government, etc.)
JOB:

LET'S NOW TALK ABOUT YOUR CURRENT JOB. WHAT IS THE OFFICIAL TITLE OF YOUR JOB?

WOULD YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHAT YOU DO ON A DAILY BASIS IN THIS JOB?

(PROBE: A typical day would include what types of activities?)

HOW LONG HAVE YOU HELD THIS PARTICULAR JOB?

IN WHAT WAYS ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR JOB AS YOU'VE DESCRIBED IT?

IN WHAT WAYS ARE YOU DISSATISFIED WITH YOUR JOB AS DESCRIBED?

GIVEN WHAT YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED AS YOUR PROFESSION, HOW DOES YOUR JOB MATCH WITH YOUR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY? WHAT ARE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT MATCH? DON'T MATCH?

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?
ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT:

NOW LET'S TALK A LITTLE MORE ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION THAT YOU IDENTIFIED BEFORE. YOU INDICATED THAT ______________________ IS THE ORGANIZATION WITH WHICH YOU IDENTIFY YOUR WORK.

HOW DOES THIS ORGANIZATION SUPPORT YOUR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY? (Remind of professional identity from earlier response)

(PROBE: Examples of support might be: money, resources, opportunities for professional growth, how the organization describes your role and responsibilities, etc.)

DOES THE ORGANIZATION'S PERCEPTION OF YOUR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY MATCH OR NOT MATCH YOUR OWN PERCEPTION?

COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME EXAMPLES?

BASED UPON WHAT YOU HAVE SAID, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FEEL THE ORGANIZATION SUPPORTS YOUR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY?
ORGANIZATIONAL PHILOSOPHY/PERSOINAL PHILOSOPHY MATCH:

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO TALK WITH YOU ABOUT THINGS OF A MORE PHILOSOPHICAL NATURE. I WANT YOU TO THINK FOR A MINUTE ABOUT YOUR OWN PERSONAL VALUE SYSTEM.

WHAT THINGS (CONCEPTS) ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU IN YOUR LIFE?

(ASSIST: Operationalize concepts such as honesty, trust, security, etc.)

DOES THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ORGANIZATION THAT YOU IDENTIFIED EARLIER SUPPORT YOUR PERSONAL VALUE SYSTEM?

COULD YOU GIVE AN EXAMPLE?

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

GIVEN WHAT YOU HAVE SAID, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT WORKING FOR THE ___(Organization)___?

(Not the job or what you do, but the organization itself)

WHY DO YOU FEEL THIS WAY?
PROFESSIONAL ESTEEM:

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO TALK ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF AS A PROFESSIONAL (professional identity).

HOW CAPABLE DO YOU FEEL YOU ARE IN YOUR IDENTIFIED PROFESSION?

THAT IS, DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU POSSESS THE ABILITIES TO BE IN THIS PROFESSION?

COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME EXAMPLES?

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS YOUR VALUE TO YOUR IDENTIFIED PROFESSION?

WHAT DO YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THE PROFESSION?

EXAMPLES?

WITHIN YOUR IDENTIFIED PROFESSION, HOW SIGNIFICANT DO YOU FEEL YOU ARE IN RELATION TO OTHERS IN THE PROFESSION OR THE PROFESSION AS A WHOLE?

AGAIN, COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME EXAMPLES?

SUCCESS:

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF SUCCESS.

WHAT THINGS COME TO YOUR MIND WHEN YOU THINK OF A PERSON BEING SUCCESSFUL IN A CAREER (RATHER THAN IN THEIR PERSONAL LIFE)?

(PROBE: Examples - money, promotion, tenure, benefits, satisfaction, etc.)

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR OWN SUCCESS.
LET'S RELATE IT TO YOUR CURRENT JOB.

BASED ON WHAT YOU HAVE JUST DESCRIBED AS INDICATORS OF SUCCESS IN A CAREER, HOW SUCCESSFUL DO YOU FEEL YOU ARE IN THIS JOB?

COULD YOU EXPLAIN? IN WHAT WAYS?

ARE THERE AREAS OF YOUR JOB THAT YOU WOULD CONSIDER TO BE UNSUCCESSFUL?

EXPLAIN?

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT SUCCESS IN TERMS OF THE ORGANIZATION YOU WORK FOR.

HOW SUCCESSFUL DO YOU FEEL AS AN EMPLOYEE OF (organization)?

COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHY YOU FEEL THIS WAY?

ARE THERE AREAS THAT YOU WOULD DESCRIBE AS BEING UNSUCCESSFUL IN WORKING FOR THIS ORGANIZATION?

EXPLAIN?

NOW THINK OF YOURSELF IN TERMS OF THE PROFESSION YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED.

HOW SUCCESSFUL DO YOU FEEL AS A MEMBER OF THIS PROFESSION?

EXPLAIN?

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT POSSIBLE CHANGES THAT MIGHT IMPROVE YOUR
PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS.

ARE THERE THINGS THAT THE ORGANIZATION (organization) COULD DO TO AID IN YOUR SUCCESS AS A PROFESSIONAL (profession)?
EXAMPLES?

ARE THERE THINGS THAT YOU COULD DO AS AN INDIVIDUAL WITHIN (organization) WITH YOUR CURRENT JOB (job title) THAT WOULD AFFECT YOUR SUCCESS AS A PROFESSIONAL (profession)?
EXAMPLES?

WHAT WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT TODAY IS YOUR JOB, THE ORGANIZATION YOU WORK FOR, AND YOUR PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY. NOW I WOULD LIKE TO CLOSE BY ASKING YOU TO THINK OF A WORD THAT WOULD BEST REPRESENT YOUR FEELINGS TOWARD EACH OF THE FOLLOWING: YOUR JOB, THE ORGANIZATION, AND YOUR PROFESSION.

LET'S START WITH YOUR JOB:

THE ORGANIZATION:

AND, YOUR PROFESSION:

IN SUMMARY, ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD RELATED TO THE AREAS WE'VE DISCUSSED?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!
APPENDIX D

LETTERS
RESEARCH PROTOCOL:

90B0107 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TYPE OF FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND OTHER
FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS AND JOB SATISFACTION AND PROFESSIONAL
IDENTITY, Emmalou Norland, Richard L. Poling, Agricultural
Education

presented for review by the Behavioral and Social Sciences Review Committee
to ensure proper protection of the rights and welfare of the individuals
involved with consideration of the methods used to obtain informed consent
and the justification of risks in terms of potential benefits to be gained,
the Committee action was:

___ APPROVED ___ DEFERRED*
___ APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS* ___ DISAPPROVED
___ NO REVIEW NECESSARY

*CONDITIONS/COMMENTS:

Subjects were deemed NOT AT RISK and the protocol was unanimously
APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

Provide a copy of the mailed questionnaire when available,
including any introductory statement that will accompany it.

If you agree to the above conditions, PLEASE SIGN THIS FORM IN THE SPACE
PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN WITH ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED TO ROOM
205, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTER, 1314 KINNEAR ROAD, COLUMBUS,
OHIO 43212, within one week. Upon such compliance, the approval form will be
mailed to you. (In case of a deferred protocol, please submit the requested
information at your earliest convenience. The next meeting of the Committee
will be two weeks from the meeting date indicated above.)

DATE 7/20/90  Signature(s) Emmalou Norland
             (Principal Investigators)

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE (HSRC)
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Date July 13, 1990

HS-025A (Rev. 3/85)
(CONDITIONS/COMMENTS)
May 30, 1990

Dr. Gary Floyd, Dean
College of Biological Sciences
105 Bio Science Building
484 W. 12th Avenue
CAMPUS

Dear Gary:

Dr. Emmalou Norland, Associate Professor and Richard L. Poling, Graduate Teaching Associate in the Department of Agricultural Education are currently conducting a study of OSU faculty members. They will be examining the relationships between the type of appointment split (resident instruction, research, and extension) and factors such as job satisfaction, professional identity, job success, and organizational commitment.

Dr. Norland and Mr. Poling would like to include as participants faculty members in the Colleges of Agriculture, Biological Sciences, Human Ecology, and Veterinary Medicine. They are especially interested in faculty members who hold joint appointments within the University (resident instruction, research, and/or extension), but would also like to include faculty members with single appointments. Contact with participants will be through a one-time survey instrument that will be completed by faculty members and returned to Dr. Norland and Mr. Poling. Additionally, a selected number of faculty will be interviewed to gain in-depth information.

I have granted approval to Dr. Norland and Mr. Poling to conduct the study in the College of Agriculture and request your permission to also include faculty in the College of Biological Sciences as participants. The results will be important to our understanding of the relationship among type of appointment and faculty perceptions of professional identity, role, and job satisfaction.

I would appreciate you indicating whether Dr. Norland or Mr. Poling may contact faculty members in your College as possible participants. Of course, faculty members may elect to participate or not participate.

Sincerely,

J. Robert Warmbord
Acting Vice President for Agricultural Administration and Dean

cc: Emmalou Norland Richard Poling
Dear Faculty Member:

We are conducting a study to identify factors that are associated with faculty satisfaction and success. As a part of this study, faculty members in the Colleges of Agriculture, Biological Sciences, Human Ecology, and Veterinary Medicine will be asked to participate by completing a survey instrument designed to describe faculty characteristics.

We ask you to complete the enclosed instrument and return it to Dr. Emmalou Norland. The Deans of the four colleges involved in the study have been informed of this study and their approvals to contact faculty in those colleges have been received. Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary. We know that your responses will contribute to the identification of factors that will be helpful in providing current and future faculty members opportunities for professional satisfaction and success.

You should be able to complete the instrument in 25 minutes or less. Once completed, please return the instrument in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. The information you provide will be held in strict confidence. The results from the instruments will be grouped for reporting purposes. Your name will never be used in connection with the information you provide. The identification number on the front of the instrument will be used only for follow-up purposes.

Please complete the instrument and return in the envelope via CAMPUS mail by AUGUST 15, 1990. If you have any questions about the study or the instrument, please contact Dr. Norland or Mr. Poling at 292-6671.

A summary of the results will be shared with the faculty of the four colleges. Thank you for your help. It is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Emmalou Norland
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Education

Richard L. Poling
Graduate Teaching Associate
Department of Agricultural Education
August 16, 1990

Dear Faculty Member:

Last week, we mailed a packet of information to you. The packet included a questionnaire for you to complete and return to us. If you have completed the questionnaire and returned it thank you very much. We appreciate your efforts and your input.

If you received the questionnaire and haven't completed it yet, would you please do so as soon as possible and return via campus mail in the self-addressed envelope included in the packet. It will take about 25 minutes to complete the instrument. Please respond to every item. If you have lost the instrument or if, for some reason, you did not receive the original packet of information, please call us at 292-6671 and we will send you another copy.

We would like to again assure you that your responses will be kept in strict confidence. The identification number on the front of the questionnaire is to assist in identifying questionnaires that have not yet been returned and to assist in obtaining them through follow-up procedures.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the questionnaire, please don't hesitate to call us. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Emmalou Norland
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Education

Richard L. Poling
Graduate Teaching Associate
Department of Agricultural Education
Dear Faculty Member:

Many faculty members have contacted us to indicate their willingness to complete the questionnaire for our study of faculty characteristics, but their inability to return it by the original deadline. Realizing the problems associated with conducting survey research during Summer Quarter, we have adjusted the timelines for our study to better fit faculty schedules which have included vacations, professional meetings, and personal activities taking faculty members from their offices.

Please overlook the deadline indicated in our original packet and complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. Your participation in the study is very important and greatly appreciated.

If for some reason you did not receive a packet initially or need a replacement questionnaire, please call us at 292-6671 and we will be glad to send one to you. It should take you 25 minutes or less to complete the survey. Again, your responses will be held in strict confidence and data will be grouped for any reporting purposes.

Thank you for your support of our study. We are grateful for your help.

Sincerely,

Emmalou Norland
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Education

Richard L. Poling
Graduate Teaching Associate
Department of Agricultural Education
APPENDIX E

COMPARISON OF DATA SAMPLE AND POPULATION
DEMOGRAPHICS
### COMPARISON OF POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS WITH DATA SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>DATA SAMPLE</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF APPOINTMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Way</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Way</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Way</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN BUDGETARY SOURCE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Inst.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Split</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE IN CURRENT POSITION:</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY RANK:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE STATUS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenured</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range for all variables:
- TENURE IN CURRENT POSITION: 31.00
- Other variables: 31.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Data Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132 88.0</td>
<td>288 86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 12.0</td>
<td>47 14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Data Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment and Main Budgetary Source</td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment and Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>Kendall's Tau c</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment and Faculty Rank</td>
<td>Kendall's Tau b</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment and Tenure Status</td>
<td>Kendall's Tau c</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Appointment and Gender</td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Budgetary Source and Tenure in Current Position</td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>DATA SAMPLE</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN BUDGETARY SOURCE and FACULTY RANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN BUDGETARY SOURCE and TENURE STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN BUDGETARY SOURCE and GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY RANK and TENURE IN CURRENT POSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's Tau c</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY RANK and TENURE STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's Tau c</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY RANK and GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER and TENURE STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>DATA SAMPLE</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURE STATUS and TENURE IN CURRENT POSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Biserial Correlation</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER and TENURE IN CURRENT POSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Biserial Correlation</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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