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The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between selected demographic and educational variables of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System and their impact on job satisfaction. The variables included in the study are the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status, along with the institutional variables of academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload, tenure, co-worker relationship, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities. This study was conducted to educate college administrators regarding faculty morale and to provide a means of communication between administrators and faculty to address faculty concerns, thus leading to a more stable learning environment for students.

A survey research design was used to collect and analyze the data from faculty members at 10 community colleges within the state of Alabama. An instrument designed by the researcher entitled the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was used to collect the data using SurveyGizmo.com. The instrument was
validated by a panel of experts and a pilot study determined the reliability coefficient to be .786.

The data were analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics, factoral analysis, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings of the study indicated a four scale structure for the created instrument which consisted of the following components: 1) administrative support and its affect on the personal life of faculty members; 2) obtaining tenure and the evaluation process; 3) technology in the classroom and training through professional development activities; and 4) relationship among colleagues. Results from ANOVA show that there were no between or within group differences among mean scores with regard to age, sex, ethnicity, salary, tenure status, or degree status. Examining measures of central tendencies revealed that over 20% of faculty members responded negatively with regard to satisfaction in the areas of academic ability of students, administrative support, professional development opportunities, and advancements in technology. However, 87% of faculty members responded favorably regarding their overall job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Community colleges in Alabama and throughout the nation provide an array of services to local communities through instruction in academic transfer programs, vocational/technical training and preparation, and through the ever-increasing responsibility of workforce development. Kasper (2003) suggested that no other segment of higher education is asked to fulfill as many roles as the community college. In addition, Dougherty and Townsend (2006) stated, “the community college is not a static institution” (p. 8) in its respective communities because its overall mission changes as events shape our nation.

In today’s society, community colleges face increasing pressure to carry out the role of being everything to everybody and that pressure is felt by college employees. McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) stated, “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college” (p. 158). Without a college faculty member’s expertise in a respective discipline and service to the local community, community colleges would not be able to enhance the quality of life of its citizens.

With close to 1,100 public community colleges nationwide (Cohen & Brawer, 2008), prospective students, regardless of age, can often find a community college campus or instructional site nearby that offers a variety of courses in varying disciplines,
while maintaining low tuition rates and an open admissions policy. In fact, due to the convenience of community colleges to area residents, Huber (1998) reported that community colleges employ 31% of faculty in higher education and service 39% of all students in higher education, including 46% of all first-year students.

In today’s society, where tuition continues to increase dramatically, the enrollment trends among institutions of higher education continue to soar. As the manufacturing industry declines, dislocated workers are increasingly seeking assistance from community colleges as a means to find new skills for future employment. This trend, along with the rise in the number of high school graduates, has led to an estimated growth in enrollment among degree-granting institutions that has reached 15.6 million in 2008 and may reach as many as 17 million students by 2010 (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). In order to cope with the increase in enrollment, administrators have allowed class sizes to increase and have employed additional adjunct faculty members to fill the void while budgets remain stagnant (Murray, 2005).

Despite enrollment growth at community colleges, two-year colleges are considered by some as second-tier institutions (Grubb, 1999). Compared with universities that set admission criteria based on individual ACT or SAT scores, community colleges operate on an open door policy where students, regardless of previous academic background, can be admitted into select academic and career/technical fields. In addition, due to the limited number of faculty members that possess terminal degrees in their respective discipline, community colleges are being looked at as less prestigious than their university counterparts and have resulted in four-year faculty members
complaining about the quality of graduates that community colleges produce (Grubb, 1999).

Although state allocations have remained stagnant, enrollment at these institutions has continually increased (Murray & Cunningham, 2004). As a result, administrators are being forced to make difficult decisions regarding operating costs. With tough current economic times facing college administrators, Lerner (2008) maintains that higher education in the United States is becoming governed more like a corporate business instead of an educational institution. As administrators tackle decreasing federal and state funding, they seek to outsource college operations such as the bookstore, cafeteria, and maintenance / custodial work. For example, in January 2009, the governor of Alabama officially declared “proration” among all publicly funded educational institutions within the state. The funding shortfall has created the possibility of academic programs being lost, faculty members being relieved of their duties, and equipment and supply funds designated for classroom materials being removed from departmental budgets.

Lerner (2008) concluded that these events have created a structure within higher education that has allowed administrators to have increased power over faculty members. This occurrence has taken place despite many administrators, including college presidents, vice-presidents, and deans, never having experienced the challenges that faculty members face on a daily basis.

Furthermore, community college faculty must overcome a variety of obstacles that university faculty do not face on a regular basis. For instance, textbook adoption within each college requires that all faculty teaching the same course use the same text, whereas university professors choose the text for their respective course sections (Kim,
Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2008). In the career/technical education area where regulations change on a regular basis, instructors must set course objectives to coincide with set standards that are needed by specific employers in order to prepare students for employment upon graduation (B. Byrne, personal communication, January 2009). Also, while some students enter terminal associate degree programs, some students are seeking to transfer to a four-year college of their choice. Therefore, the academic transfer faculty must advise these students properly. Although the articulation agreement between colleges in the Alabama Community College System and Alabama’s public universities, known as the Statewide Transfer and Articulation Reporting System (STARS), has eased the transferability of courses, system faculty still see this as a challenging and uncomfortable task as students ask about the transferability of courses.

For these reasons, college administrators must begin to acknowledge the level of job satisfaction among their respective employees in order to reduce turnover and burnout, and increase morale (Issac & Boyer, 2007). As faculty members interact with students on a daily basis, morale can have an immediate impact on an institution’s overall effectiveness which, in turn, will affect student outcomes (Milosheff, 1990). Member colleges within the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) face similar challenges.

**Statement of the Problem**

With faculty members facing a plethora of responsibilities including, but not limited to, preparing students for transfer to a baccalaureate degree program, preparing students to enter the workplace, or to remediate students for entrance into higher education, the overall level of job satisfaction can have an immediate impact in the
overall productivity of community colleges (Murray, 2000). The Alabama Community College System and its member colleges have seen the challenges of budget shortfalls, increased enrollment, and possibly the shift of power away from faculty members. Also, with the events that have occurred over the last several years with the corruption scandal involving many administrators, faculty, and staff within the system (Hunter, 2006), one might wonder whether this has dampened the morale and job satisfaction of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System. Furthermore, with the constant changing mission of the community college to provide all services to all people, the level of frustration has caused many faculty members to leave the profession (Murray, 2005).

**Purpose of the Study**

Previous research has focused on job satisfaction of four-year college and university faculty members, but little has been done with regard to community college faculty. Due to the varying differences in duties of community college and university faculty, there was also not an adequate research instrument available to assess job satisfaction among community college faculty. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between certain demographic and institutional variables of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System and their impact on job satisfaction using an instrument created by the researcher. The variables included in the study which were originally identified by Igwe (2003) are the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status, along with the institutional variables of academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload,
tenure, co-worker relationship, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities.

The findings of this study will educate community college administrators not only in Alabama, but also nationwide, with regard to faculty morale and job satisfaction. Therefore, this study is being conducted in order to provide a means of communication between administrators and faculty to address faculty concerns, thus, improving the institution’s overall effectiveness and creating a more stable learning environment for students. In addition, the findings of this study will provide a foundation for additional research regarding job satisfaction among community college faculty.

Research Questions

Answers to the following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. What is the factor structure of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey?

2. Are there within-group differences in job satisfaction based on the independent variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status?

3. What is the overall level of job satisfaction among Alabama Community College System faculty members?

Limitations of the Study

The following delimitations were observed in this study.

1. The study consisted of full-time faculty members at select Alabama community colleges within the Alabama Community College System.
2. The researcher did not compare or contrast job satisfaction levels among member institutions.

The following limitations were observed in this study.

1. The findings from this study are only applicable to community colleges within the Alabama Community College System.

2. While slightly more than half of the colleges in the Alabama Community College System participated, only a small sample of full-time faculty members completed the entire survey.

3. As a result of the factor analysis of the researcher developed instrument, specific items were deemed not related to the components selected for use on the survey.

Definition of Terms

The following operational terms are provided to assist in clarifying the research.

1. *Academic preparedness of students* refers to the level of a student’s academic ability upon entering the college ranks (Murray & Cunningham, 2005).

2. *Administrative support* refers to the amount of communication and partnership among faculty members and college administrators (Rosser & Townsend, 2006).

3. *Age* is a faculty member’s chronological age at the time he/she participated in this research study.

4. *Alabama Community College System (ACCS)* is a higher education system that is comprised of 22 regional comprehensive community colleges, 4 technical colleges, and 1 university that offers upper level courses leading to
the baccalaureate degree, all governed by the Alabama State Board of Education.

5. *Community college* is a two-year state funded institution of higher education that offers associate degrees.

6. *Degree status* is the highest undergraduate or graduate degree earned by a faculty member.

7. *Ethnicity* represents the ethnic background of a faculty member’s as it refers to race.

8. *Gender* refers to a faculty member’s sex, male or female.

9. *Job satisfaction* is the amount of fulfillment, enthusiasm, and loyalty gained from their duties as a faculty member (Locke, 1969).

10. *Professional growth opportunities* are professional development workshops, conferences, etc. in which a faculty member attends. These workshops provide intellectual activity that promotes better classroom practices or growth in their respective field of study (Rosser, 2005).

11. *Relationships with colleagues* refer to the number of interpersonal relationships that are formed by a faculty member with other workers which are employed within the employment setting (Igwe, 2003).

12. *Salary* is the amount of income a faculty member obtains on an annual basis.

13. *Teaching load* refers to the number of credit hours a faculty member teaches during a term (Igwe, 2003).
14. *Technology* refers to faculty members' use of technological advances with regard to carrying out instructional methods such as web-based courses, computer use, interactive video, and SMART classrooms.

15. *Tenure status* refers to a faculty member signing a contract for a fourth consecutive year at the same institution within the Alabama Community College System. When this occurs, they become a tenured faculty member (Fair Dismissal Act Procedures, 2004).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of the Alabama Community College System

According to About ACCS (2008), the system began in 1963 when legislators approved a system to govern Alabama’s public two-year colleges. Nineteen years later, the Department of Postsecondary Education was created and the position of Chancellor was created. The Alabama Community College System continues to meet the needs of its citizens by providing “a unified system of institutions dedicated to excellence in delivering academic education, adult education, and workforce development” (Alabama Community College System, 2008, ¶ 4). An estimated 300,000 people are served each year by the Alabama Community College System through the activities of 22 comprehensive community colleges, 4 technical colleges, 1 upper-division university, and through other entities such as adult education, Alabama Industrial Development Training Institute (AIDT), and the Alabama Technology Network (ATN); (Alabama Community College System, 2008).

The Alabama Community College System is governed by the Alabama State Board of Education which consists of seven members who represent geographic areas around the state and are elected by a referendum vote. Unique to other state boards of education nationwide, this board also oversees the operations of Alabama’s public K-12 schools. Also, unlike other community colleges in many areas which are governed by a
local board of trustees, the Alabama Community College System Chancellor is charged with the overall management and operation of all community and technical colleges while the college president is responsible for the daily operation of each institution (Alabama Community College System, 2008).

**Job Satisfaction in Academe: What is Job Satisfaction and Why is it Important?**

The topic of job satisfaction has been an area of interest over the years, not only in the business world, but also in the area of education. Numerous studies have been conducted to explain how job satisfaction relates to productivity, student outcomes and financial efficiency in community college and university settings (Garmon, 1997; Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006; Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995). However, in each of the studies conducted, the means of measuring job satisfaction was as diverse as the student population on many of the college campuses.

In the 1950s, theorist Herzberg identified factors that could encourage or discourage an individual’s motivation to work, along with the varying effects motivation has on the production of a company. This Two-Factor Theory focuses on motivators, which typically increase job satisfaction levels, and hygiene factors, which are said to decrease job satisfaction levels. Motivators, or intrinsic factors, are items such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement. On the other hand, hygiene factors, or extrinsic factors, can de-motivate employee’s performance and are based on items such as company policy, working conditions, and salary. (Hagedorn, 2000; Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995; Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Rosser and Townsend deemed Herzberg’s Theory to assume that the type of work an employee performs and the
environment in which the work is completed has an immediate impact on the job satisfaction of employees.

Researchers also look to measure job satisfaction by a company’s ability to meet the needs mentioned in Maslow’s Theory of Needs (1943). Within this theory are the basic needs of food, personal growth, and advancement, which are associated to basic human characteristics (Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995). Thus, the more employees can satisfy their needs in the context of their work, the higher the level of job satisfaction. For example, when job advancement occurs, more opportunities are available for an employee to satisfy needs identified on Maslow’s pyramid and an employee possesses an increased level of job satisfaction (Gawel, 1997).

Also affecting the level of job satisfaction are expectations that a faculty member may have upon entering the profession. For instance, Murray and Cunningham (2004) wrote that very few community college faculty members set out to pursue a career in community college instruction but choose the profession after enjoying pleasant experiences as a graduate teaching assistant at a college or university. However, these new faculty members admit they learned “virtually nothing about effective teaching, the norms of academia, or being a productive faculty member” while serving as a graduate assistant (¶ 7). Therefore, many new faculty members come in with unrealistic expectations and feel pressure to determine what tasks should take up a majority of their time and energy and hope to survive. Murray and Cunningham concluded by stating employees receive greater satisfaction when job expectations are met.

At the center of any higher education institution is its faculty members. As a result, faculty members hold a tremendous influence on the overall effectiveness of the
As undergraduate and graduate students look to gain knowledge from their classroom experiences, the level of job satisfaction among faculty members can have a direct impact on student achievement (Hagedorn, 2000; Milosheff, 1990; Truell, Price & Joyner, 1998; Woods & Weasmer, 2002). Garmon (1997) stated that “morale factor could determine the climate and mode of operation that could damage the college’s effectiveness” and that “faculty with high morale add value to a college” (¶ 27).

While administrators focus on important issues of student outcomes and financial accountability, job satisfaction among faculty members often gets overlooked (Hagedorn, 2000). Chieffo (1991) determined it is possible for faculty members to endorse the organizational goals and mission but still have a negative outlook regarding the particular job or the way it is carried out. Furthermore, faculty morale could become a contentious issue if administrators do not closely monitor the working environment of its employees (Garmon, 1997).

As administrators seek to understand how job satisfaction could impact an institution of higher education, Hagedorn (2000) concluded from previous research studies that there is no standard model that can be used to measure job satisfaction because of its intricate and complex nature. However, administrators should not allow the lack of a standard model to keep colleges from monitoring faculty job satisfaction, especially in light of the potential shortage of faculty members over the next decade, particularly in the community college setting (Milosheff, 1990; Murray & Cunningham, 2004).
The shortage of qualified faculty members can be attributed to a variety of issues. Murray and Cunningham (2004) contributed the reduction of current faculty members to an increase in the number of retirements, an increase in the number of undergraduate students entering the college ranks, lack of personnel who possess faculty credentials, and the college’s inability to retain quality faculty members. These researchers also affirmed that when faculty members reach a higher level of job satisfaction with an employer, these employees have longer tenures, a greater commitment to the institution and, in turn, a more productive career.

If colleges and universities are serious about retaining faculty members, job satisfaction should be a critical piece of retention that must be monitored on a routine basis (Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Previous research studies indicated that as many as 40% of current full-time faculty members have contemplated leaving the line of work because of the dissatisfaction that they have experienced while on the job (McBride et al. 1992; Murray & Cunningham, 2004). Woods and Weasmer (2002) pointed out that 50% of new faculty members will leave the profession within the first five years of employment while Milosheff (1990) determined through faculty surveys that only a small percentage indicated that they would choose to enter the college teaching field again as a career choice. Thus, the higher the attrition rate, the lower the morale among faculty members and employees in general (Murray, 2005). By retaining faculty members, colleges are maintaining a healthy, stable learning environment for its students (McBride et al. 1992; Truell, et al., 1998).
Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction

The U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics’ (2008) revealed that an estimated 15.6 million students are attending degree-granting postsecondary institutions in 2008, a dramatic increase since the 1970s. It is estimated that growth will continue to the year 2017 where 17.0 million students will, at that time, be attending an institution of higher education. With the increase in the number of students and the shortage of qualified faculty members at both 2-year and 4-year institutions, the work load among faculty members may become so overwhelming that it leads to absenteeism, large turnovers on a yearly basis, and employee burnout. As a result, many institutions are looking to a higher proportion of part-time or adjunct faculty to fill the ranks, especially within the community college setting. This has caused some legislators and other educational officials to question the quality of education that these institutions are providing (Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

As college operating budgets increase each year and state funding wanes, “institutions are having to take numerous steps to pare expenses, including cutting back on secretarial staff, reducing funds to libraries, increasing class size, and sometimes asking faculty to share their offices with other faculty” (Rosser & Townsend, 2006, p. 140). Furthermore, faculty members are required to create learning environments that meet the needs and expectations of its students (Houston et al. 2006). With the load that is placed upon faculty members during this time of administrative and fiscal accountability, colleges and university leaders must understand the concept of job satisfaction in order to reduce faculty turnover and burnout (Issac & Boyer, 2007). McBride et al. (1992) stated, “It is widely accepted that the people of an organization are
perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college” (p. 158).

Because of the lack of a definitive way to measure job satisfaction, previous researchers have closely examined many variables. According to Plascak and Bean (1989), the variables that are most often reviewed in literature associated with educational employees are demographic in nature, such as “gender, tenure status, and rank” (p. 8). There can, however, be institutional variables such as salary, work-related stress, the use of technology, and opportunities for professional growth that can influence an individual’s level of job satisfaction (Houston et al. 2006; Rosser & Townsend, 2006). Boberg and Blackburn (1983) suggested that faculty members gain satisfaction from their daily activities such as teaching and research, but are dissatisfied with their working conditions. However, faculty members strive to keep quality interaction with students and co-workers while maintaining a productive work environment.

The variables linked to job satisfaction that are important in this study include the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status and the institutional variables of academic preparedness of students, the use of technology, faculty workload, tenure, relationships with colleagues, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities.

**Age**

Previous research studies have concluded that a direct relationship with one’s age and the overall level of job satisfaction exist (Hays & Kearney, 1992). With the amount of time spent on the job and as an employee matures with age, an individual becomes more comfortable with the expectations set forth by a company and feels less
overwhelmed than younger, less experienced co-workers. Carrell and Elbert (1974) ascertained that as workers age, they achieve an appreciation for their respective profession simply because of the time spent on the job.

As workers age and remain in the same position for an extended period of time, some administrators feel as though faculty burnout or a sense of complacency among aging employees would result in a lack of production. However, Bland and Chou (as cited by Flores, 2005) concluded that production levels of older faculty members do not decrease, but their attention shifts to factors such as knowledge of subject area, participatory governance, and salary.

**Gender**

Society places an emphasis on females and their role in the home. Isaac and Boyer (2007) concluded that society has treated women poorly not only in regard to family responsibilities, but also educationally and professionally. Tack and Patitu (1992) stated that women give up their “own personal time to handle the demands associated with being a mother, wife, domestic servant, care giver for the elderly parents, friend, colleague, author, invited speaker, researcher, teacher, committee member, and so on” (p. 3). As a result, women tend to be outnumbered in the faculty ranks and are more likely to have a lower income than their male counterparts. Therefore, previous research has indicated that females possess a lower faculty job satisfaction than their male counterparts (Plascak & Bean, 1989; Tack & Patitu).

In addition, the type of institution that seems to possess a larger number of women faculty members is the community college. According to the article “Looking to the Future: The Status of Community College Teaching as a Profession,” produced by the
ASHE Higher Education Report (2007), women, some of whom possess terminal degrees in their respective discipline, believe that the community college setting is ideal for females to complete the responsibilities of both work and family in an acceptable manner. The area of concern for many of these women when it comes to teaching in a university setting is the amount of time dedicated to research activity.

**Ethnicity**

With data gathered in the fall of 2005, the U.S. Department of Education’s Digest of Education Statistics (2007) indicated that minorities, including African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian make up only 16.5% of all full-time faculty members. In public 4-year universities, 17.2% of full-time faculty members are minorities compared with 16.2% that are employed in a community college setting. Tack and Patitu (1992) stated that minority faculty members often have lower salaries, are not tenured, and do not receive the support from administrators in contrast to their White co-workers. Therefore, to create a more diverse workforce for all students, institutions must develop a strategy and plan to make the job more appealing to qualified minorities who are seeking employment in the teaching field (Isaac & Boyer, 2007).

Isaac and Boyer (2007) concluded many minority faculty members begin at a community college. They deemed this to be the case due to the diverse student population that is present within most community colleges, especially in urban areas. With teaching experience gained, community colleges provide opportunities for advancement for minority educators.
Salary

The salary of faculty members has been a topic of discussion over the last several years. For students who choose teaching as a profession, many choose the career field because of the intrinsic rewards that occur rather than the monetary rewards. However, it has been shown that salary does have an effect on the job satisfaction of faculty members (Plascak & Bean, 1989). In fact, Matier (as cited by Rosser, 2005) stated that salaries “continue to be the primary reason why faculty members leave their institutions” (p. 88). A once sought after profession, Tack and Patitu (1992) concluded that the position of a college faculty member does not hold the weight that it once did in years past because of the lagging salaries when compared with other professions.

According to “Looking to the Future: The Status of Community College Teaching as a Profession” article which was produced in the ASHE Report (2007), most college and university systems establish salary schedules that are based on the type of degree a faculty member holds, the number of years of experience, and participation in professional development activities. Once a faculty member enters a placement on the salary schedule, an increase in salary occurs only when a certain number of years are completed or when additional college coursework is completed or educational degree is obtained.

As a result, union membership or collective bargaining is becoming a common practice on college campuses. Unionization can be viewed two-fold. Frankel (1973) learned that collective bargaining agreements have been able to increase faculty salaries and address issues such as fringe benefits. However, Cohen and Brawer (2008) affirmed that unions raise salaries to begin with but eventually the effects of a union will level off.
so that the salaries of unionized and non-unionized faculty members will be similar. Kim, et al. (2008) study concluded that unionized faculty members are more satisfied with their compensation and benefits, whereas nonunion members find satisfaction from the support within an institution.

**Degree Status**

As professional educators, faculty members believe that education is the key to a successful life and strive to ingrain that thought into the minds of their students. As a result of this belief, faculty seek terminal degrees in their field of study to become better equipped in developing challenging curriculums and thus, students receive an enhanced, quality education prior to entering the workforce. Milosheff (1990) concluded that job satisfaction increases when a faculty member holds a higher degree status.

The degree wherein a faculty member holds qualifies them to embrace the title of instructor, associate professor, or professor rank within an institution of higher learning. Degree status also determines whether or not a faculty member can teach undergraduate and/or graduate degree courses. Because of this ranking system and the level of degree offered in a college and university setting, a majority of faculty members will have terminal degrees in a respective discipline. However, in the community college setting, most instructors possess only a master’s degree with eighteen graduate hours in a specific discipline, the only requirement set forth by the accrediting body known as the Southern Association of College and Schools (SACS). Kim et al. (2008) admitted that faculty members who maintain a terminal degree in a discipline and teach in a community college environment, have slightly lower job satisfaction levels when compared with other community college faculty members.
Academic Ability of Students

Faculty members in institutions of higher education face frustration over the lack of preparedness of students or the lack of motivation that some students possess. In the book, *Honored But Invisible*, Grubb and Webb (1999) stated that a majority of instructors who have been teaching for a number of years believe student ability has progressively gotten worse over the years and many of those instructors blame the state of the public school system.

Community colleges face another daunting task in that community colleges are considered “open access” institutions, something that their colleagues from four-year college and universities do not face. According to the article “Institutional Factors Affecting Community College Faculty Work Life” published in the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) Report (2007), by definition, “open access results in an enormous range of students in every respect: age, ability, race, or ethnicity, and motivation in attending” (p.85). With an open door philosophy that welcomes all students regardless of educational background, community colleges obtain students who lack certain academic abilities and thus, the large need for developmental or remedial education. Clark, as referenced in the ASHE Report “Institutional Factors Affecting Community College Faculty Work Life” (2007), stated this open door philosophy presents a major obstacle for any community college faculty member because of the make-up of the student body with regard to academic ability. As a result, community college instructors must be unwavering in their commitment to serve all students regardless of ability (Murray, 2005).
The perceived academic ability of students has caused faculty members to leave their teaching careers and thus lowered job satisfaction among faculty (Murray & Cunningham, 2005). Often times, new faculty members are disappointed and frustrated with the academic ability of students (Murray, 2000). This frustration is a result of having to modify classroom instruction to fit individual academic ability while also challenging more advanced students (Frankel, 1973). Murray and Cunningham (2004) stated that “many faculty members readily acknowledge that serving underprepared students is the fate of community colleges” (¶ 39).

Technology

Colleges are providing access to higher education through a variety of means for all individuals, regardless of where they are in life (Barone, 1999). As technological advances take place and growth continues in the field of online education, faculty members are seeking ways to enhance classroom instruction while at the same time meeting the different learning styles of their students.

Nevertheless, with the growth of information technology comes frustration and stress for faculty members. According to Fields (2000), two-thirds of faculty members feel pressure from having to keep up with technological advancements in the classroom. However, faculty members have a desire to teach at institutions where there are modern instructional facilities that include “state-of-the-art classrooms, up-to-date audiovisual equipment, computer facilities, and sufficient resources to support teaching” (Valadez & Anthony, 2001, p. 104).

With advancement in technology occurring on college campuses, and in particular with online education, there is a need for adequate technical support personnel to assist in
elevating the pressure that faculty members might feel (Rosser & Townsend, 2006).

German and Green (as cited by Rosser, 2005) affirmed the most important issues that
colleges and universities will face over the coming years is the amount of instructional
technology used in the classroom and the amount of technical support that will be
available to assist faculty members.

**Faculty Workload**

The workload that faculty members face can be overwhelming at times, especially
for newcomers. Murray and Cunningham (2004) learned that faculty members who are
considering whether to leave the teaching profession contribute the idea to the amount of
work that is required. Other than class preparation, which takes up the greatest number of
hours each week, faculty members take on the role of “designing new courses, teaching
diverse students, advising, contributing to institutional initiatives, and serving on faculty
ccommittees” (Murray, 2000, p. 4). As a result, the level of job satisfaction declines
(Milosheff, 1990). On the other hand, faculty members who build relationships with
students significantly increase their level of job satisfaction (Rosser, 2005).

Murray and Cunningham (2004) acknowledged that new faculty members can be
weighed down simply by the number of classes that must be taught during a term and the
preparation that goes in to each class. In keeping with this statement, Mager and Myers,
(as cited in Murray, 2000), concluded that 74% of new faculty members who participated
in their research study work more than 50 hours a week whereas 38% work 60 hours a
week.

With a number of graduate teaching assistants pursuing employment as a college
instructor upon completion of their degree, graduate assistants should gain valuable
experience of the anticipated workload. However, according to Meyers, Reid, and Quina (as cited in Murray, 2000), “many new faculty report that in graduate school they learned virtually nothing about effective teaching, the norms of academia, or being a productive faculty member” (p. 4).

Compared with university faculty members, community college instructors have one major focal point, teaching. According to the ASHE Report entitled, “Institutional Factors Affecting Community College Faculty Work Life” (2007), in a setting where research is not required, community college faculty members feel dissatisfaction from teaching loads that are typically 15 hours a semester. Frankel (1973) reported that this “frustration stems from too many students, too many classes, and too little time to do a really professional job” (p. 6).

Meanwhile, from 1977 to 1997, professors at four-year institutions have seen an increase in their workload as well, especially in the area of research. Because the university mission is two-fold, research and teaching, faculty members can see this dual function as “synergistic and complementary or antagonistic and competing” (Houston et al. 2006, p. 18).

**Tenure**

The word tenure can become a source of comfort to faculty members while at the same time cause administrators to become apprehensive. Drew (2008) defined tenure as a “measured response to meeting performance standards over a certain amount of time and demonstrating a sufficient trajectory and pattern of work” (¶ 4). In addition, tenure status is achieved in a variety of ways throughout institutions of higher learning. Community college faculty members employed in the state of Alabama receive tenure when a
contract for full-time employment is extended for a fourth consecutive year at the same institution (Fair Dismissal Act Procedures, 2004). However, colleges and universities outside the Alabama Community College System vary with the amount of time before granting tenure status.

Employees having the ability to obtain tenure at some point in their career at an institution are thought to have a greater degree of job satisfaction when compared with institutions where no tenure is available (Clery, 2002). Even at college and universities where faculty members are given different ranks and titles, most are in favor of tenure (Fields, 2000). This is due to most tenured faculty members feeling empowered to address certain issues with administrators such as institutional governance and academic freedom (Lerner, 2008) without fear of revenge when tenure comes up for discussion (Murray, 2000).

With tenure providing job security for faculty members, a number of administrators see it as a policy which can hamper the effectiveness of a teaching institution. In the text, The Invisible Hand, Grubb and Webb (1999) stated “the tenure process assumes that once an individual has been deemed fit for teaching, he or she will stay that way” (p. 291) and that “once tenured, there is no further concern with the quality of teaching” (p. 293). Therefore, administrators should focus on classroom evaluation and offer assistance when the quality of instruction is poor as a result of faculty burnout.

**Relationships with Colleagues**

In order for a worker to have a sense of belonging to an organization, an emotional connection with colleagues, either through a friendship or a working relationship, must be developed. Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (as cited by Runyon,
2008) stated that “affectively committed employees are seen as having a sense of belonging and identification that increase their involvement in the organization’s activities, their willingness to pursue the organization’s goals, and their desire to remain with the organization” (p. 2).

Barnes, Agago, and Coombs (1998) conducted research to investigate the relationship between work-related stress and a faculty member’s intent to leave the professoriate. They concluded that one of the stressors causing faculty to leave the profession is the lack of community that is felt within higher education. Thus, pleasant working relationships improve levels of job satisfaction (Hutton & Jobe, 1985).

**Administrative Governance & Support**

Research conducted by Rosser and Townsend (2006) indicates administrative support and updated, modern facilities are the most important elements when it came to measuring faculty worklife. However, the amount of political red-tape and bargaining that is sometimes involved in the workplace can also be the “greatest disappointment” for faculty (Murray, 2000).

Over the years, faculty communication with administrators has become obsolete due to a push by administrators to centralize the managerial process (Plascak & Bean, 1989). With centralization, decisions regarding program and curriculum development, method of instruction, and instructional materials are now being decided by deans and presidents even though faculty members are the ones hired to carry out the functions of all programs (Frankel, 1973). This practice has left faculty members frustrated over the lack of shared governance and authority, especially with designing and developing the curriculum (Woods & Weasmer, 2002).
According to the ASHE Report (2007), entitled “Institutional Factors Affecting Community College Faculty Work Life,” faculty involvement comes in the form of collective bargaining organizations or teachers unions, such as the Alabama Education Association (AEA), or through faculty senates. Woods and Weasmer (2002) stated the “lack of administrative and collegial support…and a controlled curriculum often squelch” a faculty members passion for teaching (¶1). Therefore, the combination of power and job satisfaction is directly related to one another. Frankel (1973) maintained “when faculty perceived an increase in their ability to make decisions concerning their college, their degree of job satisfaction was increased” (p. 4).

**Professional Growth Opportunities**

Just as students need refresher courses periodically in order to achieve a successful grade, faculty members need professional development opportunities to remain up-to-date on pedagogical issues and continue to stay abreast in their respective discipline (Frankel, 1973). However, some administrators believe otherwise because of the costs involved and the release time that must be granted (Rosser, 2005). When faculty members do “have access to professional develop, it is often inadequate” (AHSE Report, 2007, p. 110). As a result, faculty members stated that the lack of professional development opportunities is the least satisfying aspect of their job (Hutton & Jobe, 1985).

By taking part in professional growth opportunities, faculty members are engaging in scholarly activity and intellectual stimulation. Consequently, this has been shown to improve faculty morale and have an impact on the overall satisfaction of faculty members (Garmon, 1997; Rosser, 2005).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between certain demographic and institutional variables of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System and their impact on job satisfaction using an instrument created by the researcher. Because little research has been done with regard to faculty job satisfaction, particularly in the community college setting, the study will add to the current literature a validated research instrument for use in future studies. The variables included in the study are the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status, along with the institutional variables of academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload, tenure, co-worker relationship, academic policies and administrative support, and professional growth opportunities. This chapter describes the methods used in the study, along with the process that was employed in developing the instrument, and assessing the instrument’s underlying factor structure. The section is divided into the areas of population, selection of subjects, instrumentation, pilot study, data collection, and data analysis.

Population and Sample

The Alabama Community College System is comprised of 22 regional comprehensive community colleges, 4 technical colleges, and 1 university that offer upper level courses leading to the baccalaureate degree. Of those colleges, the researcher
chose only the comprehensive community colleges and technical colleges for possible participation with only 12 colleges willing to participate in the study. The letters from college administrators granting the researcher permission to contact faculty members are in Appendix A.

A total of 165 faculty members began the survey; however, only 140 faculty surveys were completed in their entirety and submitted by the participants. The remaining 25 responses were either partially completed or abandoned and not used by the researcher in this study. Since the research was conducted during the summer 2009 term, the population of full-time faculty members could have included faculty members who were either employed during the summer term on a 3-month contract or those who opted not to teach during the summer term, but checked work emails during the summer semester.

The sample population can be characterized as ranging in age from 50 to 59 (n = 51, 36.4%), were female (n = 85, 60.7%), and identified their ethnicity as Caucasian/White (n = 122, 87.1%). In addition, 70.0% indicated they taught in an academic transfer area (n = 98). Of the respondents, 112 participants had reached tenure status (80.0%), and most had only been employed within a community college setting for less than a five year period (n = 39, 27.9%). The largest number of participants indicated that they received an annual 9-month salary of $40,000 to $49,000 (n = 38, 27.1%) and held a master’s degree (n = 94, 67.1%).

Selection of Subjects

The 22 comprehensive community colleges and the 4 technical colleges from the Alabama Community College System were chosen for the study. A letter requesting participation was emailed to each of the college presidents of the 26 institutions. Due to
the low number of responses from member colleges after the first request, a letter was sent to the Alabama Community College System Chancellor, Bradley Bryne, asking him to encourage member colleges to participate and a second request for participation was mailed to the presidents via the United States Parcel Service. Within days of submitting the letter to Chancellor Bryne, the Alabama Community College System Vice-Chancellor for Instruction and Student Services, Susan Price, sent an email out to all college presidents and instructional officers encouraging their institutions to participate in the study because she deemed that the information could be of use to the college system. A total of 12 community and technical colleges participated in the study.

Once the researcher received the written approval from the community college president, a notification to take part in the study was sent to potential participants via an email that was disseminated by a designated employee identified by the college president. All full-time faculty members had the opportunity to participate, regardless of discipline. Copies of the letters from the researcher to Chancellor Bryne, the college presidents, and faculty members, as well as the authorization letters from Vice-Chancellor Price and each institution president that participated in the study are included in appendix A.

The first email request to faculty members indicated that the survey would be open for a period of two weeks. The first request yielded 98 completed responses. After the initial survey period had closed and a period of one week had lapsed, the same email was again sent to the designated employee for dissemination encouraging participants to complete the survey if they had not already done so. The second opportunity to complete the survey was again open for a two-week period. Another 42 completed responses were
returned after the second email for a total of 165 responses; however, only 140 surveys were completed in its entirety and used in this study.

**Instrumentation**

A review of the literature revealed the need to develop a job satisfaction survey that was geared toward community college faculty job satisfaction. Therefore, the researcher created an instrument entitled the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey to measure the demographic and institutional variables cited in this study as they relate to faculty job satisfaction. The researcher designed and created the instrument and a copy of the survey used in this study is included in the Appendix B.

Data were collected on the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey using various types of questions. Demographic variables that addressed the age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status, tenure status, and number of years teaching in a community college setting of each participant were collected using multiple choice type answers. Each of the 10 questions (items 2-11) had pre-determined answers provided and respondents were asked to mark the box that applied to their current status.

The institutional variables concerning the academic ability of students (6 questions), advancement in technology (6 questions), faculty workload (8 questions), tenure (6 questions), co-worker relationships (5 questions), administrative support (8 questions), and professional growth opportunities (6 questions) were assessed using a 5-point Likert scale in which responses ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” For the purposes of coding, “strongly agree” received a value of 5 while “strongly disagree” received a value of 1. Each of the institutional variables was evaluated using subscale questions that were designed by the researcher based on current
literature and personal experience. These subscale questions attempted to identify the reason for the overall satisfaction level.

Four additional questions were included at the end of the survey asking the participants: 1) if they considered leaving the field of academe during the past year; 2) if they considered leaving the institution for another institution of higher education; 3) would they choose the career field again if they had to do it over again; and 4) overall satisfaction level as a community college faculty member. One open ended question concluded the survey asking faculty members to name one area that can decrease faculty morale. A listing of those responses can be found in Appendix C.

After developing the survey, the researcher tested the validity of the instrument by asking a panel of experts to review the content of each item and the format of the survey. The panel of experts suggested revisions to several questions to make the items easier for the participants to understand. Questions that were modified included the following types of revisions: correcting typing errors, removing a question because of ambiguity, including an additional choice in degree status, and clarifying salary choices because of the additional contract that is awarded in the summer. Once feedback was obtained on the survey, the researcher placed the survey in an online format using SurveyGizmo and conducted a pilot study.

**Pilot Study**

A total of 39 full-time faculty members participated in the pilot study. The letter requesting participation to the college presidents to perform the pilot study is located in Appendix A.
The reliability of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was assessed through a single administration using an internal consistency measure. According to Pallant (2007), internal consistency addresses how consistent participants respond to items that make up the test. The internal consistency measure chosen was the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The results from the reliability yielded the following coefficients on each of the subscales as indicated on Table 3.1.

Table 3.1  Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient as Determined by Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic ability of students</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement in technology</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty workload</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker relationship</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic policies and administrative support</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth opportunities</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficient scores can range from .000 to 1.00 with no possibility for negative values. For research studies, it has been established that alpha coefficient scores of at least .70 or higher are preferred (Frankel & Wallen, 2006). An overall Cronbach alpha coefficient was determined by using all items within the survey. The overall score was .786 for the job satisfaction survey as a whole indicating the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was found to be reliable.
Because alpha coefficient scores on the academic ability of students, faculty workload, and tenure subscales were all below the recommended score of .70, the researcher reviewed the subscales to determine what led to the low scores. In the process, it was determined that a total of 10 survey items appeared to be measuring something different than the survey as a whole by evaluating the Item-Total Correlation values of each survey question. Those of particular interest were those survey items which had an item-total correlation score of less than .30. The researcher determined the low scores are partially due to the survey questions in each of these areas being worded negatively.

According to Pallant (2007), any item-total correlation values of less than .30 presents a dilemma for the researcher and thus, should be removed if the overall Cronbach alpha coefficient is less than .70. However, since the overall alpha coefficient was .786 the researcher allowed the questions to remain in the survey.

**Data Collection**

The survey was administered online through SurveyGizmo during the summer 2009 term. An email was sent to the institutions who submitted written notification from the college president or designee to the researcher. Once an authorization was obtained in writing, an email requesting faculty participation was sent to an employee designated by the college president for dissemination to all full-time faculty members. Included in the email was a link to the survey. Surveys were administered for a two week period and then a second email was sent as follow-up encouraging faculty members to participate in the study if they had not already done so. The second email indicated that the survey would continue to be available for a two-week period.
As participants opened the online survey, faculty members viewed a letter of consent which clearly explained the purpose of the study, a description of the procedures used in the study, as well as the risks and benefits involved in participation. Before continuing the survey, respondents were required to check a box indicating that they had read the letter of consent and agreed to participate in the study before being allowed to continue the survey.

**Data Analysis**

SurveyGizmo compiled results and the researcher exported the data file into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, Version 14.0, for examination. Once data were exported into the SPSS software, a predictive research design was used to analyze the data and address the research questions. Predictive research, also known as correlational research, is a type of descriptive research that “describes the degree to which two or more quantitative variables are related” (Frankel & Wallen, 2006, p. 335).

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data using numerical or graph form. Furthermore, measures of central tendency were used to describe the make-up of the sample population by categorizing the demographic variables used in this study.

A factor analysis was used to determine if the many institutional variables included in this study could be described by a few factors. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), factor analysis is used when a number of variables result in the analysis and data interpretation becoming “cumbersome”. Therefore, by reducing the number of variables that are moderately or highly related into factors or clusters, analysis becomes much easier.
Secondly, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), was chosen for this study to determine within group differences in job satisfaction based on the independent variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, tenure, and degree status, which were predetermined by the researcher. According to Pallant (2007), “a one-way between-group ANOVA is used when you have one independent variable with three or more levels and one dependent continuous variable” (p. 243). The result of the ANOVA will explain to the researcher if there are significant differences across the varying levels as it relates to job satisfaction. By conducting the ANOVA, administrators can determine specific target populations where improvements could be made to improve morale.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships between certain demographic and institutional variables of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System and their impact on job satisfaction using an instrument created by the researcher. This chapter presents the data analysis of the data collected using the instrument described in Chapter Three and addresses the following research questions presented previously in Chapter One.

1. What is the factor structure of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey?

2. Are there within-group differences in job satisfaction based on the independent variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status?

3. What is the overall level of job satisfaction among Alabama Community College System faculty members?

The first section depicts the demographic background of the faculty population who participated in the study. The second section focuses on the results of a factor analysis used to determine the most efficient factor structure for presenting the many institutional variables included in this study. The third section presents the results of an ANOVA to describe between group differences using the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, tenure, and degree status on job satisfaction. The final section provides
the overall job satisfaction level of community college faculty members employed within the Alabama Community College System.

**Descriptive Statistics – Participants**

Table 4.1 provides the age range of the 140 respondents. Of those completing the survey, the largest number of respondents \((n=51)\) identified themselves between the ages of 50-59 (36.4%). Those between the ages of 40-49 made up 28.6% \((n=40)\) of the population followed by those age 30-39 \((n=28, 20.0\%)\). The lowest number of participants ranged in age from 60 and older \((n=18, 12.9\%)\) and 20-29 \((n=3, 2.1\%)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents were female. Female respondents made up 60.7% \((n=85)\) of the sample, while males \((n=55)\) comprised 39.3%.

The breakdown of participants’ ethnic backgrounds is listed in Table 4.2. A majority of respondents were Caucasian/White (87.1%) followed by African-American/Black (9.3%). Four individuals chose not to respond to this question.
Table 4.2 Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 identifies the nine-month salaries of the participants. The largest number of respondents earned $40,000-$49,000 ($n=38, 27.1%). Those earning $50,000-$59,000 ($n=36, 25.7%) closely followed along with participants who grossed $70,000 or more ($n=30, 21.4%) for a nine-month period. Three individuals did not respond to this survey item.

Table 4.3 Nine-Month Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine-Month Salary</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$39,999 or less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 or more</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A list of the highest degree earned by the participants is provided in Table 4.4. A majority of respondents held a Master’s degree ($n=94, 67.1\%$) and 12 participants went on to earn a Doctor of Philosophy degree (8.6\%). Three other individuals marked “other” indicating they possess a degree not on the list. These participants held a Juris Doctorate degree, a Doctor of Nursing degree, and Master’s of Fine Arts degree. One individual did not respond to this item.

Table 4.4  Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist (Ed.S)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Doctorate (Ed.D)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 29 participants (20.7\%) held an administrative position such as division chair, etc., in addition to their faculty workloads. Of the respondents, 78.6\% of the respondents were not responsible for administrative duties. One individual did not respond to this question.
Table 4.5 provides a breakdown of the number of years that participants were employed as a community college faculty member. Most of the respondents were in the profession from 0 to 5 years ($n=39$, 27.9%) followed closely by those employed 11-15 years ($n=33$, 23.6%) and 6 to 10 years ($n=30$, 21.4%).

Table 4.5  Years as a Community College Faculty Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as CC Faculty Member</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents taught academic transfer courses ($n=98$, 70.0%) while those teaching technical courses made up 17.1% ($n=24$) of the faculty. The remaining participants ($n=15$, 10.7%) taught in an allied health program such as nursing. Three individuals did not respond to this question.

A majority of faculty members who responded to the survey were teaching at least one web-based class ($n=72$, 51.4%) whereas 48.6% ($n=68$) did not teach online courses.

A large number of faculty members ($n=112$, 80.0%) were considered to be tenured at their respective institutions leaving the other 20.0% ($n=28$) to have been employed at the same institution for less than three full years.
Factor Analysis

In order to determine a factor structure of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, factor analysis was conducted. Pallant (2007) states that factor analysis “takes a large set of variables and looks for a way the data may be reduced or summarized using a smaller set of factors or components” (p. 179). A confirmatory factor analysis was performed using all subscale questions that the researcher first thought would influence job satisfaction.

Selection of Factors

The researcher conducted this study by looking at the seven variables, or factors, related to faculty job satisfaction as determined in previous research by Igwe (2003). These variables included academic ability of students, technology, faculty workload, tenure, relationship with colleagues, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities. However, it was determined through the use of factor analysis that only four components, or factors, were truly significant and worthy of being retained for future studies.

The four factor component was determined by using the following criteria often employed in factor analytic designs. The first criterion was to examine the initial eigenvalues and apply Kaiser’s rule for inclusion. Each factor with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or more was considered significant and retained for further evaluation.

Due to the large number of factors that were extracted by examining the eigenvalue alone, the scree plot was examined for signs of change or an “elbow” in the
plot (Palant, 2007). Those factors which were above the elbow or break were retained since the scree plot indicates a more meaningful relationship among those factors.

Also, an evaluation of the component-pattern matrix tables was performed. Any items which had a value above .40 suggested a strong correlation among the items and therefore, similar in meaning (Palant, 2007). At least three survey items must have loaded on a given factor, thus allowing the researcher to more easily create a new description for each factor based on the relationship of the items. Consequently, since four factors had three or more items loading on the component, a four factor solution was the best fit for this study.

Table 4.6 provides the eigenvalues and the variance explained using the four factor structure. The total communality estimate for the model was 18.4 and the total variance explained was 48.4%.

Table 4.6   Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the pattern matrix criterion, Table 4.7 identifies each item that loaded on a particular factor with a value of .40 or higher. Negative values represent a negative correlation with regard to the factor.

### Table 4.7 Factor Loading of Items on the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor Loading Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 1 - “Administrative Support and Its Affect on the Personal Life of Faculty Members”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Policies that are developed by college administrators meet the needs of faculty members.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>College administrators consider faculty expertise when developing instructional policies.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>During the past year, I have felt physical / emotional stress or a lack of motivation as a result of the high levels of frustration and stress that my job brings (i.e., &quot;burnout&quot;).</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>College administrators encourage faculty members to apply for administrative positions (i.e., division chair, academic dean, etc.) when positions become available.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My job allows me to balance my professional and personal life.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Strong academic students bypass the community college for the 4-year college or university.</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Non-teaching responsibilities adversely affect my ability to adequately address student’s needs in my course(s).</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>College administrators and faculty members are typically at odds with each other.</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2 - “Obtaining Tenure and the Evaluation Process”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The State Board of Education should raise the number of years before tenure is granted.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Student evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>An obstacle to success for today's college student is a lack of educational preparedness rather than a lack of motivation.</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It is the community college’s responsibility to educate underprepared students.</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Annual performance evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tenure laws allow some faculty members to become complacent and unproductive once tenure is obtained.</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3 - “Technology in the Classroom and Training Through Professional Development Activities”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My college encourages the use of technology in the classroom.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My college provides an ample supply of up-to-date technology that can be used in the classroom.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My college provides me with proper training on the use of new technology for the classroom.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My college provides adequate technical support for the purpose of integrating technology into my classroom.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The college provides useful in-house professional development opportunities on a continual / routine basis.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>The college provides a variety of professional development opportunities.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I continually seek opportunities to integrate technology into my daily classroom activity.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The college provides me with adequate classroom resources to be successful.</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4 - “Relationship Among Colleagues”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>My colleagues are friendly and make me feel welcomed.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>My colleagues are cognizant of my awards, publications, and accomplishments, and I receive encouragement from fellow peers.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I gain valuable knowledge of classroom practices, etc. from my colleagues.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>There is a mutual respect among colleagues at my institution.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor contained eight items and was labeled as “Administrative Support and Its Affect on the Personal Life of Faculty Members.” These items describe how
policies and procedures are developed within the respective community college and the role those decisions could play in a faculty members personal life. For instance, if a faculty member feels a sense of frustration or “burnout,” it could be due to a lack of faculty input in administrative decision making. The creation of a faculty senate on each of the Alabama community college campuses or a periodic roundtable discussion where employees are allowed to meet with an administrative team to discuss concerns would help alleviate some of the frustration of faculty.

Factor two consisted of six items that mostly related to the tenure structure and how tenure is obtained. Therefore, the label was renamed “Obtaining Tenure and the Evaluation Process.” During the development of the instrument, a number of evaluation tools were reviewed that were to used assess faculty performance. For example, student evaluations may not portray an accurate representation of a faculty member’s performance due to some students having below average grades in a particular class.

The third factor was labeled as “Technology in the Classroom and Training Through Professional Development Activities.” These eight items describe a faculty member’s use of technology in the classroom and evaluates whether the respective institution is current with advancements in technology. This newly created factor also assesses the college’s role in providing training to its faculty members in the use of this technology.

The fourth factor contained four items which describe the relationship among colleagues. These items were originally together on a subscale when the researcher created the survey. Since, during factor analysis these items loaded again on a single component, the label was renamed “Relationship Among Colleagues.” This component
addresses the role co-workers play in making a faculty member feel welcomed and valued at an institution.

The four factor solution eliminated 12 of the 38 subscale items that were included in the original survey instrument. A total of 26 items loaded within the four factor structure and were retained in the final version of the survey instrument. A copy of the newly created instrument is located in Appendix D.

**Reliability of Factors**

The scale reliability of the four factor structure using the 26 items that were retained was then assessed. According to Pallant (2007), internal consistency addresses how consistent participants respond to items that make up the test. Once again, the internal consistency measure chosen was the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The results from the reliability yielded the following coefficients on each of the factors as indicated in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8  Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient as Determined by Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support and Its Affect on the Personal Life of Faculty Members (8 items)</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Tenure and the Evaluation Process (6 items)</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology in the Classroom and Training Through Professional Development Activities (8 items)</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Among Colleagues (4 items)</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (26 items)</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because Factors 1 and 2 contained negative values in the factor analysis results which indicated a negative correlation among items, reverse scoring was performed prior to assessing the reliability measurement on each factor. Correlation coefficient scores range from .00 to 1.00. The higher the coefficient scores, the more strongly correlated the survey items are to one another.

For research studies, an established that alpha coefficient scores of at least .70 or higher are preferred (Frankel & Wallen, 2006). Factor 2 was the only component which did not meet this criterion and is believed to have occurred due to one item addressing the academic ability of students while the other items address tenure and the evaluation process leading up to tenure. Therefore, item 13 which states, “It is the community colleges responsibility to educate underprepared students” was left out of the amended survey which is located in Appendix D. With a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .857 for the revised survey as a whole, the factor structure of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey was shown to have improved from the original design.

**ANOVA**

In comparing the between group and within group differences with regard to age, gender, ethnicity, salary, tenure, and degree status on overall faculty job satisfaction, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted on using the full scale score on the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction survey as the dependent variable. In Table 4.9 are the ANOVA results between the four age groups of faculty members and overall job satisfaction levels with the highest mean score ($M=4.43$) coming from those whose age ranged from 40-49. Previous researchers cited by Hays and Kearney (1992) believed there to be a direct relationship with one’s age and the overall level of job satisfaction.
However, there was no significant differences among group means with regard to age
\((F=.66, df=4/132, p>.05)\) and overall satisfaction at the .05 level.

Table 4.9  Analysis of Variance Summary Table Regarding Age and Overall Job
Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>96.62</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.54</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although females had a slightly higher mean score \((M=4.28)\) compared with their
male colleagues \((M=4.24)\), there was no significant difference between the mean scores
of males and females with respect to job satisfaction as seen in Table 4.10 which reveals
\(F=.09, df=1/135, p>.05\), at the .05 level. With higher mean scores among females in
terms of overall job satisfaction in the Alabama Community College System, this
contradicts previous research by Plascak and Bean (1989) and Tack and Patitu (1992)
which indicated males had a higher faculty job satisfaction than females.

Table 4.10  Analysis of Variance Summary Table Regarding Gender and Overall Job
Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>98.48</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.54</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.11 indicates through the use of ANOVA that there is no significant difference among ethnicities ($F=.55$, $df=2/131$, $p > .05$) and overall job satisfaction at the .05 level. When comparing mean scores, African-American scores ($M=4.42$) were higher than Caucasians ($M=4.26$). One only Asian-American completed the survey and thus was excluded from this model.

Table 4.11  Analysis of Variance Summary Table Regarding Ethnicity and Overall Job Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>95.98</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96.79</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to salary levels and overall job satisfaction, those possessing the highest mean score were those who earned $39,999 or less a year ($M=4.57$) while the lowest score came from those earning $70,000 or more ($M=3.93$) on a nine-month contract. Because the Levene’s test for homogeneity ($p=.004$) rejected the assumption of homogeneity of variances between the five salary groups, the Welch Tests of Equality of Means was used instead of the usual ANOVA. The Welch test indicates that there is no significant difference between salary and job satisfaction levels as indicated in Table 4.12 with the significance level of $p>.05$. 

50
Table 4.12  Welch Robust Tests of Equality of Means Regarding Salary and Overall Job Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 reveals that there was no significant difference between tenured and non-tenured employees \((F=0.01, df=1/135, p>.05)\) and the variable of job satisfaction at the .05 level. Those who were tenured had a slightly higher mean score \((M=4.27)\) than those non-tenured employees \((M=4.25)\).

Table 4.13  Analysis of Variance Summary Table Regarding Tenure Status and Overall Job Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>98.53</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.54</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the six degree classifications, Table 4.14 indicates that there is no significant difference between the highest degree earned \((F=1.49, df=5/127, p>.05)\) and overall job satisfaction levels at the .05 level. Employees who possessed an Associate’s Degree had the highest mean score \((M=4.80)\) while those with a Doctor of Philosophy had the lowest mean score \((M=3.83)\).
Table 4.14  Analysis of Variance Summary Table Regarding Highest Degree Earned and Overall Job Satisfaction Levels Among Alabama Community College Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92.37</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Job Satisfaction Rating**

Descriptive statistics were also calculated to determine the satisfaction levels with regard to the academic ability of students, use of technology, workload, tenure laws, relationship with colleagues, administrative policies and support, professional development opportunities, and overall satisfaction. Table 4.15 provides a summary of the frequency statistics for these variables which was addressed by asking the question, “I am satisfied with the (variable) at my college.” The variables in which a large number of participants responded negatively and thus, indicating their dissatisfaction, were in the area of academic ability of students (38.6%), technology (22.8%), administrative support (25.7%), and professional development opportunities (25.7%). However, 87.2% of participants responded positively to their overall job satisfaction level.
Table 4.15  Frequency Statistics on Various Satisfaction Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Variable</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral-No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Ability</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Relationships</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Development Opportunities</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final questions on the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey asked the participant if, within the past year, they had considered leaving their current positions for a career outside of academe and whether they had considered leaving their current institutions for other institutions of higher education. Only a small percentage (15.0%) of the 140 participants had considered leaving the academic arena during the last year, however, a higher percentage (27.1%) had contemplated leaving their current institution for other colleges or universities. When asked if the participants would consider choosing a career as a community college faculty member again if they had to start over, 89.3% indicated that their chosen career route would remain the same.

One open ended question was addressed by the participants at the end of the survey with hopes of identifying current themes in areas that are believed to decrease
faculty morale. From reviewing faculty members’ comments made at the end of survey, the following themes were presented. 1) lack of communication between faculty and administration, 2) lack of input into academic decision making, and 3) hiring practices. The participant’s responses for this item are located in Appendix C.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Community college faculty members within the state of Alabama have seen their share of negative publicity and budget cuts in recent years (B. Byrne, personal communication, January 2009). Although a former chancellor and other system employees were charged with various crimes for unethical behavior and state appropriation shortfalls occurred due to a declining economy, Alabama Community College System faculty members continue to provide exceptional educational training to students even in the worst of time (B. Byrne, personal communication, November 2008). One might ponder what affect this has on morale. McBride et al. (1992) stated “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college” (p. 158).

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between certain demographic and institutional variables of faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System and their impact on job satisfaction. The variables included in the study which were originally identified by Igwe (2003) are the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status, along with the institutional variables of academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload,
tenure, co-worker relationship, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities.

A total of 140 faculty members from ten community and technical colleges within the Alabama Community College System participated in the study along with 39 participants from two other Alabama community colleges who took part in a pilot study. In an effort to measure the job satisfaction levels in the various areas, the researcher created a survey and disseminated it to faculty via SurveyGizmo, an online survey website. The survey was designed to answer the following research questions.

1. What is the factor structure of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey?

2. Are there within-group differences in job satisfaction based on the independent variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status?

3. What is the overall level of job satisfaction among Alabama Community College System faculty members?

A factor analysis was performed to determine a meaningful factor structure with anticipation that the survey will be used during future research. Data were also tested by applying a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, degree status, and tenure status to determine if between and within group differences existed among these variables. Measures of central tendencies were used to assess the overall job satisfaction levels among full-time faculty members in the Alabama Community College System.

The findings of this study will educate community college administrators not only in Alabama, but also nationwide, with regard to job satisfaction. Thus, this study is being
conducted in order to create an environment that will encourage enthusiasm and increase morale among faculty members while improving the institution’s overall effectiveness and creating a more stable learning environment for students. In addition, the findings of this study will provide a foundation for additional research regarding job satisfaction among community college faculty.

**Results and Implications**

The researcher conducted the study by looking at seven variables, or factors, related to faculty job satisfaction as identified in previous research by Igwe (2003). These variables included academic ability of students, technology, faculty workload, tenure, relationship with colleagues, administrative governance and support, and professional growth opportunities. Through the use of factor analysis, only four components, or factors, were truly significant and were retained on the survey created by the researcher. The factors were 1) Administrative support and its affect on the personal life of faculty members; 2) Obtaining tenure and the evaluation process; 3) Technology in the classroom and training through professional development activities; and 4) Relationship among colleagues. This instrument will lay the foundation for additional research to occur with regard to community college faculty job satisfaction and gives administrators a means to assess the level of job satisfaction on a respective college campus periodically during a year. By doing this, colleges create open communication between administration and faculty which in turn, creates a more stable learning environment for students.

By applying the ANOVA principle to determine the between and within group mean differences between the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, tenure status, and degree status, the study concluded that there were no significant differences among
the means with any of these variables. Although no significant difference was determined using ANOVA, the researcher concluded from evaluation of mean scores that tenured females who possessed an associate’s degree and were of African American descent, ranging in age from 40-49 and earning $30,000-$39,999 per nine-month contract had the highest level of job satisfaction in the Alabama Community College System.

By evaluating the frequencies of overall job satisfaction with regard to each of the areas, faculty members seemed less satisfied with the academic ability of their respective students, support from administrators, professional development opportunities, and technological advancements at their respective colleges. A large percentage (38.6%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed when asked if they were satisfied with the academic ability of students. The researcher deems this occurred due to the open door policy that is part of the community college mission and the large amount of remediation that takes place in a community college setting.

A quarter (25.7%) of faculty participants disagreed or strongly disagreed when asked if they were satisfied with the support from administration and with opportunities for professional development. From reviewing faculty members’ comments made at the end of survey, a few themes stood out. One theme was the lack of communication or disconnect between administration and faculty members. Another is the lack of faculty input into decisions concerning academics and the administration’s hiring or placing individuals into positions. Therefore, the researcher encourages administrators to seek improvement in communication and input into decision making through the use of faculty senates or regular roundtable discussion with all employees. By doing this, faculty members will have a voice as critical decisions are made with regard to academics.
A total of 22.8% of faculty responded negatively when asked if they were satisfied with the technological advancements at their college. With the push of online education becoming more common in today’s education, community colleges must keep abreast of the advancements in technology to compete with four-year public and private institutions. Many colleges are purchasing software such as Camtasia Studio and others but faculty are not being trained properly on how to utilize the software most effectively in their classroom.

Overall, 87.2% of the participants in this study either agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their overall duties as a community college faculty member. Although faculty members indicated areas that need to be improved, many believe are content with their current employment. As one participant stated in the open ended question “I basically believe morale is a personal decision. You can be happy, or you can be miserable, just about anytime, anywhere.”

**Conclusions**

In order to improve institutions of higher learning, faculty members must enjoy their professional duties and remain committed to serving the needs of students. With funding shortfalls, overcrowded classrooms, and the large percentage of students who enter the community college unprepared for the rigors of college coursework, community college faculty members face challenges on a daily basis. So do these daily challenges decrease morale and in turn hurt student achievement? McBride et al. (1992) stated “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college” (p. 158).
As a result of this study, it was determined that a more meaningful four factor structure would best be utilized when assessing job satisfaction among community college faculty members. This new survey instrument, designed by the researcher, should be used periodically by administrators to evaluate faculty job satisfaction with a desire to improve their respective institution and in turn, enhance student success.

By measuring job satisfaction on a regular basis, it creates an atmosphere that will foster a renewed enthusiasm and passion for teaching. It also provides a faculty a sense of addressing needs and gives administrators an avenue to gain valuable input from those who interact with students on a daily basis thus, creating a more stable learning environment for students.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The following recommendations are made as a result of this study.

1. This study should be replicated using the revised survey which was created as a result of the new factor structure. The redesigned survey can be found in Appendix D.

2. A study of job satisfaction among staff members should be conducted to compare with faculty satisfaction levels.

3. Community college administrators should periodically use the survey to assess job satisfaction levels of their respective employees as a means of self-study and improvement.

4. Future research should be conducted that addresses job satisfaction levels of Alabama Community College System faculty members as compared with Alabama 4-year college and university faculty members.
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APPENDIX A

REQUEST FOR DATA COLLECTION AND APPROVAL LETTERS
Dear Chancellor Byrne,

My name is Russell Howton, Athletic Director at Bevill State Community College, and a Ph.D. candidate at Mississippi State University in the Community College Leadership program. I am working to complete the data collection phase of my dissertation entitled, “Assessing Job Satisfaction Among Alabama Community College System Faculty: Validation of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey”.

Research has shown that college administrators must be mindful of faculty job satisfaction in order to reduce faculty turnover and burnout, and increase morale among their respective employees. Furthermore, as faculty members interact with students on a daily basis, morale can have an immediate impact on an institution’s effectiveness which, in turn, can affect student outcomes. McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) believe that “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college.”

With that being said, I would like to ask for your assistance in encouraging the 22 comprehensive community college presidents and four technical college presidents to allow their faculty members to participate in the study if they so chose. I have, or will, be contacting each of the presidents by email and/or USPS mail seeking permission for their respective college to participate in the study. I must also obtain a written authorization from each of them prior to my sending the survey to faculty members. I have already received written permission from the presidents at the following colleges: Bevill State Community College, Central Alabama Community College, Jefferson Davis Community College, L.B. Wallace Community College, and Northwest-Shoals Community College.

Faculty members will be completing The Howton Community College Job Satisfaction Survey which consists of 60 questions. The survey is broken down into 10 demographic questions that relate to age, gender, ethnicity, degree status, salary and tenure status, and 50 institutional questions that relate to academic ability of students, advancements in technology, faculty workload, tenure, relationships with colleagues, administrative support, and professional growth opportunities. Once written authorization is received from the college president and I have forwarded a copy of the permission letter to the Mississippi State University Institutional Review Board office for review, an email will be sent to the respective faculty with a hyperlink to the survey. If faculty chose to participate in the study, they will be informed of the risks and benefits associated with participation.
The findings of this study will educate administrators of institutional variables that can be improved upon in order to increase faculty morale and thus, create a more stable learning environment for our students. Also, I will be happy to share the results of the study with faculty participants, participating institutions, and the Department of Postsecondary Education upon request.

Thank you in advance for your time, support and assistance by encouraging community college and technical college presidents to allow faculty members to participate in this study. If you have additional questions about this study, you may contact me at rh32@msstate.edu or 205-295-0628, or contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Ed Davis, at jed11@colled.msstate.edu or 662-325-9258.

Sincerely,

Russell Howton
Ph.D. Candidate, Community College Leadership
Mississippi State University
April 8, 2009

Dear President <Last Name>,

As a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Community College Leadership from Mississippi State University, I am conducting research on the job satisfaction levels of full-time community college faculty members within the state of Alabama.

Research has shown that college administrators must be mindful of faculty job satisfaction in order to reduce faculty turnover and burnout, and increase morale among their respective employees (Isaac and Boyer, 2007). Furthermore, as faculty members interact with students on a daily basis, morale can have an immediate impact on an institution’s effectiveness which, in turn, affects student outcomes. McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) believe that “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college.”

Therefore, I am requesting your assistance in this study by allowing your full-time faculty members to participate if they so choose. Participation by faculty members will be strictly voluntary and will be conducted using an online survey that I created on SurveyGizmo.com. There will be no direct identifiable information that will be requested.

My goal is to determine if any relationship(s) exist between certain demographic variables (age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status) and educational variables (academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload, tenure, co-worker relationship, academic policies and administrative support, and professional growth opportunities) as it relates to levels of job satisfaction. It is my goal that the findings of this study will educate community college administrators with regard to faculty morale and job satisfaction. By evaluating the satisfaction levels of faculty members, Alabama community colleges can create a more stable learning environment for their respective students and consequently, improve the system’s overall effectiveness.

*If you will permit your faculty members to participate in this study, I will need written confirmation on official college letterhead stating your college's desire to take part in this study and the name of your IT director or another employee who can assist me in disseminating information to your faculty via email.* You can send confirmation electronically by scanning the original document and emailing it to rh32@msstate.edu or mail the written authorization to the following address:

Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, Alabama 35504

Once I receive your written confirmation, I will contact the person that you have identified with an email that can be forwarded to all full-time faculty members asking for their participation in this study.

If you have additional questions about this study, you may contact me at rh32@msstate.edu or 205-295-0628, or contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Ed Davis, at jed11@colled.msstate.edu or 662-325-9258. Participation by your college is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Russell Howton
Ph.D Candidate, Community College Leadership Program
Mississippi State University
Dear Alabama Community College System Faculty Member,

As a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Community College Leadership from Mississippi State University, I am conducting research on the job satisfaction levels of full-time community college faculty members within the state of Alabama.

It’s important for college administrators to be mindful of faculty job satisfaction in order to reduce faculty turnover and burnout, and increase morale among their respective employees (Isaac and Boyer, 2007). Furthermore, because you, as faculty members, interact with students on a daily basis, morale can have an immediate impact on an institution’s effectiveness which, in turn, can impact student outcomes. McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) believe that “people of an organization are perhaps its most important resource. For a college this goes a step further, for the faculty are the college.”

By receiving this email or letter, your college president has agreed to allow full-time faculty at your institution to participate in the study if you so choose. If you are a part-time employee or adjunct faculty member, please disregard this letter; however, if you are full-time faculty member who would like to participate, the procedures, risks and benefits are outlined below.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and your identity will remain confidential during this process. No direct personal information is required, not even the name of the college with which you are employed. The variables included in the study are the demographic variables of age, gender, ethnicity, salary, and degree status, along with the institutional variables of academic ability of students, advancement in technology, faculty workload, tenure, co-worker relationship, academic policies and administrative support, and professional growth opportunities.

It is my goal that the findings of this study will educate community college administrators with regard to faculty morale and job satisfaction to create a more stable learning environment for students and improve the institution’s overall effectiveness.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete and will need to be completed by Thursday, July 9, 2009. Again, this survey is strictly voluntary and confidentiality will be kept. If you would like to participate in the study, please copy and paste the following web link into the address bar on your internet browser:

http://www.surveygizmo.com/s/102390/howton-faculty-job-satisfaction

If you have additional questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact me at rh32@msstate.edu or 205-295-0628, or contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Ed Davis, at jed11@colled.msstate.edu or 662-325-9258. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Russell Howton
Ph.D. Candidate, Community College Leadership
Mississippi State University
MEMORANDUM 2009-ISS-095

DATE: May 19, 2009

TO: Presidents, Alabama Community College System

FROM: Susan Y. Price, Vice Chancellor Instructional and Student Services

RE: Dissertation Research

Please find attached a request for assistance from Mr. Russell Howton, a Doctoral student in the Community College Leadership Program at Mississippi State University. Mr. Howton is currently working on his dissertation research on job satisfaction among faculty in the Alabama Community College System. Mr. Howton will be contacting you to ask for your authorization to survey your faculty members. Participation is voluntary and confidential. I have asked Mr. Howton to share his findings when he is finished. This data will be of great value to our system.

Thank you for your assistance.

/sj

Enclosure

cc: Bradley R. Byrne Instructional Officers
June 10, 2009

Dear Mr. Howton:

Your request for faculty at Alabama Southern Community College to participate in your doctoral research is approved. I commend your endeavors to strengthening our colleges, and in turn, enhancing student learning.

Good luck as you begin this phase of your dissertation. Please direct all correspondence to my email at mhaab@ascc.edu. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

Melissa J. Haab, Ph.D.
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for Instructional Design
April 10, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
Bevill State Community College
1411 Indiana Avenue
Jasper, AL 35501

Dear Russell:

I received your letter asking permission to let faculty members at Bevill State participate in a study as part of your candidacy for a Doctor of Philosophy from Mississippi State University. I am approving your request and Danny Arnold can assist you in disseminating information to the faculty.

I hope you have success with your research.

Sincerely,

Anne S. McNutt
President

jl
April 20, 2009

Mr. Russell Howten
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, Alabama 35504

Dear Mr. Howten:

Central Alabama Community College would like to participate in your study of the job satisfaction level of our full time faculty members. You have my permission to survey our faculty and allow those who want to voluntarily participate to do so.

The point of contact for administering the survey will be Mr. Wesley Storey, Director of Informational Services, and he may be contacted at (256) 215-4277 or email wstorey@caccc.edu.

Thanks for the opportunity to participate and I hope all goes well with the study and your doctoral completion.

Sincerely,

Steve Franks, Ed.D
President
June 26, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton  
2301 Sutton Place Drive  
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

This is to verify that approval has been granted for faculty at Chattahoochee Valley Community College to participate in your research study assessing job satisfaction among faculty members at Alabama Community College System institutions.

Please accept my best wishes for the success of your study. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or if I can assist you further.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Labyak  
Dean of Instruction
Office of the President                      June 3, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

This is to confirm that the faculty of Enterprise-Ozark Community College will participate in your dissertation research. As requested, the following contact information is provided:

**IT Director**
Dr. Sue Baum
sbaum@eooc.edu
334-347-2623 ext. 2231

**Person Responsible for Dissemination of Survey**
Dr. Judy Miller
Dean of Instruction
jmiller@eooc.edu
334-347-2623 ext. 2241

If you should need any further information, please feel free to contact me at 334-347-1157 or nchandler@eooc.edu.

Sincerely,

Nancy W. Chandler
President

NWC/md

cc: Dr. Baum
Dr. Miller
June 1, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

I will be delighted to permit faculty members to participate in your study on job satisfaction among two-year college employees in Alabama. The information you seek could be very helpful in maintaining faculty morale and thereby increasing student learning.

Dr. Jim Jolly, Dean of Instructional Services, will assist you with dissemination of information to our faculty via email. He may be reached at jjolly@gadsdenstate.edu or at 256.549.8256. Good luck on your dissertation project.

Sincerely,

W. Darryl Harrison, Ed.D.
President

Dr. W. Darryl Harrison, President  Phone: 256.549.8221  Fax: 256.549.8288  dharrison@gadsdenstate.edu
April 13, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, Alabama 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

Thank you for inviting the faculty at Jefferson Davis Community College to participate in your research on the job satisfaction levels of full-time community college faculty members within the state of Alabama. We would like to participate. Mr. Anthony Hardy, Director of Technology and Information Services, will assist you in disseminating information to our faculty. He can be reached at anthony.hardy@jdcc.edu or 251-809-1531.

Sincerely,

Susan A. McBride
President
June 10, 2009

Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL. 35504

Dear Mr. Howton,

I am writing to express approval for you to survey full-time faculty at Jefferson State Community College as a part of your research toward completion of your dissertation. Tam George, Jefferson State’s Institutional Research Analyst, will be happy to work with you on processes to request participation of our faculty. She may be reached by telephone at (205) 856-7850, or by email at tgeorge@jeffstateonline.com.

I would be interested in reviewing your research findings at the conclusion of your study. Good luck!

Sincerely,

Anita Norton
Dean of Instruction/Chief Instructional Officer
April 22, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

Your research study to determine the job satisfaction levels of full-time community college faculty members in the state of Alabama should produce valuable information for determining satisfaction levels of faculty members and perhaps improving institutional effectiveness.

Lurleen B. Wallace Community College is willing to participate in your research study and Mr. Greg Aplin, our Acting Associate Dean for Administrative and Academic Services, will be the contact person for this project. You may reach Mr. Aplin at 334 881-2227 or jagaplin@lbwcc.edu. We understand that participation will be entirely voluntary and that no direct, identifiable information will be requested.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Herbert H. J. Riedel, Ph.D.
President

HR/en

cc: Greg Aplin
April 14, 2009

Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, Alabama 35504

Dear Mr. Howton,

This letter is to serve as my permission for the faculty of Northwest-Shoals Community College to be given the opportunity to participate in your research study. I understand that their participation in the study is voluntary and confidential. You may email the link to your survey to our faculty at this address: faculty@nwsec.edu. This address also goes to our adjunct faculty members, so you need to specify in your email that only full-time faculty are to respond. If you need further assistance from someone at the College, you may contact Dr.  Glenda Colagross at 256-331-5275 or colg@nwsec.edu.

Good luck with completing your research and receiving your Doctor of Philosophy degree.

Sincerely yours,

Humphrey Lee
President

"Where Excellence Counts"
June 3, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

Please be advised that Trenholm State Technical College will participate in your doctoral study on the job satisfaction levels of full-time community college faculty members within the State of Alabama. We consider this research proposal to be of value to our college.

Please contact Dr. Mimi Evelyn Johnson, Director of Institutional Research and Advancement to arrange the logistics of administering this survey. Dr. Johnson may be reached at 334-420-4243 or mjohnson@trenholmstate.edu.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sam Munnerlyn,
President

SM/awc

cc: M. Johnson
April 29, 2009

Mr. Russell Howton
2301 Sutton Place Drive
Jasper, AL 35504

Dear Mr. Howton:

Your request for faculty at Wallace State Community College – Hanceville to participate in your doctoral research is approved. I commend your endeavors to strengthening our colleges, and in turn, enhancing student learning.

Good luck as you begin this phase of your dissertation. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

Vicki P. Hawsey
Vicki P. Hawsey
President
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APPENDIX B

HOWTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY
Consent Form for Faculty Participants

Title of Study: Assessing Job Satisfaction Among Alabama Community College System Faculty: Validation of the Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

Name of Researcher & University Affiliation: Russell Howton, Ph.D. Candidate in Community College Leadership and Dr. Ed Davis, Faculty Advisor, at Mississippi State University

Purpose of the Research: The purpose of the research is to assess the level of job satisfaction among faculty members employed in the Alabama Community College System. The researcher in this study will evaluate certain demographic / institutional variables and how these variables relate to job satisfaction.

Description of Procedures: You may choose to discontinue participation in this study by simply closing the window. Please understand that your participation is voluntary, your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled, and you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

If you choose to participate in this study by checking the "consent to participate" button below, you will be asked to respond honestly to pre-determined questions on demographic and institutional variables. The survey should take you 20 minutes to complete. This study will not identify you by name or the institution at which you work.

Risks Involved in the Study: There are no known risks to you through participation in this study.

Benefits Involved in this Study: At the conclusion of this study, the researcher will be glad to send you a copy of the report. It is the intention of the researcher that the study be conducted to create an environment that will encourage enthusiasm and increased morale among faculty members, thus, improving the institution's overall effectiveness and providing a more stable learning environment for its students.

If you should have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact Russell Howton at 205-295-0628 or rh32@msstate.edu or contact Dr. Ed Davis, faculty advisor, at 662-325-9258 or jed11@colled.msstate.edu. For additional information regarding your rights as a research subject, please feel free to contact the MSU Regulatory Compliance Office at 662-325-5220.

Please print a copy of this form for your records.

1. ( ) I am indicating my consent to participate in this study knowing the procedures, risks, and benefits associated with this study.
2. Your current age to the nearest birthday:
   ( ) 20-29
   ( ) 30-39
   ( ) 40-49
   ( ) 50-59
   ( ) 60 or older

3. Your gender:
   ( ) Male
   ( ) Female

4. Your ethnicity:
   ( ) Caucasian / White
   ( ) African American / Black
   ( ) American Indian / Alaska Native
   ( ) Asian American / Asian
   ( ) Mexican American / Chicano
   ( ) Other

5. Your current salary on a 9-month contract:
   ( ) $39,999 or less
   ( ) $40,000 - $49,999
   ( ) $50,000 - $59,999
   ( ) $60,000 - $69,000
   ( ) $70,000 or higher

6. Your highest degree earned:
   ( ) Associate’s Degree (A.A. / A.S. / A.A.S. / etc.)
   ( ) Bachelor’s (B.A. / B.S. / B.S.Ed / etc.)
   ( ) Master’s (M.A. / M.S. / etc.)
   ( ) Education Specialist (Ed.S.)
   ( ) Education Doctorate (Ed.D.)
   ( ) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
   ( ) Other

7. Are you currently serving in an administrative position where you receive release time in addition to your teaching responsibilities? (i.e., division chair, etc)
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

8. Number of years as a community college instructor:
   ( ) 0-5 years
   ( ) 6-10 years
   ( ) 11-15 years
   ( ) 16-20 years
   ( ) 21 or more years
9. Your primary teaching field:
   ( ) Academic Transfer
   ( ) Allied Health
   ( ) Technical

10. I currently teach an online, web-based course.
    ( ) Yes
    ( ) No

11. Are you considered a tenured employee?
    ( ) Yes
    ( ) No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY QUESTION</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/ No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ABILITY OF STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Most students enrolled in my class(es) possess the basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, computer literacy, and oral communication needed for college level work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is the community colleges responsibility to educate underprepared students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My college has policies in place to ensure that students who lack certain academic skills receive proper remediation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. An obstacle to success for today's college student is a lack of educational preparedness rather than a lack of motivation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Strong academic students bypass the community college for the 4-year college or university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. OVERALL: I am satisfied with the academic ability of my students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY QUESTION</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADAVANCEMENT IN TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My college encourages the use of technology in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My college provides an ample supply of up-to-date technology that can be used in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My college provides me with proper training on the use of new technology for the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My college provides adequate technical support for the purpose of integrating technology into my classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I continually seek opportunities to integrate technology into my daily classroom activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Overall: I am satisfied with the technological resources and support provided at my college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY WORKLOAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My job allows me to balance my professional and personal life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I can perform my duties efficiently during my scheduled working hours and rarely have to take work home with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Non-teaching responsibilities adversely affect my ability to adequately address students needs in my course(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel pressured to participate in or coordinate college sponsored activities in order to retain my position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The college provides me with adequate office facilities and supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The college provides me with adequate classroom resources to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. During the past year, I have felt physical / emotional stress or a lack of motivation as a result of the high levels of frustration and stress that my job brings (i.e., &quot;burnout&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY QUESTION</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral/No Opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Overall: I am satisfied with my workload.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tenure laws allow faculty members to obtain a sense of job security and, in turn, can enhance instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Tenure laws allow some faculty members to become complacent and unproductive once tenure is obtained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The State Board of Education should raise the number of years before tenure is granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Annual performance evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Student evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Overall: I am satisfied with tenure laws set by the Alabama State Board of Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO-WORKER RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. There is a mutual respect among colleagues at my institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I gain valuable knowledge of classroom practices, etc. from my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My colleagues are cognizant of my awards, publications, and accomplishments, and I receive encouragement from fellow peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My colleagues are friendly and make me feel welcomed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Overall: I am satisfied with my professional relationship with colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. College administrators and faculty members are typically at odds with each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. College administrators consider faculty expertise when developing instructional policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY QUESTION</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral/No Opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. College administrators have open communication with faculty members regarding instructional policies and decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. College administrators involve faculty members in campus decisions not related to academics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. College administrators encourage faculty members to apply for administrative positions (i.e., division chair, academic dean, etc.) when positions become available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Policies that are developed by college administrators meet the needs of faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. College administrators recognize faculty members who receive professional awards or publish scholarly research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Overall: I am satisfied with the administrative support that faculty members receive at my college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The college provides a variety of professional development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The college provides useful in-house professional development opportunities on a continual / routine basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The college provides me opportunities to attend off-campus professional development workshops on a continual / routine basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. The college provides adequate financial support for professional development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. The college encourages professional growth opportunities through formal education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Overall: I am satisfied with the professional growth opportunities at my college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 57. During the past year, I have considered leaving academe for a position outside of education? | ( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| 58. During the past year, I have considered leaving this institution for another institution of higher education. | ( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| 59. If I were to begin my career over, I would still consider becoming a community college faculty member? | ( ) Yes  
( ) No |
| 60. Overall, I am satisfied with my job as a community college faculty member. | ( ) Strongly Agree  
( ) Agree  
( ) Neutral / No Opinion  
( ) Disagree  
( ) Strongly Disagree |
| 61. In your opinion, what one thing decreases morale among faculty members? | " " |

---

Thank You!

---

Thank you for participating in this study. Should you wish to obtain a report of the findings of this study, please email me at rh32@msstate.edu.
APPENDIX C

FACULTY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 61: “IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE THING WILL DECREASE FACULTY MORALE?”
FACULTY RESPONSES TO QUESTION 61: “IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ONE THING WILL DECREASE FACULTY MORALE?”

1. Administration that doesn't listen to faculty.
2. Gossip
3. Unfairness in workload, not enough release time between semesters.
4. A disconnection between administration and faculty
5. Lack of being treated like a professional.
6. Poor or inadequate participation by students in classroom activities.
7. Politics, particularly at the State level.
8. An autocratic, self-serving, egocentric administration
9. Workloads expected of nursing faculty.
10. Lack of support for instructional areas and faculty.
11. When RIF (reduction in force) or proration becomes an issue, it is faculty and not administration that are mentioned as solutions.
12. Lack of faculty input in academic decisions.
13. No comment.
14. Lack of respect and consideration from administrators.
15. Lower-than-hoped for student achievement.
16. Being forced to comply with increasingly difficult, out-of-touch, and meaningless SACS requirements such as QEP and measurable outcomes.
17. Student lack of motivation and desire to learn.
18. Old, outdated facilities to work/teach in and outdated equipment.
19. High administration turnover.
20. Students that want to be given an education instead of earning one.
21. Lack of communication with administration.
22. Not promoting faculty members to administrative positions when they are qualified.

23. In my opinion, the main thing which decreases faculty morale at my college is the lack of support from the administration in regard to issues of academic integrity. My administration (especially my Dean of Instruction) consistently backs students rather than faculty members when issues of academic integrity and academic honesty come into question - this is demoralizing to the faculty members involved in such disputes and to the faculty at large.

24. Overloads

25. Money and the lack thereof.

26. Lack of organization by all parties (I don't have that problem, but that is what I say)

27. Lack of professional contact with other advanced members of their given field.

28. Lack of appropriate communication.

29. Top heavy administration & their disassociation with students.

30. Lack of field related professional development.

31. Classes that are too large.

32. Lack of explanation or direct communication about policies made by administrators.

33. Unequal work loads and salaries.

34. Don't know.

35. I basically believe morale is a personal decision. You can be happy, or you can be miserable, just about anytime, anywhere.

36. Administrative control and dictation over institutionalized syllabus and final exams and teaching styles.

37. The perception that faculty members are not supported by administrators 100%.

38. Feeling that they are at odds with the administration.

39. Student evaluations.
40. Lack of respect among faculty members of four-year institutions.

41. Proration.

42. Fairness between employees.

43. The continual need of administration to make cuts in the classroom, faculty positions, and scholarships to boost administrative positions and salaries.

44. Lack of communication from administration.

45. Biased summer employment policies and lack of internal advertisement for vacant positions.

46. Good ethical faculty members seeing other faculty members who do not pull their own weight continue to do so with no consequences.

47. Faculty gossip.

48. Using the "good ol' boy" system in hiring friends, acquaintances, and attempting to make the hiring system appear legal.

49. Tuition reimbursement for faculty to advance education.

50. Administrators push a lot of paper, but don't interact with faculty and students enough.

51. Lazy, wasteful, disinterested, rude, non-academic, "I'm here only for the grade" students.

52. Keeping instructors/deans on staff that are subpar.

53. Negativity related to a disagreement between those who have been employed for quite a while saying "that's the way we've always done it" and those newer employees who want to change things, usually for the better.

54. Focusing on the negative.

55. Disorganization.

56. Dishonesty or misleading feedback from administration. Trust is missing where SOME but not ALL administrators are concerned. I have been a victim of reverse discrimination concerning a promotion to administrative position. But I do believe things work out ok in the end!

57. The Administration.
58. Lack of statewide attendance policy.

59. Low pay.

60. Poor student body.

61. Not all administrative positions getting involved with the students.

62. Faculty are required to participate in too many activities outside of the classroom.

63. Too much paper work to teach Technical.

64. Lack of communication.

65. Assignments that administrators view as helping to improve teaching that actually interfere with time to do necessary things (portfolios of "enrichment activities", etc.)

66. I believe morale of faculty is devastated when the academic Dean makes sweeping academic decisions without the input of faculty.

67. Student lack of ability / no basic math, reading, or science skills

68. A lack of communication decreases morale.

69. People are placed in to positions by who they know - not whether they are qualified or the best person for the job.

70. Lack of administrative support. (We do not have this here.)

71. Support.

72. Poor salary. We are paid well here, however.

73. Not being allowed ANY input into my teaching schedule.

74. Lack of communication between administration and faculty (this has occurred in the past, communication is much better now).

75. Administrators have little idea what is happening in the classroom. They have not been in the classroom or have been absent for a long time. Money is the tail wagging the dog. Rarely do administrators base decisions upon what is best for the classroom.

76. Poor student performance!! I'd love to see more success from my students.
77. Administrative paperwork and excessive documentation.

78. Believing that you as a faculty member are not being considered for professional growth opportunities such as deanships and directorships within your institution because certain faculty members are favored for these promotions and position appointments.

79. The seeming disconnect between faculty members' opinions and administrative decisions.

80. Incompetent and secretive administrative totalitarianism.

81. Administration.

82. Leadership.

83. Lousy scheduling.

84. Not being a part of the decision making-especially if they are academic instruction.

85. The existence of jobs that are political favors and/or "made-up".

86. Not enough input into a faculty members schedule.

87. Administrators not realizing and appreciating what all faculty do, piling more and more things on us, and putting more praise and emphasis on trivial things rather than our most important priority - the students.

88. Lack of communication from admin to faculty about various issues; atmosphere of secrecy or "on an only need to know" philosophy.

89. Different instructional expectations.

90. Indifference to faculty members opinions and needs.

91. The lack of support and cohesiveness among faculty.

92. Political interference.

93. Things that the Chancellor and State Board have done to mandate rules and regulations and the fact that the administration at my college does not listen or involve faculty and staff in decisions.

94. Lack of input in the wider decisions and operations of the college.
95. An administrator who exhibits a "divide and conquer" attitude

96. Summer employment policies.

97. No input into any decisions that affect instruction.
APPENDIX D

HOWTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

BASED ON THE 4-FACTOR STRUCTURE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral/No Opinion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strong academic students bypass the community college for the 4-year college or university.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My job allows me to balance my professional and personal life.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-teaching responsibilities adversely affect my ability to adequately address students needs in my course(s).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During the past year, I have felt physical / emotional stress or a lack of motivation as a result of the high levels of frustration and stress that my job brings (i.e., “burnout”).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College administrators and faculty members are typically at odds with each other.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College administrators consider faculty expertise when developing instructional policies.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College administrators encourage faculty members to apply for administrative positions (i.e., division chair, academic dean, etc.) when positions become available.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies that are developed by college administrators meet the needs of faculty members.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OBTAINING TENURE &amp; THE EVALUATION PROCESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An obstacle to success for today's college student is a lack of educational preparedness rather than a lack of motivation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure laws allow some faculty members to become complacent and unproductive once tenure is obtained.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The State Board of Education should raise the number of years before tenure is granted.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Obtaining Tenure & The Evaluation Process (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual performance evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations should be considered before granting tenure to a faculty member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology in the Classroom & Training Through Professional Development Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college encourages the use of technology in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college provides an ample supply of up-to-date technology that can be used in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college provides me with proper training on the use of new technology for the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college provides adequate technical support for the purpose of integrating technology into my classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I continually seek opportunities to integrate technology into my daily classroom activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college provides me with adequate classroom resources to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college provides a variety of professional development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college provides useful in-house professional development opportunities on a continual / routine basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relationship Among Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a mutual respect among colleagues at my institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain valuable knowledge of classroom practices, etc. from my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howton Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey Using 4-Factor Structure</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Among Colleagues</strong> (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues are cognizant of my awards, publications, and accomplishments, and I receive encouragement from fellow peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues are friendly and make me feel welcomed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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