

1976

Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Women in Higher Education in the State Universities of Louisiana.

Sallye Starks Benoit

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation

Benoit, Sallye Starks, "Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Women in Higher Education in the State Universities of Louisiana." (1976). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 3004.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/3004

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA

St. John's Road, Tyler's Green

High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-10,356

BENOIT, Sallye Starks, 1933-
JOB SATISFACTION AMONG FACULTY WOMEN
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE
UNIVERSITIES OF LOUISIANA.

The Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College,
Ph.D., 1976
Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1977

SALLYE STARKS BENOIT

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG FACULTY WOMEN
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE
UNIVERSITIES OF LOUISIANA

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Education

by

Sallye Starks Benoit
B.A., Southeastern Louisiana University, 1955
M.A., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1958

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to each person who had a part in making this study possible. Sincere thanks are extended to her major professor, Dr. William M. Smith, for his guidance and encouragement. Personal gratitude is given to Dr. James W. Firnberg for his expert assistance. Special acknowledgment is made to Dr. Helen M. Cookston, Dr. Frank D. Ferguson, Dr. Richard Musemeche and Dr. Charlie W. Roberts, Jr. for serving as members of her committee. Indebtedness is expressed to Dr. Barton R. Farthing, Professor of Experimental Statistics, for his help and encouragement.

Special remembrance to LaJuana and Richard Lee for their interest and direction, to Pat and Bill Houser for their support and to Elizabeth P. Davis for her editing talents.

The researcher wishes to express her deep love to her parents, Clarence C. and Effie K. Starks--to her father, who is deceased, for his high regard for education and to her mother for a lifetime of guidance and love.

With love and affection, the writer wishes to say merci to Patrick whose love, interest, encouragement and understanding were very much appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
Questions to be Answered	3
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.	4
DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS.	5
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY.	6
2. A SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	7
REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON FACULTY WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION.	7
Historical Perspective	7
Career Developments.	9
Status of Women.	11
The Future	14
REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON JOB SATISFACTION	15
Pioneer Research	15
Current Research	16
Theories of Job Satisfaction	20
Research on Teachers and Job Satisfaction	21

Chapter	Page
REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON LIFE HISTORY ITEMS. . .	26
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH	29
3. METHODS OF THE STUDY.	31
POPULATION OF THE STUDY	31
PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY.	31
THE INSTRUMENTS OF THE STUDY.	32
The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. .	32
The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education	34
ACQUISITION OF DATA	35
ANALYSIS OF DATA.	37
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	41
ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE STUDY	41
General Satisfaction Scores for Selected Variables.	45
Discrete Variables.	56
Continuous Variables.	60
Profile of the Faculty Woman in Higher Education.	61
Career Patterns	62
SUMMARY	65
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	68
SUMMARY	68
Procedures of the Study	68
Findings of the Study	69
CONCLUSIONS	71
RECOMMENDATIONS	74

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	75
APPENDIX	84
MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE	85
THE SELECTED LIFE HISTORY ITEMS OF WOMEN FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION.	90
LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE	93
LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT OF LOUISIANA STATE CHAPTER OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN	94
COVER LETTER TO WOMEN INVOLVED IN STUDY.	95
POST CARDS USED IN STUDY	96
VITA	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution and Sample of Women in Higher Education in Louisiana, 1975-76.	36
2. Responses to Questionnaire from Faculty Women in Higher Education	35
3. Rank Order of the Sub-Scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.	43
4. Job Satisfaction of Faculty Women in Higher Education.	44
5. Comparisons of the General Satisfaction Score of this Study's Faculty Women with Other Workers.	45
6. General Satisfaction of Women According to Age.	46
7. General Satisfaction of Women According to Marital Status	46
8. General Satisfaction of Women According to Family Size.	47
9. General Satisfaction of Women According to Ethnic Identification.	48
10. General Satisfaction of Women According to Degree	48
11. General Satisfaction of Women According to Rank	49
12. General Satisfaction of Women According to Length of Service in Higher Education	50
13. General Satisfaction of Women According to Field of Specialty	50
14. General Satisfaction of Women According to Salary (9-Month Contract).	51
15. Analysis of Variance for General Satis- faction Score and Subject Matter Specialty. .	52

16.	Analysis of Variance Statistics for the Independent Variables from The Selected Life History Questionnaire.	54
17.	Analysis of Variance for the Five Variables Which Rejected the Null Hypothesis	53
18.	Distribution of Women by Ethnic Identification	56
19.	Marital Status and Family Size of Faculty Women.	57
20.	Number of Siblings of the Faculty Woman.	57
21.	Parents' Education of the Faculty Women.	58
22.	Community in Which the Woman was Reared and Section of the Country from Which She Received Her Highest Degree.	59
23.	Rank and Degree of the Faculty Women	59
24.	Job Assignment of the Faculty Women.	60
25.	Field of Specialty of the Faculty Women.	60
26.	Analysis of Continuous Variables..	61
27.	Administrators (Past and Present).	62
28.	Administrative Positions (Past and Present).	63
29.	Administrators (Present)	63
30.	Administrators Positions (Present)	64
31.	Future Administrators.	64
32.	Publications of the Faculty Women.	65

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to analyze and to quantify environmental work elements which affect job satisfaction of faculty women in state universities of Louisiana. Additional purposes were to determine degree of job satisfaction among faculty women in higher education, to learn whether job satisfaction of these women was affected by independent variables, to profile respondents and to investigate their career patterns.

A stratified random sample of three hundred was selected from the total population of the 1975-76 faculty women employed in the state universities. Two hundred and twenty of the three hundred questionnaires mailed were returned. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and The Selected Life History Items of Women in Higher Education (self-designed) were used to collect data.

The twenty sub-scales of the MSQ were analyzed by mean and standard deviation to determine what aspects of their jobs gave faculty women most satisfaction. Factors contributing most to feelings of satisfaction were moral values, social service and activity. Aspects supplying least job satisfaction were university policies and practices, advancement and compensation.

The mean of the respondents' scores on the general satisfaction portion of the MSQ was examined to determine

degree of satisfaction of faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana. The mean score for these women was 73.14, indicating to some degree dissatisfaction. Compared with the mean score of general satisfaction for five other groups--teachers, principals, distributive education coordinators, secretaries and nurses--who have responded to the same questionnaire, faculty women were less satisfied than any other group.

Using the statistical procedure, analysis of variance, the null hypothesis was rejected for five variables from the self-designed questionnaire. The variables, showing an effect on job satisfaction, were administrators (present), administrators (past and present), experience other than college teaching, published books and years at present rank.

The same questionnaire provided information to profile a respondent. Biographical background showed her to be 42.36 years of age, white and married with 1.85 children. Reared in a city with a population of 10,000 to 100,000, her family size was 1.81 brothers and/or 1.87 sisters. Parents' educational background was high school level. The masters degree, the highest obtained, was received in the South; and she had taught first in public and/or private schools. She has taught 9.66 years in her present institution and 10.91 years in higher education. She held the rank of assistant professor on a 9-month contract (\$13,251) or 12-month contract (\$16,484).

Career patterns indicated that thirty-seven had, at one time (past and present), been administrators. In 1975-76 twelve percent of the 220 respondents were administrators. Fifty-six percent of the teachers would consider becoming administrators. Articles have been written by forty-five percent, and sixteen percent have published at least one book.

Several conclusions were derived from the data of this study:

1. Internal factors were the aspects of the job giving the faculty women most satisfaction. External factors were the aspects contributing least to satisfaction. Improvement of external factors may reduce job dissatisfaction, but such improvement will not necessarily produce job satisfaction. Job satisfaction seems to rest in the nature of the job.

2. Women are becoming increasingly involved in society, and this involvement may account for their dissatisfaction.

3. Administrators were more satisfied than non-administrators. Perhaps the administrator feels that she is more the "mistress of her own fate," and finds that "power" is satisfying.

4. The women in the state universities of Louisiana are involved in research and publication, and they are performing on all levels as professionals.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The national recognition and attention given to the subject of womanpower as a frequently wasted human resource has increased the university administrator's responsibility for job satisfaction among the women faculty. Rising expenditures are caused by avoidable turnovers, lack of maximum productivity and faculty replacement. Research has related all these factors to the cost of job dissatisfaction. Because of the current financial plight of higher education, the need for research on job satisfaction in higher education is of extreme importance.

Before any attempt can be made to improve the job attitude of women, the administrator must know if and to what degree job satisfaction or dissatisfaction prevails. In order to organize and execute specific plans to improve the attitudes of women faculty members, administrators need information relating to the job-satisfaction factors which are most influential and rate priority of attention.

Administrators should be cognizant of the relationship of life-history antecedents to the job satisfaction of women. Good (1972) suggested the use of life history data as a means of studying the natural history of the individual, the reactions to early social stimuli which lead to

development of attitudes and values, evolution of a philosophy of life, personal experiences, anecdotes, mental and social conflicts, crises, adjustments, accommodations and release of tensions.

In O'Toole's (1973) research, "Work in America," women were found to be triply disadvantaged:

- (1) by exclusion from the work force;
- (2) by discrimination in wages and status once they are admitted to it;
- (3) by society's refusal to define the duties and responsibilities of the housewife as work at all, which, in our society, means that women are simply taken less seriously than men.

In a paper presented to the annual meeting of the California Educational Research Association, Cohen (1973) stated that job satisfaction in higher education seemed an important area and that the problem of imprecise dependent variables should not discourage the researcher. He added that an institution of higher learning with an enthusiastic, personally-satisfied staff was more likely to enhance student development than one with an apathetic faculty group of "time-servers going through the motions."

The current surge of interest in equality for women and especially the focus on women and education has emphasized the need for research in job satisfaction of women in higher education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to analyze and quantify the environmental work elements which affected the job satisfaction of women faculty members in the state universities of Louisiana. This study was designed to determine what internal and external elements affected the job satisfaction of these faculty women.

Questions to be Answered

1. What aspects of her job give the woman in higher education feelings of satisfaction?
2. What is the degree of job satisfaction among women in higher education?
3. How do feelings involving job satisfaction differ among women in the various disciplines within the university?
4. How is the job satisfaction of women affected by the independent variables from a Selected Life History Items of Women in Higher Education questionnaire?
5. What is the composite profile of the woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana?
6. What are some of the career patterns of the women who are involved in this study?

Data developed for questions 1, 2 and 3 were based upon information furnished by the responses taken from the

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Information used to develop questions 4, 5 and 6 was taken from The Selected Life History Items of Women in Higher Education questionnaire.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

An investigation of the job satisfaction of faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana should:

(1) help to appraise the present satisfaction/dissatisfaction of women faculty in the state universities of Louisiana;

(2) help to determine how life history affects the satisfaction of women faculty in higher education;

(3) help to sketch a composite profile of the woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana;

(4) contribute to the literature on women and job satisfaction studies.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to faculty women who were employed in higher education during the spring of 1976 in the state universities of Louisiana. The total population of faculty women employed by these universities was taken from the faculty-staff-student directories. Using a table of random numbers, a stratified random sample of three hundred was selected from the total population of over thirteen hundred women.

The institutions from which the population of this study was taken were Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, located in Baton Rouge;

Louisiana State University at Alexandria; Louisiana State University at Eunice; Louisiana State University in Shreveport; University of New Orleans, New Orleans; Grambling State University, Grambling; Louisiana Tech University, Ruston; McNeese State University, Lake Charles; Nicholls State University, Thibodaux; Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe; Northwestern State University, Natchitoches; Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond; Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, located at Baton Rouge; Southern University, located in New Orleans; Southern University, located in Shreveport; University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Job Satisfaction. The faculty woman's appraisal of her work environment as it fulfilled her personal needs, aims and expectations.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. A copyrighted technique for surveying work satisfaction developed by a research team at the University of Minnesota. The job satisfaction of employees was measured on a 20-item Likert scale format.

Selected Life History Items of Women in Higher Education. A questionnaire designed to assess the life-history antecedents of women in higher education. This instrument was designed by the researcher.

Internal Factors. The factors within a person that helped to make the individual satisfied or dissatisfied with her work environment.

External Factors. The outside factors that surrounded the accomplishment of a given task that helped to make the individual satisfied or dissatisfied with her work environment.

Career Patterns. The shape, the steps, the design, the sum total of the woman's work life as she has proceeded from the first to the current stages of her career.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 is the introduction to the study. Included in this chapter are the statement of the problem, the importance of the study, the delimitations of the study and the definition of terms. The review of pertinent literature for this study will be described in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 will contain the methods of the study, the instruments of the study and the acquisition of data. The statistical analysis and interpretation of the results will be found in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 will present the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 2

A SELECTED REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An investigation of selected research relative to the study of job satisfaction among faculty women in higher education in Louisiana was reviewed under three broad categories:

1. Research on faculty women in higher education.
2. Research on job satisfaction.
3. Research on life history items.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON FACULTY WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Historical Perspective

The North American Colonials gave little attention to the education of women either in theory or in practice (Woody, 1929). The general feeling was that woman's place was in the home; and, therefore, little formal education was needed. For religious purposes girls were usually taught to read, and for economic reasons they were allowed to attend primary school with boys. The Ursuline Convent, established in 1727 in New Orleans, Louisiana, was an isolated attempt to provide a more advanced education for women.

Some of the forefathers of the new republic did recognize the need to educate women. In 1786, Benjamin Rush advocated:

. . . mode of proper education for WOMEN (sic) in a republic. I am sensible that they must concur in all our plans of education for young men, or no laws will ever render them effectual. . . . Besides, the first impressions upon the minds of children are generally derived from the women. (Rippa, 1969:125).

The idea of more education for women was expanded during the years from 1789 to 1850. Georgia Female College was organized in 1836 and awarded its first degrees four years later. The next decade brought the establishment of Mary Sharp College, 1850; Elmire College, 1855; and Vassar College, 1861 (Newcomber, 1959).

Oberlin, the first coeducational college, admitted women to its collegiate department in 1837. The first coeds at Oberlin were given a watered-down literary course. They were expected to serve the men students at tables and remain silent in mixed classes (Bird, 1970).

With the advent of universal elementary education the demand for teachers could not be met from the number of male applicants, and women teachers came to be regarded in a new light. The argument was advanced among the general public that perhaps nature had designated women the "natural" teachers of youth. Because of this argument many people came to prefer women teachers. Occasionally there were suggestions that the women should receive equal pay for equal work (Woody, 1929).

The future seemed to promise an increasing upward trend of advancement for women in the teaching profession. By 1870 one-third of the college-teaching positions was held

by women, but this figure dropped to less than one-fourth by 1973. Discussing the history of women's contributions to the education of the youth of the United States, Sandler (1973) stated that the proportion of women faculty on our college campuses had dropped continuously over the past one hundred years.

Career Developments

For many years the belief has been accepted that personal and family circumstances have theoretical and practical significance for women only. Research on women clearly establishes the fact that personality, marriage and family status are indeed influences in the career development of women. Many women have made the observation that family factors also affect the work careers of men; but until more research has been conducted on the work and family roles of men, these observations cannot be substantiated (Rossi, 1973).

Early socialization does influence the course of a woman's college experiences and career plans. Women are socialized to choose what have traditionally been feminine majors: home economics, nursing, social work, etc. (Schwartz, Lever, 1973). Folger, Astin, Bayer (1970) agreed with these findings. Women have been guided into sex-stereotyped careers.

"Work in America traditionally has been sex-stereotyped" (Patterson, 1973:314). Historically, men and women have not usually competed in the same labor market.

As a consequence, when an occupation was sex-stereotyped, the sex of the members of the minority became occupationally salient (Epstein, 1970).

In the article "Fail: bright women," Horner (1969: 36) stated that most women, either consciously or unconsciously, equate intellectual achievement with loss of femininity and, therefore, with unpopularity and loneliness. She continued, "A bright woman is caught in a double bind. In achievement-oriented situations she worries not only about failures but also about successes."

Heavy investments in human capital are necessary for full-time entry into university teaching and research (Kreps, 1974). Investments in the male's education are rarely questioned, but because of marriage and children the investments in the female's education are rarely unquestioned (Kreps, 1971).

Pertaining to college teaching as a career, Henderson (1967) stated that approximately 85 percent of both sexes believed following a career as a college teacher was easier for a man; and both men and women would caution women about the difficulties involved in college teaching.

One research study found that women doctorates constituted a small percentage of the total female college teaching population; however, the same study showed a slight increase in the doctorates earned by women during the last decade. Most of the women doctorates, as well as men doctorates, were employed by academic institutions (Astin, 1969).

Further research into the financial area of women and education revealed that little difference existed between the institutional financial support given to men and women graduate students (Roby, 1973). However many situations existed in which women were not considered for particularly lucrative fellowships. Folger, Astin, Bayer (1970:285) stated, "It appears that women doctoral students receive about as much financial aid as men doctoral students." Voss (1967:153) disagreed to some extent. She reported, "It seems to be difficult for women to receive fellowships for two reasons: (1) the amount of time a woman can give her studies, and (2) her sex."

The woman doctorate does stay in the labor force and use her education after she has received her degree. Astin's (1969) survey of women who received their Ph.D.'s in 1957 and 1958 found that 91 percent of the fifteen hundred women who responded to her questionnaires were employed.

Status of Women

Institutions of higher learning have been criticized during the last decade because of their treatment of women. From this criticism came numerous studies on the status of women. The studies covered many facets of faculty women's status; however, this researcher chose to review three areas: rank, promotion and salary.

Rank. In research conducted by Sandler (1973), Harris (1970), Chalmers (1972), women were clustered in the lower ranks, in

part-time positions and in a limited number of departments and programs. In a 1966 survey of academic men and women, the National Education Association (NEA) reported that women who were working in universities (excluding colleges) did not hold high academic ranks (professor or associate professor) as often as men did.

In contrast to the NEA study, an examination of the academic ranks of a sample, drawn from the National Register of Scientists, of men and women natural and social scientists revealed no significant sex differences with respect to academic ranks (Bayer and Astin, 1968). However Robinson (1973) concluded from her study of institutional status reports that about half of all male faculty were in the top two ranks, compared to no more than one-fourth of all female faculty.

Promotion. "The fact that women are plentiful in the lower ranks and scarce at the higher ranks constitutes indirect evidence of discrimination with respect to promotions" (Robinson, 1973:214). In a study of ten thousand women and men who received doctorates between the years 1935 and 1960, Harmon (1968) found that when the women and men who had always worked in academe were compared, the rate at which women achieved the status of full professor was slower than the rate for men. The average lag ranged from two to five years in the biosciences or as much as a decade in the social sciences.

A 1968 study of science doctorates found promotion-rate differences by field (Bayer and Astin). The very small

proportion of women in the natural sciences tended to receive promotions equal to their male colleagues. However among social scientists, a greater proportion of whom were women, men tended to be promoted more rapidly than their female counterparts.

Salary. A wide variety of studies showed that, on the whole, faculty women were paid less than their male counterparts in academia. A 1970 national sample of faculty (Bayer) indicated that 63 percent of all women but only 28 percent of all men earned less than \$10,000 during an academic year. In addition women showed less satisfaction with their salaries and were more likely than their male colleagues to express their dissatisfaction if they were employed at universities than at two-year or four-year colleges. Studies by the National Education Association (1966) and Brown (1965) also showed that women faculty were paid less in the aggregate than men. In addition Brown found that women tended to be concentrated in low-paying fields, rather than in the scientific disciplines where salaries were relatively higher.

Salary differences persisted even among women and men with equal educational attainment. Harmon (1968) found that among doctorates who had always worked in academe, the mean salary of single women was about \$500 per year less than that for men, while the differential for married women was about \$700 a year.

In their 1968 study Bayer and Astin concluded that across all work settings, fields and ranks women received

lower salaries than male colleagues with equivalent work experience; however, these differences were less in the social sciences than in the natural sciences.

The Future

John E. Smylie (1974:10), President of Queen's College in Charlotte, North Carolina, wrote in a pamphlet, "There's Something Special About A Woman," ". . . As a young woman you have the opportunity--indeed the mandate!--to help redefine the role of women in American society and to develop a new life-style for yourself, . . ." This pamphlet was written to stress the benefits of a women's college. However Buzenberg (1975) read this as a mandate to college women: a mandate which should be taken as a challenge by professors whose responsibility it was to prepare women for their new roles in society.

One of the growing needs in our changing society is to provide young women with role models. Such role models can stimulate women to establish goals for themselves and guide them in achieving these goals (Pfiffner, 1975). There is also a need for men to see professional women being equally treated. Without proper models, how can the future generation be expected to look any differently upon the "role of women" in society (Dolan, 1972)?

In regard to professional positions, Mitchell (1968) believed the growing body of literature on women had not yet become part of the cultural heritage; consequently, many of

those who advised and counselled with females were often not aware of the realities or alternatives which these females would face. Most women will work sometime in their lives whether they marry or not. Raushenbush (1961) commented that professional people who educate and counsel girls cannot disregard the fact that working in an outside job is likely to be a part of the life of a woman during her middle years. Women must be more cognizant of the fact that they will not have to make a choice between a career and domesticity. Educated women today, unlike those in the 1950's, can give priority to their professional life rather than to their family life (Kahne, 1976).

Sex differences which existed in academic career patterns were analyzed by Bernard (1964). During the past twelve years steps have been taken to rectify the inequities, but this process has been slow. Oltman (1974:83) stated,

Higher education has yet to see its responsibility for the reeducation of learned social roles which operate to distort the image of women and restrict women's contributions to higher education and to society.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON JOB SATISFACTION

Pioneer Research

Interest in worker attitudes and job satisfaction has increased during the past forty-six years. As early as 1930 Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) conducted a study at one of the Kimberly-Clark Corporation manufacturing plants. They stated that efficiency ratings of employees showed no relationship

to their attitudes. Kornhauser and Sharp also concluded that the foreladies' differences in supervisory techniques, used with workers engaged in the same type of job, might account for the differences in job attitudes.

At approximately the same time Kornhauser and Sharp were conducting their study, the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration and the Western Electric Company were conducting the Hawthorne studies. This experiment demonstrated rather clearly that the labor force controlled production to a marked degree, influenced worker morale and was a cohesive force in uniting employees to work together (Roethlisberger, 1946).

In spite of the early job satisfaction studies such as the two mentioned above and the Hoppock (1935) and Houser (1938) studies, job satisfaction studies were relatively rare until the reviews of Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Herzberg and others (1957). A series of reviews by Robinson and others, since 1957 and totaling more than two thousand by 1975, confirmed the increasing interest in this area of research.

Current Research

"Work in America," (O'Toole, 1973) said that job satisfaction, as a part of the total life adjustment, also influenced the individual's self-realization or actualization, mental health happiness and personality. One of the study's more publicized conclusions was that work was absolutely central to identity in America; who you were in other words,

depended on how you earned your living. Many Americans felt estranged and bound by their work. Unfortunately some American workers could not seem to adapt their work to their interests and/or needs. The report also stated that although work satisfaction was clearly related to job status, alienation is now very widespread; and evidence of increased dissatisfaction with jobs was found among such traditionally privileged groups as the nation's four and one-half million middle managers.

A group of Michigan social scientists (Chapman, 1974) found just the opposite in their research. They reported that the trend over the past two decades indicated an increase in satisfaction instead of a growing alienation.

However job satisfaction warrants study in all occupations because of its importance to all work in the basic area of turnover, absenteeism, productivity, efficiency, performance and loyalty (Olson, 1967).

Research by Ronan (1970) showed turnover, the first criterion mentioned by Olson, as most consistently, directly and positively relating with measures of job satisfaction. Several studies listed job dissatisfaction as the major reason for job turnover which is "avoidable" or related to the worker's attitude toward her occupation (Butler, 1961; Block, Yuker, Campbell, Melvin, 1964; Zander, Quinn, 1962).

Herzberg and others (1957) reviewed twenty-one studies and related job attitudes to job turnover. They

stated that workers having positive job attitudes had less avoidable severance than those having negative job attitudes.

Severance costs both the employer and the employee. Disney, in a 1954 study, reported the expense to the employer, organization or company as \$300 per administrative or professional worker released. This \$300 did not consider the cost of relocation to the employee. Disney predicted increased cost of severance or turnover with the growing demand for administrative and professional workers and the rising cost of living.

An editorial in Society (1976:10) raised this question about turnover:

The issue here is not which factor is the most important determinant of voluntary job changing. The issue here is, does quality of worklife have a role in this important economic phenomenon?

Absenteeism was also an increasing expense to the employer. In 1954 Menninger and Levinson reported that absenteeism caused a yearly loss to industry of more than nine billion dollars and that high absence rates correlated positively with low morale and worker dissatisfactions.

Mattial (1974:7) stated, "Job redesign will increase worker satisfaction and productivity by increasing morale and decreasing turnover and absenteeism."

Through an analysis of twenty-six studies, Herzberg and others (1957) concluded that the measure of productivity related closely to employee's attitude and morale and that satisfied employees with positive attitudes produced more than did dissatisfied employees with negative work attitudes.

Agreeing with the above outcome, a later study dealing with productivity, efficiency and performance concluded that the satisfied worker with the positive attitude not only produced more work in less time but also demonstrated greater efficiency and better performance than did the dissatisfied worker with the negative attitude (Herzberg, 1959).

Herzberg (1957) stated that the more efficient and productive worker is usually more loyal. A company might expect the degree of loyalty it received from its employees to vary with the degree of their job satisfaction. He also said that loyalty was more highly demonstrated by satisfied employees than disloyalty by dissatisfied employees.

Although job satisfactions and attitudes related most directly and constantly to job turnover and affected areas of loyalty, productivity, efficiency, performance and absenteeism, many writers considered job satisfaction of most importance and concern in the field of the individual's entire life adjustment or mental health.

Psychology Today (Horn, 1975) reported that job satisfaction seemed to be the key--more important than workload, pressure and other external factors--in keeping workers healthy.

A conclusion from the research "Work in America" (O'Toole, 1973) was that satisfaction with work seemed to be the best predictor of longevity--better than known medical or genetic factors--and various facets of work account for many of the factors associated with heart disease.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

The four sponsors of job satisfaction research-- government, industry, private foundations and individuals-- contribute vast amounts of information, and in this data is included every facet of the life of the worker including her feelings and attitudes. From this research has emerged the three most common job satisfaction theories.

First, in the Pittsburgh studies, under a grant from the Buhl Foundation, Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman concluded that the theory of job satisfaction related to one cluster of variables. In fact they found that people, describing their happiness in their jobs, most frequently related events that indicated their success in performance and the possibility of professional growth. However dissatisfied individuals described problems not associated with the job itself but with conditions that surround the doing of the job (Herzberg, 1959).

This two-factor theory hypothesized that job satisfaction was a job-content variable, and job dissatisfaction was a job-context variable. The job-content or satisfier set of variables contributed to the individual's need for self-actualization in her work. Conversely, the job context or hygiene set of variables described the unhealthy work environment as it was viewed by the worker. Removal of the hygiene variables problems with supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies, administrative practices and job security will not

increase job satisfaction. Taking away this variable, however, will prevent job dissatisfaction from occurring (Herzberg, 1959).

The second theory of job satisfaction, developed by the Cornell Studies under the direction of Hulin and funded by the Ford Foundation, differed from Herzberg's two-fold theory. Nevertheless Hulin also saw job satisfaction as two-fold in nature, defining it as a persistent affective state which arises in the worker as a function of the perceived characteristics of her present job, on the one hand, and her frame of reference and adaption level, on the other hand (Hulin, 1969).

A third theory of vocational satisfaction, The Theory of Work Adjustment, developed by the Minnesota Work Adjustment Project under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, consisted of a conceptual framework for research based on the needs of the individual. In fact an individual's work personality matched with the work environment of the job predicted work adjustment. In this theory the individual's work personality included her vocational needs and abilities, and the work environment included the reinforcer systems and the abilities needed for the job (Weiss, 1967).

Research on Teachers and Job Satisfaction

Studies including many occupational levels--skilled, non-skilled, white-collar workers, supervisory, management and professional personnel--attempt to analyze the worker and

the worker's environment (Robinson, 1963). A review of the literature on job satisfaction of these different groups of workers revealed that about 40 percent of the studies involved teachers, deans, guidance counselors and other educational groups (Robinson, 1966).

Hoppock (1935) concluded from his study of teachers that there were six major factors in job satisfaction: (a) manner of response of the individual to unpleasant situations, (b) adjustment of the individual to others, (c) status of the individual compared to status of others in his socio-economic group, (d) nature of the work in relation to the ability, interests, and training of the individual, (e) desire of the individual for economic and social security and (f) loyalty of the individual as a worker to group interests.

In a 1959 study (Eckert, Stecklein and Sagen) of college faculty members, the three most common reasons for job dissatisfaction were (a) low salaries, (b) heavy workloads and (c) general working conditions. The authors concluded that the most common source of satisfaction was the nature of the work itself. They also concluded that teachers in four-year colleges were generally more satisfied in their positions than teachers in junior colleges.

Cohen, in a 1973 study among junior college faculty members, concluded from those surveyed that their ability to gain satisfaction was related in some way to their students. He also said that interaction with students was the chief intrinsic motivation.

Rudd and Wiesman (1962) studied four hundred teachers in England and ranked their dissatisfaction as: (1) salaries, (2) poor human relations, (3) working conditions and (4) heavy teaching assignments (this included duties both inside and outside the classroom).

Kirkpatrick (1964), after reviewing the literature, selected the following factors as major elements in job satisfaction: (1) formal relations with administration, (2) quality of leadership, (3) job situation, (4) work situation attributes and (5) salary. These factors were used in a questionnaire which was responded to by two hundred and fifty public high school teachers.

Myers (1966) found more competent principals were needed in order to improve the job satisfaction of teachers, and Butler (1961) reported the direct relationship between the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of teachers. Satisfied teachers praised administrators; dissatisfied teachers expressed a lack of confidence in them.

Merrill (1969) studied one hundred and sixty-four elementary teachers and twenty-two principals and concluded that teachers and principals exhibited a marked similarity in wants related to job satisfaction. The common areas of high satisfaction included creativity, social service, moral values, achievement, activity and responsibility. The areas of common low satisfactions included company practices and policies, compensation, social status, advancement, authority and recognition. In this study both satisfiers

(questions related to job satisfaction) and dissatisfiers (questions related to dissatisfaction) were items on the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by the Minnesota Work Adjustment Project.

As McCoy (1973:27) pointed out in her study of selected secondary teachers in East Baton Rouge Parish:

Research reveals that job satisfaction among teachers involves many factors. It is not one factor alone which determines job satisfaction for any one teacher, rather it is the interaction of the sum total of all factors taken as a whole. The literature keeps repeating individual factors which do have a pronounced effect upon morale. Factors such as salary, security, administration, pupil discipline, class size, teacher involvement in planning, peer relationships, teaching load, teaching assignment, and community support are all involved in the total job satisfaction and teacher morale.

Investigators have found correlational studies effective in studying job satisfaction. The worker's life history of demographic variables, such as salary, age, educational level, intelligence or experience served as correlates in studying the degree of job satisfaction of the individual and her job environment (Ronan, 1970).

Lee (1972:24) stated that the literature revealed some inconsistencies in the relationship of demographic and personal history variables to job satisfaction. He continued,

Recent studies, however, indicate the complicated interaction of work satisfaction and these independent variables, although their relationship may be somewhat controversial.

Using age as a personal history variable to job satisfaction, Super (1939), Heron (1957) and Herzberg (1957)

found high correlations between age and job satisfaction. Super reported teachers from 20-24 usually satisfied; from 25-34, dissatisfied; from 35-44, satisfied; and from 45 on progressively more satisfied.

Vollmar and Kinney (1955) found that the younger the worker, regardless of education level, the more he expressed dissatisfaction. Hoppock (1935), similarly, concluded that job satisfaction seemed to increase with age and also that the largest satisfaction increases were achieved by persons who changed jobs. In the educational field, however, Jurgensen (1947) found job preference and satisfaction more affected by educational level than age.

Relative to educational level, Vollmar and Kinney (1955) found more dissatisfaction expressed in higher education groups, who probably expected more. Rempel and Bentley (1963), conversely, reported that teachers with no academic work beyond the bachelor's degree had significantly lower job satisfaction than teachers having advanced work.

In the fourteen studies reviewed by Herzberg (1957), six studies showed women more satisfied with their jobs than men, three studies showed men more satisfied, and five studies showed no sex differences in job satisfaction. In educational studies, however, women generally reported more job satisfaction than men; single women teachers, particularly, were more satisfied than married men teachers (Mason, 1961). Married male beginning teachers were the most likely to be dissatisfied (Butler, 1961). Elementary teachers were more satisfied

than secondary teachers; male elementary teachers were more satisfied than male secondary teachers (Butler, 1961).

Although Mason reported non-whites more satisfied than whites, Thompson (1960) found dissatisfaction among black college teachers. Gottlieb (1964) portrayed black elementary school teachers as more satisfied with their jobs and their pupils than white elementary school teachers. In contrast to some of the studies cited above, he found satisfaction for both black and white teachers decreased with age and experience.

Evidence points the way to a complex but undisputed relationship between personal characteristics and life history to job satisfaction.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON LIFE HISTORY ITEMS

The term life history, or biographical information, refers to a collection of multiple choice questions in which a person describes herself and her background. Life history information as a selection procedure has been used for a long time, but only in recent years has an extensive systematic research begun to accumulate.

The reason this approach is used is because past behavior can be utilized as an indicator of future behavior and performance (Ellison, 1973). Helmreich and others (1973: 148) confirmed this statement, "One of the most widely accepted truisms in psychology is that the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior."

Good (1972) suggested the use of life history data as a means of studying the natural history of the individual, his reactions to early social stimuli which led to development of attitudes and values, evolution of a philosophy of life, personal experiences, anecdotes, mental and social conflicts, crises, adjustments, accommodations and release of tensions.

Glennon, Albright and Owens (1966) list approximately seven hundred questions in their Catalog of Life History Items. The questions are divided into thirteen categories, and researchers use selected items for predictive purposes. Perhaps one of the first uses of life history items as a predictor was Goldsmith's study (1922), "The Use of a Personal History Blank as a Salesmanship Test."

Siegel (1956) cited industry's wide acceptance and positive evaluation of biographical information with its use of application blanks for employment purposes. However he also noted research's lack of quantitative and systematic evaluation of this biographical information until World War II.

During World War II the Navy National Research Council, because of the lack of success of some of its training programs, recognized the need to change the method of selection of Navy Flight trainees. The Council compiled and validated a more specific and systematic questionnaire using life history items as predictive measures of success of students entering flight training (Jenkins, 1944). Radloff and

Helmreich (1968), while doing a study of Aquanaut performance during the Navy's Project SEALAB, found that life history items were most successful in predicting performance.

A four-year study by Taylor, Ellison and Tucker (1964) was conducted to see if biographical data could indicate whether creativity and other relative scientific performance measures could be predicted with biographical data. This research, which involved over two thousand scientists and engineers, indicated that creativity and other scientific performance measures could be predicted with biographical data with cross validities ranging from .30 to .59.

Tucker, Cline and Schmitt (1967) identified characteristics which, when incorporated into scoring keys, predicted the performance of pharmaceutical scientists. Buel (1965), who also used pharmaceutical personnel, employed biographical data in a slightly different manner. He identified creative research personnel who were employed by a major research organization.

In a 1973 study Murray researched the utility of biographical information in predicting attrition from the United States Air Force Training programs and in measuring personality constructs assessed by a standardized personality test. Results indicated that more than one-half of the personality constructs measured by the personality test was also measured by the biographical inventory. The constructs as measured by the inventory were more highly intercorrelated than those of the personality test but were much more externally valid in

predicting attrition. Murray stated that his study expanded the conceptual understanding of biographical information in addition to providing further evidence of the validity of the approach in predicting a broad range of criteria.

Research conducted by Fudge (1970) found that biographical information aided in the accurate prediction of criteria of academic performance in college. He further stated that information, taken alone or incorporated with aptitude test scores, better estimated academic performance than did aptitude test data, either by itself or in combination with another commonly used predictive index, high school rank.

"The Use of a Biographical Inventory in the Selection of Educators for a Foreign Assignment" (Johnson, 1972) was designed to determine if future performance of these educators could be predicted by the use of a biographical questionnaire. Two of the four conclusions from this study were (1) the biographical questionnaire was a useful instrument in predicting future human performance, and (2) the effective screening and selection of personnel required much research and thought. Effective selection process was a set of several techniques. The use of the biographical questionnaire was only one of these processes.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

Women in higher education have not had the same opportunities as men in either the pursuit of a degree or in

the acquisition of a faculty position. A discussion of sex-based discrimination was not the purpose of this review, but these findings indicated the powerful effect of sexual discrimination on all women in higher education.

While progress has been made to enhance the position of women in higher education, serious problems remain in this area. Societal conditioning is difficult to counteract, and the road ahead for the professional woman in higher education will not be smooth.

Job satisfaction is important in every profession or occupation. As Herzberg stated, the satisfied worker with a positive attitude not only produced more work in less time but also demonstrated greater efficiency and better performance. The review of literature further revealed that job satisfaction and good health are closely linked. The review on teachers and job satisfaction indicated that an interaction of variables is responsible for job satisfaction and not just one variable.

Because past behavior is an excellent predictor of future behavior, life history information is used in research as a selection procedure. Research using biographical information has been successfully used to predict academic performance of college students, creative and scientific behavior of engineers and scientists, success of military trainees and success of educators placed in special situations.

Chapter 3

METHODS OF THE STUDY

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The total population of this study was the faculty women employed by the state universities of Louisiana during the academic year 1975-76. Using a table of random numbers, a stratified random sample of three hundred was selected from the total population of over thirteen hundred women. The sample from each institution was in the same proportion as the institution represented in the total population.

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

On February 14, 1976, the investigator mailed to each woman selected a packet containing a cover letter, two questionnaires, a return, self-addressed post card and a return, stamped, self-addressed envelope. The cover letter (see Appendix) explained the purpose and nature of the study, named the sponsoring agency and gave instructions for the completion and return of the questionnaires. The letter also informed the respondents that a copy of the findings, conclusions and recommendations would be sent to the administrators (president and deans) of each university. The Louisiana State Chapter of American Association of University Women gave the researcher permission to use the organization's name in the

cover letter (see Appendix). The women were requested to return the packets by February 29, 1976.

The questionnaires were not numbered; and, therefore, a numbered post card was included in the packet for follow-up purposes. The post card and the packet were to be mailed separately.

Follow-up post cards (see Appendix) were mailed March 15, 1976, to those women not responding initially. In the first week of April, telephone calls were made for follow-up purposes.

THE INSTRUMENTS OF THE STUDY

Two instruments were used in this study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire measured the criterion variables of satisfaction. The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education secured information on independent variables to be used in an investigation of items which could affect the job satisfaction of women faculty in higher education.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), developed by Weiss and others (1967) at the University of Minnesota, measured the job satisfaction of workers on a 20-item Likert scale format. These twenty scales, developed by factor analytic studies, quantified the worker's feelings about her job and also gave a total general satisfaction score. The manual listed and described the scales as follows:

1. ABILITY UTILIZATION. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
2. ACHIEVEMENT. The feeling of accomplishment I get from my job.
3. ACTIVITY. Being able to keep busy all the time.
4. ADVANCEMENT. The chance for advancement on this job.
5. AUTHORITY. The chance to tell other people what to do.
6. COMPANY POLICIES AND PRACTICES. The way policies are put into practice.
7. COMPENSATION. My pay and the amount of work I do.
8. CO-WORKERS. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
9. CREATIVITY. The chance to try my own methods of doing my job.
10. INDEPENDENCE. The chance to work alone on the job.
11. MORAL VALUES. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
12. RECOGNITION. The praise I get for doing a good job.
13. RESPONSIBILITY. The freedom to use my own judgment.
14. SECURITY. The way my job provides for steady employment.
15. SOCIAL SERVICE. The chance to do things for other people.
16. SOCIAL STATUS. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
17. SUPERVISION: HUMAN RELATIONS. The way my boss handles his men.
18. SUPERVISION: TECHNICAL. The competency of my supervisor in making decisions.
19. VARIETY. The chance to do different things from time to time.
20. WORKING CONDITIONS. The working conditions (Weiss, 1967:1-2).

Reliability studies of the MSQ scales were high. As estimated by Hoyt's analysis-of-variance method the median reliability coefficients ranged from .93 for Advancement and Recognition to .78 for Responsibility. Of the 567 reliability coefficients 83 percent were .80 or higher, and only 2.5 percent were lower than .70 (Weiss, 1967).

According to validity studies, both construct and concurrent, conducted on the MSQ this questionnaire performed according to expectations. The construct validity was derived indirectly by using the MSQ and the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire based on the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss, 1967).

Weiss and others compared groups of workers using one-way analysis of variance and Bartlett's test of homogeneity of variance to establish concurrent validity. Concurrent studies indicated that the MSQ could differentiate among occupational groups (Weiss, 1967).

Therefore the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was selected to measure the job satisfaction of faculty women in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana because of the questionnaire's reliability coefficients, estimated by Hoyt's method of analysis of variance, and the validity data, as evidenced by construct and concurrent studies.

The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education

The second instrument, The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education, constructed by the investigator to secure information for use as independent variables, consisted of questions in five areas of interest: biographical background, family background, educational background, vocational experiences and career patterns.

All questions, included in this instrument, were written by the researcher or selected for useability from A Catalog of Life History Items (Glennon, 1966). The questions followed the criteria developed by William A. Owens and others (1962:329-331) and used in their study of consistent and inconsistent life-history test items:

1. The question should be brief with the stem line approximately two lines or less in length.
2. Whenever possible, numbers should be used to graduate or define options or alternatives.
3. Either all options or alternatives should be covered or an "escape" option should be provided.
4. Items, particularly item stems, should carry a neutral or pleasant connotation for the respondent.

In summary life history items have been used to predict success, performance and career patterns of workers. The use of statistically developed techniques for writing or selecting questions to assess life history data indicated that the questionnaire, The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education, was an efficient instrument for an exploratory investigation of some of the variables which could affect the job satisfaction of faculty women in higher education.

ACQUISITION OF DATA

The 1975-76 faculty-student-staff directories from the institutions included in this study were used to obtain the names of the faculty women. Table 1 on page 36 shows

Table 1
 Distribution and Sample of Women in Higher
 Education in Louisiana, 1975-76

	Percent	Random Sample Population	Total Population
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge	18.02	54	249
Louisiana State University, Alexandria	2.31	7	32
Louisiana State University, Eunice	1.01	3	14
Louisiana State University, Shreveport	2.75	8	38
University of New Orleans	8.25	25	114
Grambling State University	6.73	20	93
Louisiana Tech University	6.01	18	83
McNeese State University	3.47	10	48
Nicholls State University	5.14	16	71
Northeast Louisiana University	6.73	20	93
Northwestern State University	6.87	21	95
Southeastern Louisiana University	5.21	16	72
Southern University, Baton Rouge	11.72	35	162
Southern University, New Orleans	4.20	13	58
Southern University, Shreveport-Bossier	1.81	5	25
University of Southwestern Louisiana	<u>9.77</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>135</u>
Total	100.00	300	1382

the percent, random sample population and total population of each institution.

The number and percent of useable responses from the sample population are shown in Table 2. Because the questionnaires were not coded, the researcher found it impossible to determine the number of respondents from each university.

Table 2
Responses to Questionnaires from
Faculty Women in Higher Education

Questionnaires Mailed	Number of Useable Returns	Percent of Returns
300	220	73.33

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education questionnaire were recorded on punched cards to facilitate analysis and to answer the following questions:

1. What aspects of her job give the woman in higher education feelings of satisfaction?
2. What is the degree of job satisfaction among women in higher education?

3. How do feelings involving job satisfaction differ among women in various schools within the university?
4. Is there a relationship between job satisfaction of women in higher education and selected independent variables of life history?
5. What is the composite profile of the woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana?
6. What are some of the career patterns of the women who are involved in this study?

A ranking of the population means of the different sub-scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire answered the first question: What aspects of her job give the woman in higher education feelings of satisfaction? Ranking these population means defined the aspect of the work environment which contributed to job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) and quantified the environment in relation to other aspects of the job situation.

A frequency distribution answered the second question: What is the degree of job satisfaction among faculty women in higher education? The general satisfaction score on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire provided the data for the frequency distribution which ranged from a low value of 20 for "very dissatisfied" workers through a value of 100 for "very satisfied" workers.

Comparing the population mean of the general satisfaction score from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire with the responses to variable ten from The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education answered the third question: How do feelings involving job satisfaction differ among women in various disciplines within the university? The different disciplines within the university were business, education, fine arts, home economics, humanities, library, medical services and science. Analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis.

Analysis of variance was the statistical procedure used to test the null hypothesis for the fourth question: No significant relationship exists between selected life history antecedents of women in higher education and her feelings of satisfaction with her job. For the analysis of variance, the dependent variable was the general satisfaction score from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; the independent variables were the items from The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education.

Further analysis of the discrete and continuous variables from The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education answered the fifth question: What is the composite profile of the woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana? The discrete variables of ethnic identification, marital status, family size, number of siblings, parents' education, community in which reared, section of country degree received, highest

degree earned, field of speciality, job assignment and professional rank were analyzed by number and percentage. The continuous variables of age, length of service at present institution, length of service in higher education, length of service at present rank and salary were analyzed by mean and standard deviation.

The information on career patterns of the women in this study was analyzed by number and percentage.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to analyze and quantify the environmental work elements which affect the job satisfaction of faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana. This study was designed to determine what internal and external elements affect the job satisfaction of these women.

Chapter 2 was a review of selected related literature. This review of literature was divided into three broad categories: (1) research on faculty women in higher education, (2) research on job satisfaction and (3) research on life history items.

In the third chapter the methods of the study were described. Included in this chapter were the definition of the study population, the discussion of the test instruments, the procedures for obtaining the data and the analysis of the statistics.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE STUDY

The population means of the twenty sub-scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were ranked to determine the aspects of the job which were most liked and least liked by faculty women in higher education. The results of

this analysis, Table 3, page 43, indicate that the factors of moral values, social service, activity, achievement and creativity were most related to the job satisfaction of the women studied.

The factor of university policies and practices contributed least to job satisfaction. Other factors, relating least to the feelings of job satisfaction of the women, were advancement, compensation, supervision--human relations and supervision--technical.

The 220 general job satisfaction scores, obtained by the responding women in higher education, were placed into a frequency distribution. This score was Variable 21 from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

In this frequency distribution, Table 4, page 44, the lowest score on Variable 21, general job satisfaction, for any respondent was 20; and the highest score listed was 100.

The mean of this distribution was 73.14. According to the theoretical design of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a score of 80.0 indicated the employee was satisfied with her job. A score of 73.14 showed that women in the state universities of Louisiana were, to some degree, dissatisfied.

Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire's general satisfaction scores of the respondents of this study, a comparison was made with the norms established by the Work Adjustment Project, University of Minnesota, for teachers, nurses and secretaries. The same score was also compared

Table 3

Rank Order of the Sub-Scales of the
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Variable	Mean	S.D.
1. Moral Values	21.46	3.90
2. Social Service	21.19	3.85
3. Activity	20.27	3.09
4. Achievement	19.83	4.25
5. Creativity	19.56	5.61
6. Independence	19.45	4.61
7. Responsibility	19.24	4.40
8. Ability Utilization	19.09	5.62
9. Variety	18.98	4.72
10. Social Status	18.71	3.97
11. Co-workers	18.64	4.40
12. Authority	18.10	4.10
13. Security	18.04	5.03
14. Working Conditions	17.10	5.80
15. Recognition	16.77	5.31
16. Supervision--Technical	16.63	5.58
17. Supervision--Human Relations	16.30	6.05
18. Compensation	14.72	6.11
19. Advancement	14.63	5.68
20. University Policies and Practices	14.06	5.60

Table 4
 Job Satisfaction of Faculty Women in Higher Education
 (N = 220)

Range of Values	Number of Observed Values
100-104	3
95-99	9
90-94	12
85-89	22
80-84	30
75-79	33
70-74	41
65-69	25
60-64	15
55-59	7
50-54	9
45-49	3
40-44	4
35-39	1
30-34	2
25-29	1
20-24	<u>3</u>
	220

Mean = 73.14

Standard Deviation = 14.80

with research from doctoral dissertations on distributive education coordinators and principals. Women in higher education were not as satisfied with their positions as workers in other occupations. Table 5 indicates the degree of satisfaction of workers in several professions and occupations.

Table 5
Comparisons of the General Satisfaction Score
of this Study's Faculty Women with Other Workers

Workers	Number of Workers Studied	General Satisfaction Score	Source
Teachers	191	82.14	Weiss, 1967
Principals	400	79.67	Lee, 1972
DE Coordinators	60	77.90	Olson, 1967
Secretaries	118	77.64	Weiss, 1967
Nurses	419	75.40	Weiss, 1967
Faculty Women	220	73.14	

General Satisfaction Scores for Selected Variables

With the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire as an indicator of satisfaction, several of the variables from The Selected Life History questionnaire were ranked to provide additional information.

Age. Age has always been one of the factors considered in the determination of satisfaction. As stated in the literature, studies differed on which age groups were more satisfied. In this study, the older the woman was, the more satisfied she was; the younger the woman was, the more dissatisfied.

Table 6
General Satisfaction of Women According to Age

Age Group	Number	General Satisfaction Score
65-69	2	82.50
60-64	8	81.38
55-59	29	75.14
50-54	22	74.09
45-49	31	69.65
40-44	33	73.79
35-39	32	73.56
30-34	35	74.03
25-29	26	68.88
20-24	2	67.50

Marital Status. Marital status has also been an influence on workers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In this study the most satisfied group of women were married, 74.34. Ranked second were the single group with a mean score of 72.33. Those least satisfied were in the widowed or separated group, 70.27 and 66.83 respectively.

Table 7
General Satisfaction of Women According to Marital Status

Marital Status	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Married	125	74.34
Single	52	72.33
Divorced	25	71.36
Widowed	11	70.27
Separated	6	66.83

Family size. Family size plays an important part in the life of a career person. According to the data of this study the women most satisfied were the ones with eight and six children. Following these were the women with from one to four children. Those least satisfied were single women and the married women without children, 70.86, and the women with five children, 69.80.

Table 8

General Satisfaction of Women According to Family Size

Family Size (Children)	Number	General Satisfaction Score
8	1	97.00
6	2	88.50
5	5	69.80
4	15	73.73
3	25	75.48
2	46	74.65
1	40	73.63
0	85	70.86

Ethnic identification. Because of the current interest in ethnic identification, this study presents the general satisfaction of the different ethnic groups. The most satisfied was the Hispanic, but only one person was in this group. The white women were more satisfied, 73.45, than the black women, 71.40.

Table 9
General Satisfaction of Women
According to Ethnic Identification

Ethnic Identification	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Hispanic	1	96.00
White	174	73.45
Black	45	71.40

Degree. The level of education, or in this study the professional degree obtained by the woman, was analyzed to determine which women were the most satisfied. The seven women involved in the study with bachelor degrees were the most satisfied. The women with doctorates ranked second, 74.67. Those with masters degrees had a mean score of 72.17; and the masters plus thirty were the most dissatisfied, 69.68.

Table 10
General Satisfaction of Women According to Degree

Degree	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Doctorate	73	74.67
Masters plus thirty	19	69.68
Masters	121	72.17
Bachelor	7	83.29

Rank. This research indicated that the women with the highest academic rank were the most satisfied, 78.41. Assistant professors were second with a mean score of 72.68.

Associate professors were least satisfied averaging 71.38 on the general satisfaction score. The instructors ranked third, 72.51.

Table 11
General Satisfaction of Women According to Rank

Rank	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Professor	27	78.41
Associate Professor	52	71.38
Assistant Professor	91	72.68
Instructor	49	72.51

Length of Service. The length of service in higher education has some significance in the satisfaction of the women faculty members. However the data in this research did not seem to follow a pattern. The one respondent in this study who was most satisfied had served between 36 and 40 years. The least satisfied were the six women who had taught between 31 and 35 years. The respondents who ranked second had served 26 to 30 years, and the next satisfied were those who had been employed either 1 or 2 years.

Table 12

General Satisfaction of Women According
to Length of Service in Higher Education

Length of Service	Number	General Satisfaction Score
36-40	1	85.00
31-35	6	63.50
26-30	7	77.29
21-25	16	72.13
16-20	19	72.79
11-15	35	72.91
6-10	73	71.36
3-5	41	74.98
1-2	21	77.00

Field of specialty. The women who taught in medical service were the most satisfied with a general satisfaction score of 79.82. Those teaching in home economics ranked second with 77.57. The respondents least satisfied were those teaching in fine arts, 68.50, and those in business, 70.69.

Table 13

General Satisfaction of Women
According to Field of Specialty

Field of Specialty	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Medical Service	11	79.82
Home Economics	21	77.57
Library	26	74.50
Education	39	73.85
Science	28	72.50
Humanities	53	71.74
Business	26	70.69
Fine Arts	16	68.50

Salary (9-month contract). The sub-scale scores of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire indicated which aspect of her job gave the woman in higher education the most satisfaction. Compensation was one of the sub-scales and, as indicated in Table 3, ranks eighteenth out of twenty. The women receiving salaries from \$19,000 to \$22,999 were the most satisfied; however, just seven women were in this category. The woman who earned over \$23,000 ranked seventh. Those respondents who were most dissatisfied were the seven women who received between \$7,000 and \$8,999.

Table 14

General Satisfaction of Women
According to Salary (9-Month Contract)

Salary	Number	General Satisfaction Score
Over \$23,000	1	71.00
\$21,000-\$22,999	2	79.50
\$19,000-\$20,999	5	80.60
\$17,000-\$18,999	10	71.70
\$15,000-\$16,999	22	74.77
\$13,000-\$14,999	49	70.31
\$11,000-\$12,999	60	72.33
\$ 9,000-\$10,999	34	72.68
\$ 7,000-\$ 8,999	4	67.75

The statistical procedure, analysis of variance, was used to determine if feelings of job satisfaction differed among women in various disciplines within the university. The dependent variable was the general satisfaction score from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; the independent

variable was the subject matter specialty from The Selected Life History of Women Faculty in Higher Education. The different disciplines within the university were business, education, fine arts, home economics, humanities, library, medical services and science.

The results of the analysis indicated that significance was not present at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. Table 15 shows the analysis of variance for the dependent variable, general satisfaction score, and the independent variable, subject matter specialty. Women in various disciplines within the university did not differ in their feelings concerning job satisfaction.

Table 15
Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction
Score and Subject Matter Specialty

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Total	219	48481	
Subject Matter	7	1586	227
Residual	212	46895	221
F Value = 1.02473		Prob. > F = 0.4152	

This study investigated the question: Is there a difference between job satisfaction of women in higher education and selected independent variables of life history? Analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. The

dependent variable was the general satisfaction score from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; the independent variables were the items of The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education. The hypothesis was tested at the .05 level.

The null hypothesis was not rejected for twenty-two of the twenty-seven independent variables from the life history questionnaire. Table 16, page 54, presents the information on the analysis of variance for the variables from this instrument.

The null hypothesis was rejected for five variables from the life history questionnaire at the .05 level of significance. Table 17 gives the F value and probability of greater F for these variables.

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for the Five
Variables Which Rejected the Null Hypothesis

Source	df	F-Value	Prob. > F
Experience other than College Teaching	1	6.23	.013
Administrators (present)	1	5.71	.017
Administrators (past and present)	1	5.46	.019
Published Books	1	2.52	.022
Years at Present Rank	20	1.78	.024

Those women who had experience other than college teaching were more satisfied than those women who had taught only in higher education. Analysis of variance established

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Statistics for the Independent
Variables from The Selected Life History Questionnaire

Variable	F Value	Prob. > F
Age	.907	.521
Marital Status	.587	.713
Number of Children	1.015	.426
Ethnic Identification	1.534	.216
Mother's Education	.847	.564
Father's Education	.765	.650
Number of Sisters	1.604	.147
Number of Brothers	1.460	.192
Community in which Reared	.524	.722
Section of Country Degree Received	.597	.705
Highest Degree Earned	1.880	.132
Field of Specialty	1.025	.415
Job Assignment	1.816	.085
Length of Service at Present Institution	1.116	.354
Length of Service in Higher Education	.982	.543
Present Rank	1.578	.180
*Length of Service at Present Rank	1.788	.024
Salary--9-month	.763	.652
Salary--12-month	.950	.523
*Other than College Teaching	6.231	.013
*Administrator (past and present)	5.461	.019
Title of Position	1.368	.228
*Administrator (present)	5.711	.017
Title of Position	.738	.622
Future Administrators	3.024	.069
Published Articles	.678	.713
*Published Books	2.524	.022

*.05 Level of Significance

the fact that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and this independent variable at the .013 level.

Women administrators (present) were more satisfied than the non-administrators (teachers). Analysis of variance established that there was a significant difference at the .017 level between job satisfaction and the independent variable of administrators (present).

Analysis of variance also established that there was a significance difference between job satisfaction and the independent variable of administrators (past and present) at the .019 level. The administrators were more satisfied than the non-administrators.

A significant difference was established by analysis of variance at the .024 level between the independent variable number of years at present rank and job satisfaction. However since very few responses were obtained in the higher categories for length of service, the significance level was probably not representative of the population.

A relationship was established between job satisfaction and the independent variable published books. Analysis of variance established significance at the .022 level. However one person who had published three books had a general satisfaction score of 31, and this score may be the source of the significance.

The discrete and continuous variables of The Selected Life History questionnaire were examined for a composite

profile of the woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana.

Discrete Variables

The discrete variables of ethnic identification, marital status, family size, number of siblings, parents' education, community in which reared, section of country degree received, highest degree earned, field of specialty, job assignment and professional rank were analyzed by number and percentage.

Ethnic identification. The data for the variable ethnic identification indicated that 79.09 percent (174) of the faculty women were white; 20.46 percent (45) were black; and .46 percent (1) were Hispanic.

Table 18

Distribution of Women by Ethnic Identification

Ethnic Identification	Number	Percent
White	174	79.09
Black	45	20.46
Hispanic	1	.46

Marital status and family size. Analysis of the data on marital status showed that the largest percentage (57.27 percent) were married. Ranked second were the single women, 23.64 percent; followed by those who were divorced, 11.36 percent. The information on family size indicated that the

distribution was more even. Single women and married women without children comprised the largest group, 39.09 percent. Those women with one child ranked second, 20.91 percent; and those with two children were third, 18.18 percent.

Table 19
Marital Status and Family Size of Faculty Women

Marital Status	N	Percent	Family Size	N	Percent
Married	126	57.27	5 & Over	8	3.64
Single	52	23.64	4	15	6.82
Divorced	25	11.36	3	25	11.36
Widowed	11	5.00	2	40	18.18
Separated	6	2.73	1	46	20.91
			0	86	39.09

Number of siblings. Table 20 illustrates the number and percentage of brothers and sisters in the family of the faculty woman. There were twenty-five or 11.36 percent of the women who were an only child. The women with one brother and/or one sister comprised the largest group.

Table 20
Number of Siblings of the Faculty Woman

Sisters	N	Percent	Brothers	N	Percent
6	5	2.27	6	6	2.73
5	6	2.73	5	8	3.64
4	14	6.36	4	10	4.55
3	25	11.36	3	16	7.27
2	29	13.18	2	35	15.91
1	63	28.64	1	74	33.64
0	53	24.09	0	46	20.91

Parents' education. The level of education attained by the parents of the faculty women was important background information that was relevant when profiling the woman in higher education. The largest percentage of both mothers and fathers had either received a high school diploma or had had some education at the high school level. Seventeen of the fathers had attained their doctorate.

Table 21

Parents' Education of the Faculty Women

Educational Level	Mother		Father	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Doctorate	1	.50	17	7.76
Masters	19	8.63	17	7.76
College	56	25.45	44	20.09
High School	85	38.64	67	30.59
Junior High	32	14.54	32	14.61
Elementary	27	12.27	42	19.18

Community and section. The type of community in which the woman was reared and the section of the country in which she received her highest degree were two discrete variables which were factors to be considered when describing the faculty woman in higher education in Louisiana. The largest percentage of women were reared in a city of 10,000 to 100,000. The smallest number came from small towns, 2,000 or less. The largest number of degrees were awarded from institutions in the South.

Table 22

Community in Which the Woman was Reared and Section of the Country from Which She Received Her Highest Degree

Community	N	Percent	Section	N	Percent
City, 100,000 or over	36	16.44	South	139	63.18
City, 10,000 - 100,000	68	31.05	Middle West	30	13.64
Town, 2,000 - 10,000	49	22.37	Southwest	29	13.18
Town, 2,000 or less	28	12.79	Northeast	13	5.91
Farm	38	17.35	Pacific Coast	6	2.73
			Other, U.S.	3	1.36

Rank and degree. The largest percentage of the women involved in this study held the rank of assistant professor, 41.36 percent. Four more women held the rank of associate professor than instructor. The rank of full professor was held by the least. The majority of the respondents had earned masters degrees, and seventy-three (33.18 percent) had received their doctorates.

Table 23

Rank and Degree of the Faculty Women

Rank	N	Percent	Degree	N	Percent
Professor	27	12.27	Doctorate	73	33.18
Associate Prof.	53	24.09	Masters + thirty	19	8.63
Assistant Prof.	91	41.36	Masters	121	55.00
Instructor	49	22.27	Bachelor	7	3.18

Job assignment. Approximately 75 percent of the women faculty in higher education in Louisiana were classified as teachers; three of the 220 held the position of dean.

Table 24

Job Assignment of the Faculty Women

Job Assignment	Number	Percent
Teacher	162	73.97
Department Chairperson	21	9.59
Librarian	20	9.13
Teacher-Researcher	9	4.11
Assistant Director	4	1.83
Dean	3	1.37

Field of specialty. The subject-matter specialities of the women involved in this study are classified in Table 25. Fifty-three of the respondents taught in the humanities area, and the smallest number taught in medical services. An analysis of the data indicated that women are fairly evenly distributed across the disciplines.

Table 25

Field of Specialty of the Faculty Women

Specialty	Number	Percent
Humanities	53	24.09
Education	39	17.72
Science	28	12.72
Business	26	11.82
Library	26	11.82
Home Economics	21	9.54
Fine Arts	16	7.27
Medical Services	11	5.00

Continuous Variables

The continuous variables of age, length of service at present institution, length of service in higher education,

length of service at present rank and salary were analyzed by mean and standard deviation.

Table 26
Analysis of Continuous Variables

Variable	Mean	S.D.
Age	42.36 (years)	10.63 (years)
Length of Service at Present Institution	9.66 (years)	7.44 (years)
Length of Service in Higher Education	10.91 (years)	8.02 (years)
Length of Service at Present Rank	5.42 (years)	4.49 (years)
Salary, 9-month	\$13,251	\$2,812
Salary, 12-month	\$16,484	\$4,540

Profile of the Faculty Woman in Higher Education

From the information gathered from The Selected Life History questionnaire, a composite profile of the faculty woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana was developed. Biographical background showed her to be 42.36 years of age, white and married with 1.85 children. Her family background depicted parents who had education on the high school level, with 1.87 sisters and/or 1.81 brothers. She was reared in a city (size, 10,000 to 100,000). The masters degree was the highest obtained and was received in the South. Vocational experiences classified her as a teacher (only) who had taught first in public and/or private schools. She had taught in her present institution for 9.66 years and in higher education for 10.91.

She held the rank of assistant professor and on a 9-month contract earned \$13,251; 12-month, \$16,484.

Career Patterns

In The Selected Life History questionnaire six questions were grouped under the heading of career patterns. The data obtained from this career-pattern portion of the questionnaire were classified by number and percentage.

Administrators (past and present). The responses to the question concerning administrator (past and present) indicated that thirty-seven women had been or were administrators in higher education. (Table 27). The majority of those administrators had or were serving as department chairpersons. Six were classified as directors, and three were deans. (Table 28, page 63).

Table 27

Administrators (Past and Present)

Respondents	Number	Percent
Administrator	37	16.82
Non-Administrator	183	83.18

Table 28

Administrative Positions (Past and Present)

Position	Number	Percent
Dean	2	5.41
Department Chairperson	21	56.76
Assistant Dean	1	2.70
Coordinator	4	10.81
Director	6	16.22
Assistant Director	3	8.11

Administrators (present). Twenty-six of the respondents of this study were administrators in the 1975-76 academic year. (Table 29). The largest percentage of these women were department chairpersons. Three served as deans, two as directors, two as assistant to directors and one as a coordinator. Seven of the respondents failed to supply their positions. (Table 30, page 64).

Table 29

Administrators (Present)

Respondents	Number	Percent
Administrator	26	12.82
Non-Administrator	194	88.18

Table 30

Administrators Positions (Present)

Position	Number	Percent
Dean	3	11.54
Department Chairperson	11	42.31
Director	2	7.69
Coordinator	1	3.85
Assistant to Director	2	7.69
No Response*	7	26.92

*Seven of the administrators failed to supply their position.

Future administrators. When asked if they would consider becoming administrators, fifty-six percent of the respondents answered "yes."

Table 31

Future Administrators

Responses	Number	Percent
Would Consider	110	56.12
Would Not Consider	86	43.88

Publications. Publications are of interest to all persons involved in higher education. The following table reveals the number of articles and books the faculty women in higher education in Louisiana have published.

Table 32
Publications of the Faculty Women

Number of Articles	Number of People	Number of Books	Number of People
1	23	1	21
2	19	2	6
3	23	3	1
4	8	4	1
5	4	5	3
6	4	6 & Over	2
7	17		
8	1		

Career patterns indicated that thirty-seven (17 per cent) of the women who participated in this study at one time (past and present) had been administrators. In the 1975-76 academic year, twelve percent of the 220 women were administrators. Fifty-six percent of the teachers would consider becoming administrators. Articles have been written by forty-five percent of the women, and sixteen percent have published at least one book.

SUMMARY

The twenty sub-scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were analyzed by mean and standard deviation to determine what aspects of their jobs gave the faculty women in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana the most satisfaction. The factors which contributed the most to their feelings of satisfaction were moral values, social service and activity. University policies

and practices, advancement and compensation were the aspects of their work which supplied the least job satisfaction to these women.

The mean of the respondents' scores on the general satisfaction portion of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was examined to determine the degree of satisfaction for faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana. The mean score for these women was 73.14 which indicated that the women were, to some degree, dissatisfied. When compared with the mean score of general satisfaction for five other groups--teachers, principals, distributive education coordinators, secretaries and nurses--who had responded to the same questionnaire, the faculty women were less satisfied than any of the other groups.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if feelings of job satisfaction differed among women in various disciplines within the university. The data indicated that women in various disciplines within the university did not differ in their feelings concerning job satisfaction.

Using the statistical procedure of analysis of variance, the null hypothesis was rejected for five of the variables from The Selected Life History questionnaire. The variables which showed an effect on job satisfaction were experience other than college teaching, administrators (present), administrators (past and present), published books and years at present rank. The women who had taught in other areas, public and/or private schools, were more

satisfied than those who had taught only in higher education. Administrators (present) and administrators (past and present) were more satisfied than non-administrators. The variables, published books and years at present rank, indicated a significant difference; but these variables were not representative of the total population.

Information from The Selected Life History questionnaire was used to provide a composite profile of the faculty woman in higher education in the state universities of Louisiana. Included in the profile were data concerning biographical background, family background, educational background and vocational experiences.

The career patterns of the women involved in the study were examined. Fifty-six percent of the teachers would consider becoming administrators, and forty-five percent of the respondents had published articles.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major purpose of this study was to analyze and quantify the environmental work elements which affect the job satisfaction of faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana. Additional purposes were to determine the degree of job satisfaction among faculty women in higher education, to ascertain if feelings involving job satisfaction differ among women in the various disciplines within the university, to find out if job satisfaction of faculty women was affected by the independent variables from The Selected Life History Items of Women Faculty in Higher Education questionnaire, to sketch a composite profile of the faculty woman in the state universities of Louisiana and to investigate the career patterns of the women involved in this study.

SUMMARY

Procedures of the Study

The subjects of this study consisted of the faculty women employed by the state universities of Louisiana during the academic year 1975-76.

Two questionnaires, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and The Selected Life History Items of Women

Faculty in Higher Education, were used to collect data from the faculty women. These questionnaires were mailed to three hundred women in the spring of 1976, and two hundred and twenty responses were returned.

The mean scores of the twenty sub-scales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire were analyzed to determine the aspects of the job which were the most satisfying and the least satisfying to the faculty women. The mean score of the general satisfaction score was examined to determine the degree of their job satisfaction.

Analysis of variance was used to explore the question concerning job satisfaction across the different disciplines within the universities. This statistical procedure was also used to determine if job satisfaction was affected by the independent variables from The Selected Life History Items questionnaire.

Seventeen variables from The Selected Life History questionnaire were analyzed by mean, standard deviation, number and percentage in order to provide a composite profile of the faculty woman in higher education in Louisiana. Six questions from the career-pattern section of the life history questionnaire were examined to ascertain the career patterns of the respondents.

Findings of the Study

Those aspects of the job which contributed to the faculty women's feelings of satisfaction are listed in

descending order of importance: moral values, social service, activity, achievement and creativity. In contrast the aspects of the job which contributed to the faculty women's feelings of least satisfaction are listed in ascending order of importance: university policies and practices, advancement, compensation, supervision--human relations and supervision--technical.

Faculty women in the state universities of Louisiana were, to some degree, dissatisfied with their work. When their general satisfaction score was compared with the scores of five other groups of workers--teachers, principals, distributive education coordinators, secretaries and nurses--these women were least satisfied.

The women in the various disciplines within the universities did not differ in their feelings of job satisfaction. This fact was established by analysis of variance. The general satisfaction score from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was the dependent variable, and the field of specialty from The Selected Life History questionnaire was the independent variable.

The findings revealed that five of the twenty-seven life history variables significantly affected job satisfaction. The variables were as follows:

1. The variable, Experience Other than College Teaching, was associated with job satisfaction. The women who had taught in other areas, public and/or private schools, were more satisfied than those who had taught only in higher education.

2. The variable, Administrators (Present), was associated with job satisfaction. The administrators (present) were more satisfied than the non-administrators (teachers).

3. The variable, Administrators (Past and Present), was associated with job satisfaction. These administrators were more satisfied than the teachers.

4. The variable, Published Books, was associated with job satisfaction. However one person who had published had an extremely low score, and this score might have been the source of the significance.

5. The variable, Years at Present Rank, was associated with job satisfaction; but because of the limited number of responses in the higher categories, the significance level was probably not representative of the population.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study support Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction. The internal factors of the job help to give the worker the type of job attitude that will improve her performance. The internal factors lead to positive job attitudes because they satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization in her work. The external factors of the job, if they deteriorate below what an employee considers acceptable, can result in job dissatisfaction.

In this research the internal factors were the aspects of the job that gave the faculty women satisfaction--moral values, social service, activity, achievement and creativity. The external factors were the aspects that contributed least to satisfaction--university policies and practices, advancement, compensation, supervision--human relations and supervision--technical. Improvement of the external factors may reduce job dissatisfaction, but such improvement will not necessarily produce job satisfaction. Job satisfaction seems to rest in the nature of the job itself.

Women seem no longer content to merely support and perpetuate the social system. They are becoming involved with the broader aspects of social structure and social dynamics. This increasing involvement in society may account for the degree of dissatisfaction. Only in recent years have women been permitted to think of themselves as individuals. Literature concerning women was almost nonexistent until the late sixties and the seventies. Women are now thinking of themselves as persons.

The fact that women's feelings toward job satisfaction did not differ across the disciplines should not cause surprise. Again, the fact can be examined that job satisfaction is gained as the job supplies the needs of the individual which enable her to reach her aspirations. Regardless of the discipline in which the woman is teaching, she is fulfilling her self-actualization needs.

Three of the five variables from the life history questionnaire which indicated a significant effect on job satisfaction were probably representative of the whole population. That women who had taught in other areas, public and/or private schools, were more satisfied than those who had taught only in higher education indicated two conclusions. First, having known the restrictions on their time and effort in other areas of public and/or private schools, the university climate offered a sense of "academic freedom" that probably was not present in the other teaching environments. Second, having a background in education better prepared these women for their responsibilities in the classroom and toward their students.

The other two variables, administrators (present) and administrators (past and present), indicated that administrators were more satisfied than non-administrators. Perhaps the decisive factor would be that the administrator felt that she was more the "mistress of her own fate." Another factor might be that "power" is satisfying. Also the administrator is in a position to receive more rewards, beyond the monetary, for her endeavors. The fact that her responsibilities increased did not seem to have an adverse effect.

An inference on career patterns can be made to the effect that women are interested in becoming administrators. A decade ago this idea would have been unacceptable. In 1976 women want to be administrators in our colleges and

universities. The women in the state universities of Louisiana are involved in research and publication, and they are performing on all levels as professionals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. A study to analyze and quantify the environmental work elements which affect the job satisfaction of faculty men in the state universities of Louisiana should be undertaken. This research could help to determine if the dissatisfaction exists only among the women faculty or if the dissatisfaction is true for the faculty as a whole.

2. The findings of this study should be disseminated to the administrators of the universities and the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors, the Southern University Board of Supervisors and the Board of Trustees. Job satisfaction in the state universities of Louisiana is the responsibility of all administrators, and these administrators should know how the faculty women feel in the event that something can be done to improve the external factors.

3. Consideration should be given to the conduct of more research on women in higher education. This field is a new area for research and is practically untapped.

4. A better instrument for determining job satisfaction among the faculty in higher education should be developed.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, Helen S. The Woman Doctorate in America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Bardwick, Judith M. Readings on the Psychology of Women. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972.
- Bayer, Alan E. "College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description," Ace Research Reports, 5 (5). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.
- _____, and Helen S. Astin. "Sex Differences in Academic Rank and Salary Among Science Doctorates in Teaching," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 3, (1968), 191-200.
- Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.
- Bird, Caroline. Born Female. New York: McKay, 1970.
- Block, J. R., H. E. Yuker, W. J. Campbell, and K. B. Melvin. "Some Correlates of Job Satisfaction Among Disabled Workers," Personnel and Guidance Journal, LVII (1964), 396-424.
- Brayfield, A. H., and W. H. Crockett. "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. LII (1955), 386-424.
- Brown, David G. Academic Labor Markets. A report submitted to the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, U. S. Department of Labor, 1965.
- Buel, W. D. "Biological Data and the Identification of Creative Research Personnel," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLIX (1965), 318-321.
- Butler, T. M. "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, XXXVI (1961), 11-13.
- Butler, W. P. "Job Satisfaction Among Foremen," Personnel Practice Bulletin, XXVII (1961), 5-14.
- Buzenberg, Mildred E. "Teaching Women to Become Executives: Problems and Prospects," The Iris, Vol. LI, No. 2, (Winter, 1975), 6-13.
- Caplow, Theodore, and Reece McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

- The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Opportunities for Women in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Chalmers, E. L., Jr. "Achieving Equality for Women in Higher Education--Graduate Enrollment and Faculty Status," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43, (October, 1972), 517-524.
- Chapman, William. "The Vanishing Blues," The American Federationist, Vol. 81, (January, 1974), 18-19.
- Cohen, Arthur M. Work Satisfaction Among Junior College Faculty Members. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 426, November, 1973.
- Disney, F. "Employee Turnover is Costly," Personnel Journal, XXXII (1954), 97-100.
- Dolan, Eleanor F. "A Century for Equality," Improving College University Teaching, Vol. 20, (Winter, 1972), 23-27.
- Eckert, R. E., J. E. Stecklein, and H. B. Sagen. "College Faculty Members View Their Jobs," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 45, (1959), 513-528.
- Ellison, Robert L., and others. Biographical Data as Predictors of College Grades of Negroes and Whites. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 358, July, 1973.
- Epstein, Cynthia F. "Women and Professional Careers: The Case of the Woman Lawyer," Columbia University, 1968. Dissertation Abstracts, 30:824.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Folger, John K., Helen S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer. Human Resources and Higher Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.
- Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Fudge, Jack Winston. "Predicting Academic Performance from Biographical Data," The University of Texas at Austin, 1970. Dissertation Abstracts, 32:3785.
- Furniss, W. Todd, and Patricia Albjerg Graham, editors. Women in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.

- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. 6th ed. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.
- Glennon, J. R., L. E. Albright, and W. A. Owens. A Catalog of Life History Items. Scientific Affairs Committee, American Scientific Affairs Committee, American Psychological Association, Division 14, 1966.
- Goldsmith, D. "The Use of the Personal History Blank as a Salesmanship Test," Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 6, (1922), 1948-1955.
- Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of Meredith Publishing Company, 1972.
- Gottlieb, D. "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," Sociology of Education, Vol. XXVII (1964), 345-353.
- Harmon, Lindsey R. "Careers of Ph.D.'s Academic versus Nonacademic: A Second Report on Follow-up of Doctorate Cohorts 1935-1960." Publication 1577. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science, 1968.
- Harris, Ann Sutherland. "The Second Sex in Academe," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 56, (Summer, 1970), 283-295.
- Helmreich, Robert, Roger Bakeman, and Roland Radloff. "The Life History Questionnaire as a Predictor of Performance in Navy Diver Training," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 57, (April, 1973), 148-153.
- Henderson, Jean. "Women as College Teachers," University of Michigan, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts, 28:2026.
- Heron, A. "Personality and Occupational Adjustment: A Cross-Validation Study," Canadian Journal of Psychology, Vol. IX (1957), 15-20.
- Herzberg, F., and others. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- _____, and others. The Motivation to Work. 2d ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- Hoppock, R. A. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper Brothers, 1935.
- Horn, Jack. "Bored to Sickness," Psychology Today, Vol. 9, (November, 1975), 92.

- Horner, Martina S. "Fail: bright women," Psychology Today, Vol. 3, (November, 1969), 36-38.
- Houser, J. D. What People Want from Business. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Hulin, Charles L., and others. "Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction, II, Model and Method of Measuring Job Satisfaction," Ithaca: Cornell University, 1963.
- Jenkins, J. G. "Predictions of Flight Performance by Biographical Data," Aviation Medicine, Vol. XV (1944), 131-135.
- Johnson, Harold Riley. "The Use of a Biographical Inventory in the Selection of Educators for a Foreign Assignment," University of Utah, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts, 33:2029.
- Jurgensen, C. E. "Selected Factors Which Influence Job Preferences," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXXI (1947), 553-564.
- Kahne, Hilda. "The Woman in Professional Occupations: New Complexities for Chosen Roles," The Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, & Counselors, Vol. 39, No. 4, (Summer, 1976), 179-185.
- Kirkpatrick, R. N. "The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Perceived Staff Promotional Policies," California Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XV (1964), 76-81.
- Kornhauser, Arthur W., and Agnes A. Sharp. "Employees Attitudes: Suggestions from a Study in a Factory," Personnel Journal, Vol. X (April, 1932), 393-404.
- Kreps, Juanita M. Sex in the Market Place: American Women at Work. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1971.
- _____. "The Woman Professional in Higher Education," pp. 75-94, Women in Higher Education, eds. W. Todd Furniss and Patricia Albjerg Graham. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1974.
- Lee, LaJuana Williams. "Personality Characteristics and Job Satisfaction of Certified Professional Secretaries and Non-Certified Secretaries." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1970.
- Lee, Richard H., Jr. "The Relationship Between Selected Life History Antecedents and the Job Satisfaction of School Principals." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972.

- Mason, W. S. The Beginning Teacher. OE-23009, Circular No. 644, Washington: U. S. Office of Education, 1961.
- Mattial, J. Peter. On the Economics of Worker Alienation. U.S., Educational Research Information Center, ERIC Document ED 096 408, 1974.
- McCoy, Patricia B. "A Study of the Job Satisfaction of Selected Teachers in East Baton Rouge Parish, 1970-1972." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1973.
- "Measuring Job Satisfaction," Society, Vol. 11, (January/February, 1976), 10-11.
- Menninger, W., and Levinson, Harold. "The Menninger Foundation Study of Industrial Mental Health: Observation and Perceptives," Menninger Quarterly, Vol. VIII (1954), 1-13.
- Merrill, Peter Pine. "A Study Concerning the Job Satisfaction of Elementary Teachers and Principals," Syracuse University, 1969. Dissertation Abstracts, 31:1547.
- Mitchell, Susan B. Women and the Doctorate: A Study of the Enabling or Impeding Factors Operative Among Oklahoma's Women Doctoral Recipients in the Attainment and Use of the Degree. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, October, 1968.
- Murray, S. L., and others. "An Analysis of the Racial Fairness of Biographical Predictors of Academic Performance." Paper presented at meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, 1973, cited by Robert Ellison, "Biographical Data as Predictors of College Grades of Negroes and Whites." ERIC Document ED 081 358.
- Myers, Kenneth Holly. "Factors Related to the Choice of Secondary Teaching as a Career," Oregon State, 1966. Dissertation Abstracts, 27:2288.
- National Education Association, "Research Bulletin," May, 1966.
- Newcomer, Mable. A Century of Higher Education for American Women. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Olson, Harry. "Relationships Between Certain Personality Characteristics of Distributive Education Teacher- Coordinators and Job Satisfaction." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967.

- Oltman, Ruth M. "Status of Graduate and Professional Education of Women--1974," pp. 81-88, Graduate and Professional Education of Women. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Women, 1974.
- O'Toole, James, and others. Work in America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M. I. T. Press, 1973.
- Owens, William A., J. R. Glennon, and Louis E. Albright. "Retest Consistency and the Writing of Life History Items," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLVI (1962), 375-384.
- Patterson, Michelle. "Sex and Specialization in Academe and the Professions," pp. 313-331, Academic Women on the Move, eds. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Pfiffner, Virginia. "Women as Leaders in Higher Education in These Changing Times," The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Vol. XLI, No. III, (Spring, 1975), 5-9.
- Radloff, R., and R. Helmreich. Groups Under Stress: Psychological Research in Sealab II. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Rauschenbush, Esther. "Unfinished Business: Continuing Education for Women," Educational Record, Vol. 42, (October, 1961), 261-269.
- Rempel, A. M., and R. R. Bentley. "Factors Affecting the Morale of Vocational Agriculture Teachers," Agricultural Education, Vol. XXXV (1963), 236-238.
- Robinson, H. A., and R. F. Conners. "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1962," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. LVII (December, 1963), 136-137.
- _____, R. F. Conners, and Ann H. Robinson. "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1963," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. LVIII (December, 1964), 360-361.
- _____, Ralph P. Conners, and G. Holly Whitacre. "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1964-65," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XLV (December, 1966), 371.
- Robinson, Lora H. "Institutional Variation in the Status of Academic Women," pp. 199-238, Academic Women on the Move, eds. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.

- Roby, Pamela. "Institutional Barriers to Women Students in Higher Education," pp. 37-56, Academic Women on the Move, eds. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., and W. J. Dickinson. Management and the Worker: An Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1946.
- Ronan, W. W. "Individual and Situational Variables Relating to Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, LVIV (February, 1970), 4.
- Rossi, Alice S. "Summary and Prospects," pp. 505-528, Academic Women on the Move, eds. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Rudd, W. G., and S. Wiseman. "Sources of Dissatisfaction Among a Group of Teachers," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (1962), 275-291.
- Rush, Benjamin. "Education for a New Republic," pp. 116-126, Educational Ideas in America: A Documentary History, ed. S. Alexander Rippa. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969.
- Sandler, Bernice. "Women in Higher Education: A Progress Report," AAUW Journal, Vol. 67, (November, 1973), 17-22.
- Schwartz, Pepper and Janet Lever. "Women in the Male World of Higher Education," pp. 57-77, Academic Women on the Move, eds. Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Siegel, L. "A Biographical Inventory for Students: I. Construction and Standardization of the Instrument," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XL (1956), 5-10.
- Smylie, John E. "There's Something Special About a Woman," cited by The National Observer, January 12, 1974, p. 10.
- Super, C. E. "Occupational Level and Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXIII (1939), 547-564.
- Taylor, C. W., R. L. Ellison, and M. F. Tucker. "Biographical Information and the Prediction of Multiple Criteria of Success Science," NASA Research Project, NASA-105, 1964.

- Thompson, D. C. "Problems of Faculty Morale," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. XXIX (1960), 37-46.
- Tucker, M., V. Cline, and J. Schmitt. "Prediction of Creativity and Other Performance Measures from Biographical Information Among Pharmaceutical Scientists," Journal of Applied Psychology, LI (1967), 131-138.
- Vollmar, H. M., and J. A. Kinney. "Age, Education and Job Satisfaction," Personnel, Vol. XXXII (1955), 38-43.
- Voss, Virginia. "With a Telling Tongue," Mademoiselle, Vol. 64, (March, 1967), 152-153.
- Weiss, D. J., Rene Dawis, G. W. England, and Lloyd Lofquist. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: XXII. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, 1967.
- Woody, Thomas. A History of Women's Education in the United States, Vol. 1. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1929.
- Zander, A. and R. Quinn. "The Social Environment and Mental Health," Journal of Social Issues, XXVIII (1962), 48-66.

APPENDIX

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire



Vocational Psychology Research
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Copyright 1963

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. The chance to be of service to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The chance to try out some of my own ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Being able to do the job without feeling it is morally wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The chance to work by myself.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The variety in my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The chance to have other workers look to me for direction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The chance to do the kind of work that I do best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The social position in the community that goes with the job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The policies and practices toward employees of this company.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The way my supervisor and I understand each other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. My job security.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The amount of pay for the work I do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. The working conditions (heating, lighting, ventilation, etc.) on this job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. The opportunities for advancement on this job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. The technical "know-how" of my supervisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The spirit of cooperation among my co-workers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The chance to be responsible for planning my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. The way I am noticed when I do a good job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Being able to see the results of the work I do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The chance to be active much of the time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. The chance to be of service to people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. The chance to do new and original things on my own.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Being able to do things that don't go against my religious beliefs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. The chance to work alone on the job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. The chance to do different things from time to time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
26. The chance to tell other workers how to do things.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. The chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Company policies and the way in which they are administered.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. The way my boss handles his men.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. The way my job provides for a secure future.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. The chance to make as much money as my friends.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. The physical surroundings where I work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. The chances of getting ahead on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. The chance to develop close friendships with my co-workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. The chance to make decisions on my own.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. The way I get full credit for the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39. Being able to take pride in a job well done.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40. Being able to do something much of the time.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. The chance to help people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. The chance to try something different.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44. The chance to be alone on the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45. The routine in my work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46. The chance to supervise other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47. The chance to make use of my best abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48. The chance to "rub elbows" with important people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49. The way employees are informed about company policies.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50. The way my boss backs his men up (with top management).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
51. The way my job provides for steady employment.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. How my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other companies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. The pleasantness of the working conditions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54. The way promotions are given out on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55. The way my boss delegates work to others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56. The friendliness of my co-workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. The chance to be responsible for the work of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. The recognition I get for the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. Being able to do something worthwhile.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60. Being able to stay busy.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61. The chance to do things for other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62. The chance to develop new and better ways to do the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63. The chance to do things that don't harm other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64. The chance to work independently of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65. The chance to do something different every day.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66. The chance to tell people what to do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68. The chance to be important in the eyes of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69. The way company policies are put into practice.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70. The way my boss takes care of complaints brought to him by his men.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71. How steady my job is.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
72. My pay and the amount of work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
73. The physical working conditions of the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
74. The chances for advancement on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
75. The way my boss provides help on hard problems.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
76. The way my co-workers are easy to make friends with.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
77. The freedom to use my own judgment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
78. The way they usually tell me when I do my job well.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
79. The chance to do my best at all times.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
80. The chance to be "on the go" all the time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
81. The chance to be of some small service to other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
82. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
83. The chance to do the job without feeling I am cheating anyone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
84. The chance to work away from others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
85. The chance to do many different things on the job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
86. The chance to tell others what to do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
87. The chance to make use of my abilities and skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
88. The chance to have a definite place in the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
89. The way the company treats its employees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
90. The personal relationship between my boss and his men.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
91. The way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
92. How my pay compares with that of other workers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
93. The working conditions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
94. My chances for advancement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
95. The way my boss trains his men.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
96. The way my co-workers get along with each other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
97. The responsibility of my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
98. The praise I get for doing a good job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
99. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
100. Being able to keep busy all the time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

THE SELECTED LIFE HISTORY ITEMS OF WOMEN FACULTY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Instructions: Please mark only one blank (X) - the blank which best describes you - under each question.

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

1. In what age group do you fall?

<u> </u> 20-24	<u> </u> 45-49
<u> </u> 25-29	<u> </u> 50-54
<u> </u> 30-34	<u> </u> 55-59
<u> </u> 35-39	<u> </u> 60-64
<u> </u> 40-44	<u> </u> 65-69

2. What is your marital status?

<u> </u> Single	<u> </u> Widowed	<u> </u> Divorced
<u> </u> Married	<u> </u> Separated	

3. Do you have children?

<u> </u> 0	<u> </u> 4
<u> </u> 1	<u> </u> 5
<u> </u> 2	<u> </u> 6
<u> </u> 3	<u> </u> (If more than six, please give number.)

4. What is your ethnic identification?

<u> </u> White
<u> </u> Black
<u> </u> Hispanic
<u> </u> Asian or Pacific Islander
<u> </u> American Indian or Alaskan Native

FAMILY BACKGROUND

5. How many years of education did your parents have?

<u> </u> Mother	<u> </u> Father
--------------------------	--------------------------

6. How many siblings in your family?

Sisters	Brothers
<u> </u> 1	<u> </u> 1
<u> </u> 2	<u> </u> 2
<u> </u> 3	<u> </u> 3
<u> </u> 4	<u> </u> 4
<u> </u> 5	<u> </u> 5
<u> </u> (If more, please state.)	<u> </u> (If more, please state.)

7. The place in which you spent the most time during your early life was a
- 1. Farm
 - 2. Town of less than 2,000
 - 3. Town of 2,000 or more but less than 10,000
 - 4. City of 10,000 to 100,000
 - 5. City larger than 100,000

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

8. In what section of the country did you receive your most advanced degree?
- 1. The Northeast - including Pennsylvania and New Jersey
 - 2. The South
 - 3. The Southwest - including Oklahoma and Texas
 - 4. The Middle West - including the Rocky Mountain Area
 - 5. The Pacific Coast
 - 6. Outside the Continental United States
9. State your highest degree.
- _____

VOCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

10. What is your subject matter speciality?
- _____

11. What is your job assignment? (Check all that apply.)

- 1. Teacher
- 2. Department chairwoman
- 3. Dean
- 4. Researcher
- 5. Other (Please specify) _____

12. How long have you been employed as a full-time faculty member by the institution in which you are now employed?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 36-40 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41-45 |

13. How long have you been employed as a full-time faculty member in higher education?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 36-40 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41-45 |

14. What is your present faculty rank?

1. Professor
 2. Associate Professor
 3. Assistant Professor
 4. Instructor

15. How many years have you held your present faculty rank?

16. What is your contract salary: _____ 9-month contract? _____ 12-month contract?

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| _____ \$7,000-\$8,999 | _____ \$15,000-\$16,999 |
| _____ \$9,000-\$10,999 | _____ \$17,000-\$18,999 |
| _____ \$11,000-\$12,999 | _____ \$19,000-\$20,999 |
| _____ \$13,000-\$14,999 | _____ \$21,000-\$22,999 |
| | _____ Over \$23,000 (PLEASE STATE) |

17. Have you taught in public or private elementary or secondary school?

_____ yes _____ no

CAREER PATTERNS

18. Have you ever been an administrator (dean, department chairwoman, etc) in a university?

_____ yes _____ no

19. If the answer in question 18 is yes, please state position.

20. Are you presently an administrator in your university?

_____ yes _____ no

21. If the answer in question 20 is yes, please state position.

22. If you are not presently an administrator, would you consider becoming one?

_____ yes _____ no

23. How many articles have you published? Books?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| _____ 1 | _____ 1 |
| _____ 2 | _____ 2 |
| _____ 3 | _____ 3 |
| _____ 4 | _____ 4 |
| _____ 5 | _____ 5 |
| _____ 6 | _____ 6 |
| _____ Over (Please specify) _____ | _____ Over (Please specify) _____ |



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Department of Psychology
Elliott Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

December 29, 1975

Ms. Sallye S. Benoit
Assistant Professor
Office Administration Department
McNeese State University
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70601

Dear Ms. Benoit:

I apologize for this belated response to your inquiry. The delay was caused, in part, by our not having received your original letter, which was addressed to the Industrial Relations Center and apparently has been lost in transit between the two departments.

We appreciate your interest in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. You have our authorization to use the MSQ, long form questionnaire, in your dissertation research. You may purchase the questionnaire from Vocational Psychology Research, Department of Psychology, N660 Elliott Hall, University of Minnesota. The price per copy is 20¢.

Regarding your questions:

We have not compiled any new normative data on the MSQ beyond those reported in Monograph XXII (Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire).

It is possible to use the norms for women shown in Monograph XXII. I believe, that while not reported, the normative group for teachers is almost exclusively female. While not at the same occupational level, the normative groups for "Supervisor Nurses," "Fulltime Nurses," and "Secretaries," among others, are exclusively female groups. With a sample of 300, a return rate of 200 would provide you with a sizable group from which to construct your own norms.

We would appreciate some report about your research results, e.g., a copy of your summary chapter in your dissertation.

We wish you success in your research.

Sincerely,

Rene V. Dawis
Professor



Louisiana Division

November 10, 1975


Mrs. Sallye Beniot
1533 Seventh Street
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70601

Dear Mrs. Beniot:

The State American Association of University Women highly endorse the study you will be doing entitled "Job Satisfaction Among Faculty Women in Higher Education in the State University of Louisiana".

We are eager to have the results of this study and will appreciate your sending us a copy of your completed dissertation.

Sincerely yours,


(Mrs.) Allegra LaPrairie, President
Louisiana Division

AL:mc

P. O. Box 317
McNeese State University
Lake Charles, LA 70601
February 12, 1976

Dear Colleague

You have been chosen as a participant in a research study concerning women in higher education in Louisiana. Won't you please help me ascertain what women believe about their positions in Louisiana universities. In order to have a representative picture, please answer the questionnaires sincerely and return them immediately.

This research will be the first extensive study of job satisfaction on women in higher education in Louisiana. The findings should be useful to your administrators as they analyze and improve the work environment of the women faculty. A summary of the findings will be sent to the administrators (president and deans) of your university.


My experience as a teacher for eight years in the secondary school and for twelve years at McNeese State University has posed many questions concerning women and their work environment. Consequently, doctoral research is needed on the extent of job satisfaction among women faculty in the state universities of Louisiana. This study has been approved by my research committee at Louisiana State University.

Your cooperation in this study will help answer some of the questions that are being asked by women in higher education. Please give twenty to thirty minutes of your time to complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire booklet and the Life History Questionnaire.

A return stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please return the questionnaires by February 29, 1976. Also enclosed is a numbered post card which is to be mailed separately, but at the same time you return the questionnaires. This post card will help with follow-up procedures and will also maintain complete confidentiality for you.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely



Sallye S. Benoit

The AAUW Louisiana State President has written to me expressing the organization's support and interest in this timely research.

POST CARDS USED IN STUDY

If you would like a copy of the abstract of this research, please check here. _____

Please mail this card when you return the questionnaire to me. This will allow for follow up but will insure your confidentiality

Your help and cooperation are appreciated.

Follow-up Number _____

Sallye Benoit

J U S T A R E M I N D E R ! ! !

Please remember to complete and return the forms which were sent to you about ten days ago.

YOUR return, along with those already received, will improve the validity, reliability, and statistical accuracy of this FIRST study of satisfaction among women in higher education in the state of Louisiana (perhaps the nation). Your feelings need to be included in the findings that can help us in the analysis and improvement of our work environment.

Your efforts will be appreciated. Take a few minutes from your busy schedule to complete and return the questionnaires.

Sallye Benoit

Sallye S. Benoit

3/8/76

(Should you need additional forms please let me know.)

VITA

PERSONAL

Name: Sallye Starks Benoit
Date of Birth: September 29, 1933
Birthplace: Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Parents: Clarence C. and Effie K. Starks
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Husband: Patrick J. Benoit

EDUCATION

High School: Istrouma Senior High School
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1951
B.A.: Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, Louisiana, 1955
Major: Business
Minor: Social Studies
M.A.: George Peabody College for
Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee, 1958
Major: Business Education
Minor: Education
Ph.D.: Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1976
Major: Education
Minor: Business Education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1955-1958 St. Mary Parish Schools, Morgan
City High School, Business Edu-
cation Teacher
1955-1958 Vermilion Parish Vocational-
Technical School, Business
Training Instructor, Evening
Classes

1958-1960	East Baton Rouge Parish Schools, Istrouma Senior High School, Business Education Teacher
1960	East Baton Rouge Parish Vocational-Technical School, Business Training Instructor, Evening Classes
1960-1963	Calcasieu Parish Schools, LaGrange Senior High School, Business Education and Super- vising Teacher
1960-1970	Owned and helped manage a carpet business--activities included management, retailing, marketing and secretarial
1973-1974	Louisiana State University, Graduate Assistant, Office Administration and Education (Summer)
1963-Present	McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana, Assistant Professor, Office Administra- tion Department

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Business Education Association
 Southern Business Education Association
 Louisiana Business Education Association
 Delta Pi Epsilon - National Honorary Fraternity in Busi-
 ness
 Delta Kappa Gamma - National Honorary Fraternity for
 Women in Education
 Phi Chi Theta - National Fraternity for Women in Business
 American Association of University Women
 Business and Professional Women's Club

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Sallye Starks Benoit

Major Field: Education

Title of Thesis: JOB SATISFACTION AMONG FACULTY WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE UNIVERSITIES OF LOUISIANA

Approved:

William M. Smith
Major Professor and Chairman

James H. Traynham
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Helen M. Crockett

J. H. Lindsey

Richard A. Musemenbe

Charlie W. Roberts, Jr.

Frank D. Ferguson

Date of Examination:

October 1, 1976