A study assessed job satisfaction among Engineering/Industrial Technology faculty at Delgado Community College (New Orleans, Louisiana). A secondary purpose was to confirm Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction (1966) that workers derived satisfaction from the work itself and that causes of dissatisfaction stemmed from conditions external to the work. A literature review focused on methods of measuring faculty job satisfaction and factors contributing to job satisfaction. A job satisfaction questionnaire was completed and returned by all 26 members of the Engineering/Industrial Technology faculty. Results indicated that this cohort of faculty were satisfied with their jobs. Aspects of the job perceived as satisfying included autonomy/control, use of skills and abilities, immediate supervisor, and self-fulfillment. Aspects of the job perceived as dissatisfying included opportunities for promotion-in-rank, top management, pay, and job security. The following recommendations were made to the dean: the college should: (1) continue to enhance those job aspects perceived as satisfying; (2) investigate discrimination against technical faculty in the promotion policy; (3) develop an institutional human resource development plan; (4) engender a participative managerial style; and (5) allow for more open communication between faculty and top management. (Eleven references and the questionnaire are appended.) (YLB)
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ABSTRACT

A study of personnel-human resources development issues affecting community colleges indicated that faculty satisfaction with their jobs may impact faculty productivity, longevity, and student achievement. Attitudes that faculty hold regarding their positions, and the college itself, should be of concern for college administrators.

The purpose of this practicum was to assess job satisfaction among Engineering/Industrial Technology faculty at Delgado Community College, located in New Orleans, LA. A secondary purpose was to confirm Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction: That, in general, workers derive satisfaction from the work itself, and causes of dissatisfaction stem from conditions external to the work.

The initial step in this assessment was the development of a job satisfaction questionnaire, which was then distributed to the entire Engineering/Industrial Technology faculty. All twenty-six members returned the completed questionnaire to the division office, where the responses were tabulated.

The results indicated that, overall, this cohort of faculty were satisfied with their jobs. Aspects of the job perceived as satisfying include autonomy/control, the use of skills and abilities, the immediate supervisor, and
self fulfillment. Aspects of the job perceived as dissatisfying include opportunities for promotion-in-rank, top management, pay, and job security.

Recommendations were made, supported with the results of this study, to the dean for further HRD considerations. The college should: (1) Continue to enhance those aspects of the job perceived as satisfying; (2) Investigate discrimination against technical faculty in the promotion policy; (3) Develop an institutional HRD plan; (4) Engender a participative managerial style; and (5) Allow for more open and effective communication between faculty and top management.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Delgado Community College, founded by an endowment from sugar planter Isaac Delgado, opened in August 1921 under the name of Isaac Delgado Central Trades School. Its purpose was to give white boys over twelve years of age training in cabinet making, plumbing, and tailoring. The typical length of instruction was three years. By 1961, at the time of its fortieth anniversary, over forty-thousand students had trained at the institution. Delgado Community College (DCC) became coeducational in the early 1960’s, and by the end of the decade was open to all races. DCC has undergone three official name changes in its sixty-eight year history:

1. Isaac Delgado Central Trades School (1921).

Each change reflected a shift in the institutional mission. The current mission of DCC is to be a comprehensive, multi-campus community college with a strong occupational and technical orientation, complemented with liberal arts and personal-social enrichment opportunities.
Academic instruction is administered in one of five divisions: Arts and Humanities (AH), Business Studies (BU), Communications (CU), Engineering and Industrial Technology (ET), and Math and Science (MS). The EG division, comprising occupational and technical training, offers coursework in Engineering Technology, Mechanical Trades, and Construction Trades.

A study of personnel-human resources development (HRD) issues affecting community colleges indicated that faculty satisfaction with their jobs may impact student achievement, faculty productivity, and longevity. Colleges should "plan for periodic assessment of job satisfaction so that areas of least satisfaction may be explored and if problems exist, they may be corrected or modified" (Hutton and Jobe: 1985:324).

The purpose of this study was to determine the job satisfaction of the EG faculty at DCC. A job satisfaction questionnaire was used to gather information needed to conduct this study (Appendix A). The results were analyzed, and recommendations concerning the improvement of faculty working conditions were made to the Dean of Instruction. The study was limited to faculty job satisfaction in the EG division.
Chapter Two
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The concern for attitudes that faculty hold concerning their positions, and the college itself, is important for two reasons:

1. A strong concern for HRD is whether faculty find their work satisfying or frustrating, challenging or boring, meaningful or pointless.

2. Academic administrators should be concerned about the impact of faculty attitudes on their performance and the subsequent affect on students.

For the purposes of this study, job satisfaction will be defined as the overall positive feelings that faculty have toward their jobs.

One method of measuring faculty job satisfaction is the use of job satisfaction surveys. Feldman and Arnold (1983) state that job satisfaction surveys can be utilized to fulfill at least six organizational purposes: (1) To assess sources of potential problems in the college; (2) To discover the causes of indirect productivity problems, i.e., turnover and absenteeism; (3) To assess the impact of...
organizational change on employee attitudes; (4) To stimulate better communication between administrators and faculty; (5) To provide accurate information about pro-union sentiment; and (6) Act as an indicator concerning the effectiveness of organizational reward systems. Each of these purposes may be classified as concerns of human resource development.

Numerous instruments for surveying job satisfaction are available. Dunham and Smith (1979) list three of these instruments and the characteristics that make them more respected. First, the instrument must be valid; it should measure what it intended to measure. Additionally, it should include items that are highly related to other previously validated measures of job satisfaction. Second, the instrument must be reliable; it should produce stable and consistent results. Several items should be used to measure each particular satisfaction factor. The questions should be unambiguous in nature. Finally, the instrument should provide information on the factors most administrators are interested in. It should identify the wide range of factors that affect quality of work life and organizational effectiveness.

Literature relating to organizational behavior indicates that this issue has been intensely researched. In the 1920's, Frederick Taylor espoused the principles of scientific management, based on the assumption that high
employee morale and productivity were the product of work design, work conditions, and pay. In the 1930's, the Hawthorne Studies reported that job performance was heavily influenced by employee satisfaction with their supervisor and work group. A new concept emerged in 1959, when Frederick W. Herzberg focused on the work itself, i.e., job characteristics as a major factor in job satisfaction. In later writings, Herzberg (1966) classified job characteristics into two major categories: (1) Motivators and (2) Hygiene factors. Motivation factors, such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and personal growth/development are intrinsic to the job. Hygiene factors, such as company policies, working conditions, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships, status, and security are extrinsic to the work itself. It is Herzberg's hypothesis that satisfaction and dissatisfaction with work are separate and independent continua, not opposite ends of a single continuum. The extent to which a worker is satisfied and motivated by a job is determined exclusively by the extent to which the job contains intrinsic motivators. On the other hand, dissatisfaction is caused by a lack of the extrinsic hygiene factors. Hygiene factors must be present in order to prevent dissatisfaction. They cannot generate satisfaction; that can only be done by introducing the intrinsic motivators into the job.
Herzberg's theory, referred to as the "two-factor" theory of motivation and satisfaction, implies that if individuals are to be satisfied with their jobs and motivated to perform effectively, then their jobs must be high on motivator factors. It should be noted that the two-factor theory is not unanimously supported by researchers in the field of job satisfaction (Cohen and Associates: 1975). However, it is well publicized in the literature and does provide an important conceptual framework.

Willie and Stecklin (1982) examined three decades of research concerning faculty satisfaction with their jobs. They found that most college faculty, like other professionals, were highly satisfied with their jobs most of the time. Areas of job dissatisfaction came mostly from conditions that were external to the work itself. Diner (1985:354) concurs: "...historically, studies have shown college faculty usually like their work and have positive feelings about it. The full professional life for most college teachers is one of personal and professional fulfillment. This life is attractive to many who see it as a way to encourage and enhance human beings and their learning. They are attracted to the world of ideas. They value the great amount of authority they have over their own professional affairs, the amount of autonomy they can exercise in the performance of their duties."

Hutton and Jobe (1985) surveyed the job satisfaction of three-hundred and ninety college faculty in fourteen Texas community colleges. The survey instrument used items that assessed a spectrum of attitudes regarding employment in a community college. Faculty relationships with their
supervisors and peers, and teaching were the greatest areas of satisfaction. Areas of least satisfaction were opportunities for professional growth, time allocation, and the preparation/motivation of students.

Other studies of community college faculty have examined sources of job satisfaction and reported on the correlates of job satisfaction; that intrinsic factors contribute to satisfaction; extrinsic factors contribute to job dissatisfaction (Cohen, 1974; Hill: 1983;).

**Significance to the College**

This study was significant to Delgado Community College (DCC) in that the assessment of faculty job satisfaction provided college administrators with reliable and valid information to be used in planning and evaluation activities. This information was to form the basis for decisions concerning faculty development, a priority for college human resource development.

Faculty are the critical human resource element of the community college. Understanding job satisfaction is important because it contributes to productivity via the engendering of communication and teamwork. An ancillary benefit of assessing job satisfaction is its potential impact on the faculty member in terms of promoting a positive influence on physical and mental health.
Significance to the Seminar

According to the Seminar Study Guide, a specific objective of the Personnel-Human Resources Development Seminar is:

"to provide each student the opportunity to select several aspects of HRD and explore them in depth in a manner uniquely fitted to their context through a series of elective units."

One elective unit examines the linkage between HRD and organizational development. The significant concept of that unit is as follows: If community colleges are to remain viable, they must diagnose HRD areas for development and then "specify strategies to progress along a course of action" (Groff: 1986). The purpose of this seminar was to perform such a diagnosis in the specific area of job satisfaction. A secondary purpose was to confirm Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction: That, in general, workers derive satisfaction from the work itself and causes of dissatisfaction stem from conditions external to the work.
Chapter Three

PROCEDURES

Upon completion of the review of the professional literature, a questionnaire was developed to fulfill the purpose of this study. As noted in the previous chapter, a wide variety of valid and reliable instruments were available for use in surveying job satisfaction. Dunham and Smith (1979) suggest that if a custom-designed instrument is preferred, then the instrument constructed should include items that are highly related to other previously validated measures of job satisfaction. Three instruments described by Dunham and Smith have been demonstrated to produce stable and consistent results. Hence a custom designed instrument that is highly related to these three should also prove to demonstrate like results.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was found to contain items most applicable to the faculty of DCC. General satisfaction is measured by summing the scores for all twenty items. The questionnaire is designed to be administered in ten minutes.

Two objectives were formulated to provide guidance in the development of the questionnaire. The first objective was to determine which aspects of the faculty
members' job were perceived as satisfying. The second objective was to determine which aspects of the job were perceived as dissatisfying.

The MSQ was modified to suit the organizational environmental idiosyncracies of an academic institution. A draft of the questionnaire was then submitted to several division chairpersons and the dean for suggestions. These suggestions were considered, and the questionnaire was revised as needed.

Once the review process was completed, the final version of the questionnaire was prepared for distribution, via the campus mail system, to each EG faculty member. The faculty were instructed to return the completed questionnaire to the division chairperson's office, where the results were manually tabulated and analyzed. The results of the questionnaire were then presented to the dean for further HRD consideration.

Assumptions and Limitations

The expected outcome of this practicum was the development of a questionnaire to assess the level of job satisfaction among EG faculty. It was assumed that:

1. All EG faculty members would participate in the survey.
2. The questionnaire would produce all of the data needed to assess job satisfaction.
3. The EG faculty would understand and follow
the questionnaire directions correctly.

4. The EG faculty would respond to the items in a straightforward and complete manner.

5. For purposes of analysis, a "not sure" response to a questionnaire item would be considered a "dissatisfied" response.

The questionnaire was developed for Delgado Community College, and was limited to the EG faculty of that institution. The outcome of this practicum were applicable only to DCC, and to this group of faculty members.
Chapter Four

RESULTS

The purpose of this practicum was to assess job satisfaction among EG faculty members at Delgado Community College, located in New Orleans, Louisiana. The initial step in this assessment was the development of a job satisfaction questionnaire. The questionnaire was then distributed to the entire EG faculty. All twenty-six faculty members replied and returned the questionnaire to the EG division office. The responses were tabulated, and the results of the questionnaire are presented in this chapter.

Two objectives were devised to provide: (1) guidance in the development of the questionnaire and (2) a conceptual basis for summarizing and reporting the results of the questionnaire. The first objective was to determine which aspects of the faculty members' jobs were perceived as satisfying. The second objective was to determine which aspects of the faculty members' jobs were perceived as dissatisfying.

Table 1 contains the summary of responses to these objectives, listing the questionnaire item number and the total number of responses for each item. Table 2 is a
summary of responses to the objectives, listing the questionnaire item number and the responses by percentage.

Table 1
Summary of Responses by Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>v.d.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>v.s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a summary of responses by objectives.

The faculty were given the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire items in the following manner: (1) very dissatisfied, (2) dissatisfied, (3) not sure, (4) satisfied, and (5) very satisfied. General satisfaction was measured by summing the scores for all twenty items.
Table 2
Summary of Responses by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replies indicated that the EG faculty were satisfied with sixty-five percent of their jobs. Thirteen aspects of the job were perceived as satisfying. On the other hand, the faculty were dissatisfied with eighteen percent of their jobs, and seventeen percent of the replies were not sure whether they were satisfied or not. Seven aspects of the job were perceived as dissatisfying.
Chapter Five

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the job satisfaction of the EG faculty at Delgado Community College, via an administered job satisfaction questionnaire. The results were analyzed, indicating that, overall, the faculty were satisfied with their jobs. This chapter contains a discussion of the analysis, including conclusions drawn and recommendations made based on the results. The practicum was presented to the dean for further human resource development consideration and planning.

Discussion and Conclusions

Satisfying Aspects of the Job

Thirteen aspects of the job were perceived by the majority of the faculty as satisfying. To facilitate the discussion, they are grouped by the following categories:

1. Autonomy and Control (Items 1 and 2)
2. Use of Skills, Abilities, and Task Variety (Items 3, 9, 10, 11, and 16).
3. Supervision (Items 5, 6).
4. Recognition/Fulfillment (Items 4 and 20).
5. Work Conditions/Work Group (Items 17, 18).
Overall, the EG faculty appear to be the most satisfied with aspects of the job that allow them to use their skills and abilities. One-hundred percent of the faculty indicated that they were satisfied with the teaching aspect of their jobs. Ninety-two percent were satisfied with the student advising aspects of their jobs. Closely related to this is the satisfaction that EG faculty derive from the feelings of accomplishment they get from their jobs; ninety-two percent were satisfied with this aspect (fulfillment).

The next most satisfying aspect of their jobs is the immediate supervision they receive from their chairman. Eighty-eight percent of the faculty were satisfied with the competence of their chairman in making decisions; eighty-four percent were satisfied with the way the chairman handles the faculty.

Ninety-two percent of the faculty were satisfied with how their time was spent at DCC, and eighty-four percent of the faculty were satisfied with their schedule of classes and office hours, which are determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the chairman. The faculty are satisfied with the amount of autonomy, control, and task variety provided by their jobs.

Finally, the faculty were satisfied with both the work conditions and the work group. Sixty-two percent were satisfied with the way the faculty got along with each
other, while fifty-eight percent expressed satisfaction concerning work conditions.

The results discussed support the research of others investigating community college faculty satisfaction with their jobs. The EG faculty at DCC are typical of other community college faculty in that they are highly satisfied with their jobs, most of the time. The aspects of job satisfaction among the EG faculty are interrelated and lead to the following conclusions:

1. The typical EG faculty member possesses expertise in a technical field and perceive themselves as practitioners, not theorists. They derive enormous satisfaction from being able to apply their skills and abilities in the practice of teaching. They are satisfied with what they are accomplishing.

2. The faculty derive satisfaction from job aspects they can control, and from working in an environment that encourages professional autonomy.

3. The most effective managerial style is one that is perceived as facilitating, as setting and attaining goals by consensus. This style is practiced by the incumbent chairman.

4. The EG faculty, as a whole, have been employed at DCC for a number of years, and
derive satisfaction from being involved in long-term professional relationships and from working in familiar working conditions. Stability appears to be important.

Dissatisfying Aspects of the Job

Seven aspects of the job were perceived by the majority of the faculty as dissatisfying. To facilitate discussion, they are grouped by the following categories:

1. Promotion/Advancement (Items 7, 14).
2. Top Management (Items 12, 15, 19).
3. Pay (Item 13).

Overall, the EG faculty appear to be the most dissatisfied with their chances for promotion-in-rank (85 percent). Each year, the administration allocates funding for a certain number of promotions (11 total for last year). Eligible faculty submit a request for promotion to their division chair, who in turn, makes a recommendation to the Promotion Committee for the faculty member. Preference is given to faculty who hold graduate degrees. Only one faculty member out of the total of twelve who were eligible was promoted from the EG division last year. That one held a graduate degree. The typical EG faculty member does not possess the graduate degree. In the EG division, technical competency, rather than educational attainment, is the basis for employment. The remaining ten promotions were evenly
distributed among the other four divisions, where a graduate degree is a prerequisite to employment.

The faculty were dissatisfied with opportunities for professional growth (56 percent). The only staff development activities supported by the college are in-service seminars conducted by DCC staff. The full expense of other professional growth activities is borne by the individual faculty member. Exceptions to this policy are rare.

The second area of dissatisfaction concerns top management at the college. Eighty-one percent of the faculty were dissatisfied with the extent of DCC's interest in their welfare and happiness; sixty-five percent were dissatisfied with the way policies were put into action, and fifty-four percent were dissatisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job. The faculty perceive that the administration is not interested in their welfare, that they are not given due recognition by the administration, that college policies are not carried out by the administration in an acceptable manner.

The last areas of job dissatisfaction concern faculty pay and job security. Fifty-four percent expressed dissatisfaction with their pay; fifty-three percent were not satisfied with the way DCC provides for steady employment. The probable reason for the dissatisfaction with pay is that DCC faculty, as is the case with all state employees, have not received a pay raise since 1984. The probable reasons
for the dissatisfaction with job security are: (1) The state is approaching fiscal insolvency, and much discussion about declaring financial exigency is taking place on campus, and (2) Lack of enrollments in technical programs is placing them in jeopardy of being discontinued. At the present time, no faculty have been laid off. However, the anxiety and stress produced by such a threat is taking its toll.

The conclusions draw. from the discussion of the dissatisfying aspects support Herzberg's two-factor theory. Of the seven items depicted as dissatisfying, five were extrinsic to the work itself (Items 8, 12, 13, 15, 19). Dissatisfaction among EG faculty members is caused by a lack of the extrinsic hygiene factors: College policies, top management, salary, and job security.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are derived from the results of this study:

1. The college should continue to enhance those aspects of the job that faculty perceive as satisfying. These factors should be reassessed on a regular basis to ensure the maintenance of faculty satisfaction.

2. The college should investigate discrimination against technical faculty in the promotion policy, i.e., preference given to applicants possessing
graduate degrees over those possessing technical competence. It should list technical competency in technical areas as equivalent to graduate coursework in academic areas.

3. The college should develop an institutional HRD plan, and rewarding faculty who successfully participate in such activities.

4. Top management should allow the faculty the opportunity to identify administrative areas deemed as deficient, and make suggestions for the amelioration of the identified deficiencies.

5. The faculty should receive a salary increase, their first since 1984.

6. Faculty are concerned with unofficial talk of financial exigency and other economic matters. The administration should attempt to communicate information regarding this issue with the faculty. These recommendations could not have been supported without the results of this study. They were presented to the dean for further HRD consideration.

The potential for positive change at the college will be enhanced if top management implements these recommendations. Faculty satisfaction with their jobs should significantly impact the relationships they have with DCC administrators, colleagues, and most importantly, their students.
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APPENDIX

JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
ENGINEERING/INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY FACULTY
JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions

Please complete this questionnaire and return it to the division office (Bldg. 22, Rm. 110).

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

V.S. means very satisfied.
S. means satisfied.
N. means not sure.
D. means dissatisfied.
V.D. means very dissatisfied.

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

1. How my time is spent at DCC
2. My schedule of classes and office hours
3. The chance to do different things
4. The social status of being a faculty member
5. The way my chairman handles the faculty
6. My chairman’s competence in making decisions
7. Opportunities for professional growth
8. The way my job provides for steady employment
9. The teaching of students
10. The advising of students
11. Doing things that make use of my abilities
12. The way college policies are put into action
13. My pay and the amount of work I do
14. My chances for promotion-in-rank at DCC
15. The extent of DCC’s interest in my welfare
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job
17. The working conditions
18. The way the faculty get along with each other
19. The recognition I get for doing a good job
20. The feelings of accomplishment I get from the job

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.