

Administrator Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

By

Tonia Howard-Baldwin, Ph.D.

National Defense University – Joint Forces Staff College

Norfolk, VA

Bekir Celik

Educational Psychology, Ph. D. Student

Dept. of Educ. Foundations, Leadership, & Technology

Auburn University

Marie Kraska, Ph. D.

M. C. Fraley Distinguished Professor, Research and Statistics

Dept. of Educ. Foundations, Leadership, & Technology

Auburn University

May 8, 2012

## Administrator Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

### Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the job satisfaction of men and women administrators in higher education in a four-year university in the southeast. In addition, the study examined whether there was a relationship between gender and overall job satisfaction, work climate, and job structure. Data were collected in the spring of 2009.

In conducting the study, researchers selected four public four-year higher education institutions from a list of 14 four-year public institutions governed by the Commission on Higher Education within the state in which the sample was taken. The total number of administrators in the data set was 56. The administrator demographic variables were as follows: gender, ethnicity, age group, marital status, education level, years of administrator experience, salary, and job title.

Results from the statistical analysis showed that in terms of present job duties, pay, opportunities for promotion, and supervision, the administrators who participated in this study were satisfied. The administrators expressed a level of dissatisfaction with the people with whom they work and their job in general. There was no statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction of the male and female administrators surveyed. There was no statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction, work climate, and job structure between the male and female administrators who

participated in this study. The findings indicated that male administrators were more satisfied with their work climate than the female administrators; however, the findings were still not statistically significant at the .05 level.

### Introduction

Job satisfaction has been the subject of many studies for over forty years (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek & Frings-Dresen, 2003). Early research on work climate and management effectiveness as they relate to job satisfaction tends to focus more on corporate and government organizations than institutions of higher education (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000). Literature relating to the organizational environment focuses on models that examine the relationships between work environment, employee satisfaction, employee productivity, and turnover behavior (Tett & Meyer, 1993). However, in higher education, past studies focus primarily on some of the above variables and their relationship to job satisfaction of academic faculty (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000).

Fraser and Hodge (2000) wrote that most approaches to job satisfaction fall into two categories: structural and dispositional model. The structural approach focuses on the relationship between workplace environment and employee satisfaction. Fraser and Hodge (2000) explained that this perspective suggests that the structure of the workplace is a direct reflection of the employees' attitude. The dispositional model focuses on the "...individuals' attributes and abilities to adapt to the organizational environment. The dispositional model contends that workers will approach job satisfaction contingent on their personal experiences, values, and attributes" (Fraser & Hodge, 2000, p. 173). Fraser and Hodge (2000) extended the notion that since males benefit from gender status beliefs, males are largely uninterested in correcting discrimination. This

creates an unequal organizational culture in which Lev S. Vygotsky believed directly impacts the way individuals learn and view their surroundings (as cited in Gredler, 2005). Talbert-Hersi (1994) believes that the structure and business of an organization, communication and gender stereotyping are elements of the culture which negatively impact the level of job satisfaction for women in higher education administration.

In general, there is a lack of sufficient information regarding overall job satisfaction of men and women administrators in higher education. Much has been written on job satisfaction as it relates to businesses and governmental organizations, but most of the literature that examines the satisfaction levels in higher education focuses on faculty rather than administrators.

### **Review of Literature**

Job satisfaction has been described in so many ways by researchers. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the optimistic orientation of a person towards his or her current work role. According to Locke (1976) job satisfaction is “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (p. 1300). Luthans (1994) described job satisfaction as an attitude developed by an individual towards the job condition and job itself.

There are major theories that support those different definitions. One of those studies is Taylor’s Scientific Management Theory which is an early study focusing on motivation and job satisfaction (Taylor, 1911). Taylor (1911) mentioned that it is necessary to give some special motivator to the workman, such as promotion, higher wages and better working conditions, if the manager desires any effort from the workman. Duncan (2006) highlighted that Taylor’s belief of job satisfaction connected to extrinsic rewards and the physical needs of the worker, which meant that meeting these needs would maximize the workers potential.

Abraham Maslow believed that his hierarchy of needs theory outlines how people satisfy various personal needs in the context of their work. According to Maslow (1954), humans have five basic needs; (1) physiological needs, (2) safety needs, (3) affection and belongingness needs, (4) esteem needs, and (5) self-actualization or self-development needs. Maslow (1971) also believed that an individual could not be satisfied unless the elements of the hierarchy of needs are met. He considered the concept of self-actualization as the ultimate state for satisfaction but believed that very few individuals could achieve it (Maslow, 1971).

Several studies have addressed the factors that influence job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Thomas, 1987; Fraser & Hodge, 2000; Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003; Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Some researchers believe specific factors such as promotion, and fringe benefits influence job satisfaction. While others believe that intrinsic and extrinsic factors such as job security, work conditions, achievement and recognition influence job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Thomas, 1987). For example, Talbert-Hersi (1994) defined general job satisfaction as extrinsic and intrinsic factors contributing to a feeling of fulfillment and happiness felt by individuals as they relate to their occupation and the tasks associated with them. These intrinsic and extrinsic factors that contribute to general job satisfaction, as described by Talbert-Hersi (1994), are salary, the work itself, fringe benefits, working conditions, achievement, recognition, responsibility, supervision, and institutional policies and practices.

Job satisfaction has become an important topic of discussion for many years. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) acknowledged since the Hawthorne studies in the 1920s, job satisfaction has been the topic of research. “Literally thousands of studies have examined how people feel about their work experience as a whole as well as about specific facets of their jobs such as pay, supervision, or autonomy” (McFarlin, et al., 1995, p. 489). The key to a successful and viable

organization is to maintain satisfied and qualified employees (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003). This could explain the growing number of studies relating to job satisfaction in medicine, education, manufacturing, and corporate sectors.

Job satisfaction of scholars and staff in the field of higher education has been the topic of research in past decades (Rhodes, Hollinshead, & Nevill, 2007). Much of the literature relating to job satisfaction in higher education tends to focus more on faculty and staff than administrators (Volkwein & Parmley, 2000; Fraser & Hodge, 2000; Iacqua, Schumacher & Li, 1995; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003). For instance, Milosheff (1990) conducted a study that focused on factors contributing to faculty job satisfaction in the community college system. Milosheff (1990) surveyed 703 community college faculty from 35 institutions. The study focused on six general categories, job satisfaction, personal and demographic characteristics, professional activities/responsibilities, perceptions of relationships with students, institutional environments, and departmental environment.

The findings indicated that on the average, community college faculty are satisfied with their jobs. In comparison to those studies that surveyed faculty in four-year institutions, gender was not significant in predicting job satisfaction at the community college level. The more time faculty spent with professional responsibilities and activities the less job satisfaction they enjoyed. The findings also suggested that the faculty members surveyed enjoyed being recognized as contributing members to the students and institution. The more faculty saw students as appreciative, interested, and academically well prepared, the more faculty were satisfied with their jobs (Milosheff, 1990).

Previously mentioned, in a search of the literature on administrator job satisfaction, there is a paucity of research on this topic. “In higher education, job satisfaction, particularly among administrators, has been sparsely examined, and cumulatively the studies in this area suggest there is little unity in understanding job satisfaction in a college or university context” (Smerek & Peterson, 2007, p. 230). Volkwein and Zhou (2003) pointed out that the few studies that addressed administrative job satisfaction in higher education mainly focused on understanding the dimensions and levels of satisfaction rather than the intrinsic, extrinsic and interpersonal influences of job satisfaction. For example, in 1990, Chieffo (1991) examined the results of a survey developed by compiling the literatures most valid and relevant questionnaire scales. The purpose of the study was to measure job satisfaction and organization commitment. In addition, determine the factors that contribute to both job satisfaction and organization commitment. The sample for this study was comprised of 97 administrators identified as leadership team members at 16 two-year colleges in New Mexico. The results of the study suggested that the administrators in New Mexico’s two-year institutions were fairly satisfied and committed to their jobs and institutions. In addition, Chieffo (1991) stated that all five leadership behaviors (i.e., influence orientation, people orientation, motivational orientation, and values orientation) contributed to both job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Factors that contribute to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction have varied greatly among researchers. Some researchers have focused on very specific factors while others have focused on intrinsic and extrinsic factors. There have been reports that suggest pay, opportunities for promotion, and relationships on the job directly impact job satisfaction. On the contrary, there have been reports that suggest organizational climate and structure directly effect job satisfaction. Volkwein, et al. (1998) believed that there is a relationship between administrator

job satisfaction and the human relations aspects of the work climate. This could suggest that such things as gender and race discrimination, unequal pay, and security in the workplace all directly impact job satisfaction. In addition, attempt to explain the low representation of women in higher education administration, and their low levels of job satisfaction in comparison to men. Evaluating the overall job satisfaction of employees can be very useful for employers. Job satisfaction research can help employers identify changes in satisfaction and help develop appropriate and effective solutions to address employee dissatisfaction.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the job satisfaction of men and women administrators in higher education in four-year public institutions in Alabama. The researchers examined whether there was a relationship between gender and overall job satisfaction, work climate, and job structure.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of administrators in higher education in four-year public institutions in Alabama?
2. To what extent are administrators in higher education institutions satisfied with their jobs in terms of (a) their present job duties, (b) pay, (c) opportunities for promotion, (d) supervision, (e) people with whom they work, and (f) the job in general?
3. What is the overall job satisfaction of administrators in higher education in four-year public institutions in Alabama?

4. To what extent are there differences in job satisfaction (work climate) of male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama?

5. To what extent are there differences in job satisfaction (job structure) of male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama?

### **Research Hypotheses**

1) The mean of administrator is equal to 27 which is the published neutral point on the Job in General and Job Descriptive scales for (a) present job duties, (b) pay, (c) opportunities for promotion, (d) supervision, (e) people with whom they work, and (f) the job in general.

2) There is no statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama.

3) There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction (work climate) between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama.

4) There is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction (job structure) between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama.

### **Method**

This was a survey research study to identify the overall job satisfaction of administrators in higher education in the four-year public institutions in Alabama. The dependent variables were components of job satisfaction, work climate and job structure as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) surveys. The independent variable was gender.

## **Sampling and Data Collection**

The administrators used in this study are from the following four-year public institutions in the State of Alabama: Auburn University, Auburn University Montgomery, University of Alabama Huntsville, and University of South Alabama. Administrators currently employed in positions at the selected institutions as Provost, Assistant or Associate Provost, Dean, Assistant or Associate Dean, or Department Head or Chair were identified from a current list of administrators provided by the website of each institution. Each administrator was contacted electronically requesting their participation. The data for this study yielded 36 Department Heads or Chairs, 16 Assistant or Associate Deans, three Deans, and one Assistant or Associate Provost. The total number of educational administrators in the data set was 56. The response rate was 26.4%. Data were collected in the spring of 2009.

Researchers electronically contacted each administrator, explaining the purpose of the study, a request for their participation, assurance that their involvement would be anonymous, and the link to the survey. The surveys were formatted for Internet delivery and hosted through SurveyMonkey.com, a web-based survey application (surveymonkey.com, 2009), using demographic questions, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) job satisfaction scales.

## **Instrumentation**

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG), surveys developed at Bowling Green State University, were used for this study (Balzer et al., 2000). The JDI measures five principal facets: work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, and people with whom you work on your present job. The JIG addresses workers' general feelings towards their jobs (Balzer et al.,

2000). JDI has 72 items and the JIG has 18 items. “Employees respond by marking a “Y” (yes), “N” (no), or#“?” (cannot decide) to each item” (Balzer et al., 2000, p. 12). There is minimal reading and it can be completed by anyone reading on a third grade level (Balzer et al., 2000).

Validity and reliability requirements were established for the JDI and JIG. The validation process for the JDI started in 1959 and lasted five years with four different studies. The results of these four studies demonstrated similarities (Smith, Smith, & Rollo, 1974). “The internal reliability estimates for each subscale of the 1997 JDI and the JIG were calculated from the approximately 1600 cases of the national norm data” (Balzer et al., 2000, p. 43). “A random sampling procedure, stratified by state population, was used to obtain a representative sample of the U.S. work force in the spring and summer of 1996” (Balzer et al., 2000, p. 40). The internal reliability for the 1997 JDI, using Cronbach’s alpha, for each subscale is as follows: work (0.90), Pay (0.86), Opportunities for promotion (0.87), supervision (0.91), Co-workers (0.91), and the convergent validity is 0.49 to 0.70 (Balzer, et al., 2000; Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek & Frings-Dresen, 2003). Internal reliability for the JIG, using Cronbach’s alpha, is 0.92 and the convergent validity is 0.66 to 0.80. (Balzer, et al., 2000).

Researchers developed items to collect demographic information on race, age, marital status, education level, salary, and job title. There were seven sections on the survey: (1) demographic, (2) work on present job, (3) pay, (4) opportunities for promotion, (5) supervision, (6) people on your present job, and (7) job in general with a combined total of 98 items.

### **Method of Procedure**

Descriptive data such as percents and frequencies were calculated from the demographic section of the instrument. A one-sample t test was used to test the first null hypothesis. The first null

hypothesis was that the population mean is equal to 27. Twenty seven is the published neutral point on the JDI and JIG, for (a) present job duties, (b) pay, (c) opportunities for promotion, (d) supervision, (e) people with whom they work, and (f) the job in general. The neutral point of 27, was set by the developers of the JIG and JDI scales.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was used to test the second null hypothesis. The second null hypothesis was that there is no statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama. The third null hypothesis was that there is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction (work climate) between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was used to test the third null hypothesis. The fourth null hypothesis was there is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction (job structure) between male and female administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was also used to test the fourth null hypothesis.

The on-line survey was closed to participants after the deadline set by the researcher. The data collected were downloaded from the on-line survey in the SurveyMonkey account into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, coded, and entered into a spreadsheet for statistical analysis in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), release 17.0. The original data from the on-line survey were continually maintained throughout the study at SurveyMonkey.com. This information could not be traced to any of the participants.

## **Results**

### **Research Question 1**

Demographic characteristics for all administrators used in this study were summarized in terms of gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, education level, years of administrator experience, job title, and current salary. The total number of administrators used in this study was 56. The majority of the administrators in the sample were male (66.1%), and white (89.1%). Thirty-nine percent of the sample was 60 years of age or older and 85.7% was married. The highest degree held by the sample was the doctorate (98.2%). The majority of the sample were department heads or chairs and had 4 – 6 years of administrative experience. Seventy-nine percent of the sample reported earning a salary of \$100,000 or more. Table 1 shows the frequencies and percents of the demographic information for all administrators.

Table 1  
Frequencies and Percents of Administrators' Demographic Information

Variable	Frequency	Percent
<u>Gender</u>		
Female	19	33.9
Male	37	66.1
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
African American/Black	1	1.8
Asian/Asian American	1	1.8
Hispanic/Latino	3	5.5
Native American/American Indian	0	0.0
White/Caucasian	49	89.1
Other	1	1.8
<u>Age</u>		
30 or under	0	0.0
31 to 39	0	0.0

40 to 49	11	19.6
50 to 59	26	46.4
60 or older	19	33.9
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single, never married	4	7.1
Married	48	85.7
Separated	1	1.8
Divorced	3	5.4
Widowed	0	0.0
<u>Highest Education Level</u>		
Bachelor	0	0.0
Masters	1	1.8
Education Specialist	0	0.0
Doctorate	54	98.2
<u>Administrator Experience</u>		
3 years or less	5	8.9
4 to 6 years	19	33.9
7 to 11 years	12	21.4
12 to 15 years	6	10.7
16 years or more	14	25.0
<u>Job Title</u>		
Department Head/Chair	36	64.3
Assistant/Associate Dean	16	28.6
Dean	3	5.4
Assistant/Associate Provost	1	1.8
Provost	0	0.0
<u>Salary</u>		
\$40,000 to 59,999	0	0.0
\$60,000 to 74,999	3	5.4
\$75,000 to 99,999	8	14.3
\$100,000 or more	45	80.4

---

## Research Question 2

The mean values for (a) present job duties, (b) pay, (c) opportunities for promotion, and (d) supervision all exceeded the test value of 27, indicating that on these variables administrator job satisfaction is greater than the neutral point of 27. The neutral point of 27 was derived from the

possible range of scores (0-54) on each of the scales. However, for the variables people with whom they work, and job in general, the administrators expressed less than favorable satisfaction. For the variables people with whom they work and the job in general, mean values were 25.73 and 20.96 respectively.

Results of the first research question (a) showed that the sample mean of 43.75 for the present job duties variable (SD = 7.80) was statistically different from 27,  $t(54) = 15.92$ ,  $p < .01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis that the population mean was equal to 27 was rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference of the means for the present job duties variable ranged from 14.64 to 18.85. Cohen's  $d$  effect size statistic was 2.1, which indicates a very large effect. The results support the conclusion that administrator job satisfaction was positive in terms of their present job duties.

Results of the first research question (b) showed that the sample mean of 80.04 for the (b) pay variable (SD = 24.31) was statistically different from 27,  $t(54) = 16.18$ ,  $p < .01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis which states the population mean was equal to 27 was rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for difference in the mean of the pay variable ranged from 46.46 to 59.61. Cohen's  $d$  effect size was 2.2, which indicates a very large effect. The results support the conclusion that administrator job satisfaction was positive in terms of their pay.

Results of the first research question (c) revealed that the sample mean of 36.30 for the (c) opportunities for promotion variable (SD = 25.58) was statistically different from 27,  $t(53) = 2.67$ ,  $p = .01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis which states the population mean is equal to 27 was rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the mean of the opportunities for promotion variable ranged from 2.31 to 16.28. Cohen's  $d$  effect size was .36,

which indicates a moderate effect size. The results support the conclusion that administrator job satisfaction was positive in terms of their opportunities for promotion.

Results of the first research question (d) revealed that the sample mean of 44.75 for the (d) supervision variable ( $SD = 8.67$ ) was statistically different from 27,  $t(54) = 14.84$ ,  $p < .01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis which states the population mean is equal to 27 was rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the mean of the supervision variable ranged from 15.35 to 20.14. Cohen's  $d$  effect size was 2.0, which indicates a very large effect size. The results support the conclusion that administrator job satisfaction was positive in terms of their supervision.

Results of the first research question (e) showed that the sample mean of 25.73 for the (e) people with whom they work variable ( $SD = 6.06$ ) was not statistically different from 27,  $t(54) = -1.56$ ,  $p = .13$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis which states the population mean is equal to 27 was not rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference between the means for the people with whom they work variable ranged from -2.91 to .36. Cohen's  $d$  effect size was .21, which indicates a small effect size. The results do not support that administrator job satisfaction was positive in terms of the people with whom they work. In other words, the people with whom they work variable has a slightly negative effect on administrator job satisfaction.

Results of the first research question (f) revealed that the sample mean of 20.96 for the (f) job in general variable ( $SD = 6.40$ ) was statistically different from 27,  $t(54) = -6.99$ ,  $p < .01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that the population mean is equal to 27 was rejected at the .05 level. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the mean of the job in general variable ranged from -7.77 to -4.31. Cohen's  $d$  effect size was .94, which indicated a large effect.

In other words, the job in general variable had a large negative effect on administrator job satisfaction. This means that the results do not support the conclusion that administrator job satisfaction is positive in terms of their job in general.

The descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation (SD), median, minimum and maximum score, and range, is presented in Table 2 for each variable.

Table 2  
Summary of Descriptive Data for Each Variable

Variable	Mean	SD	Median	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Range
<u>Present job duties</u>						
Female	45.16	8.04	48.00	19	54	35
Males	43.11	7.76	45.00	18	54	36
<u>Pay</u>						
Female	81.16	24.48	86.00	36	108	72
Male	80.00	24.68	84.00	24	108	84
<u>Opportunities for Promotion</u>						
Female	27.05	18.14	24.00	0	72	72
Male	41.31	27.79	36.00	4	108	104
<u>Supervision</u>						
Female	41.16	10.20	45.00	25	54	29
Male	46.43	7.56	48.00	24	54	30
<u>Coworkers</u>						
Female	25.47	3.45	24.00	21	33	12
Male	25.83	7.20	24.00	9	51	42
<u>Job in General</u>						
Female	20.95	6.86	21.00	8	30	22
Male	20.97	6.34	22.00	6	30	24

### Research Question 3

The null hypothesis was tested using the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. The F value for the one-way analysis of variance for overall job satisfaction was  $F(1, 54) = .00$ ,  $p = .99$ . This value was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states there is no statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction between male and female administrators was retained. Descriptive data regarding the variable overall job satisfaction such as frequency distributions, mean scores, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores, are presented in Table 3. Results of the one-way ANOVA for overall job satisfaction are presented in Table 4.

Table 3  
Descriptive Results for Overall Job Satisfaction

Variable	Female (N = 19)	Male (N = 36)
<u>Overall Job Satisfaction</u>		
Mean	20.95	20.97
Standard Deviation (SD)	6.86	6.25
Minimum Score	8	6
Maximum Score	30	30
<u>Overall Job Satisfaction</u>		
95% Confidence Interval for Mean		
Lower Bound	17.64	18.86
Upper Bound	24.25	23.09

#### Research Question 4

The F value for the one-way analysis of variance for work climate of female and male administrators was  $F(1, 54) = 3.47$ ,  $p = .07$ . When we look at the means in Table 5, we see that

satisfaction with work climate is higher for males than for females, although not statistically significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis which state there is no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction (work climate) between male and female administrators was retained. Descriptive data regarding the variable work climate such as frequency distributions, mean scores, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores, are presented in Table 5. Results of the one-way ANOVA for work climate are presented in Table 6.

Table 4  
Descriptive results for Work climate

Variable	Female (N = 19)	Male (N = 36)
<u>Work climate</u>		
Mean	66.63	72.50
Standard Deviation(SD)	11.53	10.89
Minimum Score	49	48
Maximum Score	84	105
95% Confidence Interval for Mean		
Lower Bound	17.64	18.86
Upper Bound	24.25	23.09

### Research Question 5

The F value for the one-way analysis of variance for job structure of female and male administrators was  $F(1, 53) = .10, p = .32$ . This value was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated there is no statistically significant difference in

job satisfaction (job structure) between male and female administrators was retained. Descriptive data regarding the variable job structure such as frequency distributions, mean scores, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores, are presented in Table 7. Results of the one-way ANOVA are presented in Table 8.

Table 5  
Descriptive results for Job Structure

Variable	Female (N = 19)	Male (N = 35)
<u>Job Structure</u>		
Mean	153.37	164.43
Standard Deviation(SD)	34.17	41.08
Minimum Score	90	82
Maximum Score	231	270
95% Confidence Interval for Mean		
Lower Bound	136.90	150.32
Upper Bound	169.84	178.54

### Limitations & Implications

The findings of this research study were base entirely on administrators who were currently employed as educational administrators in public four-year colleges and universities located in the State of Alabama. The results must be interpreted with caution for three primary reasons. First, for the purpose of this study, ‘administrator’ was defined as an individual mainly in a

nonteaching, decision-making, supervising, and general management function. Therefore, there may have been administrators included in this study that did not perform these duties exactly as their title suggested. Second, the population for this study was limited to administrators employed in professional education positions such as Provost, Assistant or Associate Provost, Dean, Assistant or Associate Dean, or Department Head or Chair. Third, the results may not be representative of administrators at other universities since the sample for this study was obtained from only four public universities in southeastern United States. Despite these limitations, this study provides information that may be useful in job satisfaction research, enhance program planning and improvement, and student recruitment and retention.

The results of this study suggest several implications. First, the results of this study imply that the low representation of women in administration positions in higher education may be that more men apply for and are hired in administrative positions than women. More men may be promoted to administrative positions than women. Overall, men and women administrators in higher educational institutions are satisfied with their jobs. When women are employed in these positions, the work climate appears to be equitable to that of their male counterparts. Therefore, one could assume that women are treated equally by their supervisors and co-workers. In addition, the job structure appears to be equitable for men and women. Furthermore, the results of this study imply that the work on the present job, job duties, pay, and opportunities for promotion are equal for men and women.

### **Conclusions**

To the extent that the data collected in this study were valid and reliable and the assumptions of the study were appropriate and correct, the following conclusions may be made. Based on the

results of this study, it may be concluded that there are more Caucasians and males in administrator positions in higher education institutions in the State of Alabama. Specifically, Caucasians represented 89.1% of the administrative sample surveyed. Males represented 66.1% of the sample. Previous research by Kuk and Donovan (2004), Reisser and Zurfluh (1987), and Twombly and Rosser (2002) has also reported that males outnumber females in senior administrative positions in institutions of higher education.

The results of this study also indicated that there is no difference in overall job satisfaction among female and male administrators in higher education institutions in Alabama that participated in this study. When comparing the means of the males (20.97) and females (20.95) the overall level of satisfaction is similar. The means of males and females administrators as it relates to their work climate are slightly different. The results suggested that males are more satisfied with their work climate than that of females. These findings concur with the literature (Fields, 2000; Fraser & Hodge, 2000; Lacy & Barry, 1997; Zurfluh & Reisser, 1990) that males tend to be more satisfied than females with most aspects of their job such as supervision, and people on present job. On the other hand, the satisfaction level in this study was not statistically significantly different between the two groups. At the same time, the results also indicated that the male and female administrators' satisfaction level is not statistically significantly different as it relates to job structure. When comparing the means, the results suggested that the male administrators are more satisfied with the job structure than the female administrators. These findings also concur with the literature (Fields, 2000; Fraser & Hodge, 2000; Hagedorn, 1998; Lacy & Barry, 1997) that males are more satisfied than females as it relates to pay, opportunities for promotion, and present duties.

## References

- Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., et al. (2000). Users' manual for the job descriptive index (JDI; 1997 version) and the job in general scales. In J. M. Stanton and C. D. Crossley (Eds.), *Electronic resources for the JDI and JIG*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Chieffo, A. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. *Community College Review, 19*(2), 15-24.
- Duncan, J. C. (2006). Relationship between demographic characteristics and current level of job satisfaction among north carolina state agency rehabilitation counselors. Unpublished Thesis, Auburn University.
- Fields, C. (2000). Faculty survey indicates overall satisfaction, room for improvement. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 17*(20), 38.
- Finley, R. (2009). SurveyMonkey.com. Portland, Oregon, USA
- Fraser, J., & Hodge, M. (2000). Job Satisfaction in higher education: Examining gender in professional work settings. *Sociology Inquiry, 70*(2), 172-187.
- Gredler, M. E. (2005). Lev s. vygotsky's cultural-historical theory of psychological development. In *Learning and instruction: Theory into practice* (pp. 304-340). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (1998). Implications to postsecondary faculty of alternative calculation methods of gender-based wage differentials. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(2), 143-162.

- Iiacqua, J. A., Schumacher, P., & Li, H. C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education, 116*(1), 51-62.
- Kuk, L., & Donovan, J. (2004). Women in higher education revisited: Intergenerational Conversations [Electronic verison]. *Journal of Student Affairs, 13*, 1-10. Retrieved February 15, 2008 from [http://www.sahe.colostate.edu/Data/Sites/1/documents/journal/Journal2003\\_2004vol13/Women\\_highered.pdf](http://www.sahe.colostate.edu/Data/Sites/1/documents/journal/Journal2003_2004vol13/Women_highered.pdf).
- Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 305-322.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Luthans, F. (1994). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: The Viking Press.
- McFarlin, D. B., Coster, E. A., Rice, R. W., & Cooper, A. T. (1995). Facet importance and job satisfaction: Another look at the range-of-affect hypothesis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 16*(4), 489-502.
- Milosheff, E. (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community College. *Community College Review, 18*(1), 12.

- Reisser, L. J., & Zurfluh, L. A. (1987). Female administrators: Moving up, or moving out? *Journal of the National Association of Women Dean, Administrators, and Counselors*, 50(4), 22-29.
- Rhodes, C., Hollinshead, A., & Nevill, A. (2007). Changing times, changing lives: A new look at job satisfaction in two university schools of education located in the english west midlands. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 12(1), 71-79.
- Roethlisberger, Fritz J.; Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smerek, R., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250.
- Smith, P.C., Smith, O. W., & Rollo, J. (1974). Factor structure for blacks and whites of the job descriptive index and its discriminations of job satisfaction among three groups of subjects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(1), 99-100.
- Talbert-Hersi, D. E. (1994). The impact of chronic job stressors and work support on job satisfaction for women in higher education: A communication climate study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Howard University.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259-293.

- Thomas, B. W. (1987). "Gender differences in job satisfaction of men and women Administrators in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Twombly, S. B. & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Women administrators: Overview. In A. M. Martínez Alemán, & K. A. Renn, (Eds.) *Women in higher education: An encyclopedia* (pp. 459-465). Santa Barbara: ABC CLIO.
- van Saane, N. V., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. A. M. & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). *Occupational Medicine*, 53(3), 191-200.
- Volkwein, J.F., Malik, S. M., & Napierski-Pranel, M. (1998). Administrative satisfaction and the regulatory climate at public universities. *Research in Higher Education* 39(1), 43-63.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Parmley, K. (2000). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1), 95-116.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(3), 149-171.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Zurfluh, L. A., & Reisser, L. (1990, January). *A Comparison of Sources of Dissatisfaction among Male and Female Administrators*. Paper presented at the International Conference for Women in Higher Education, El Paso, TX.