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ABSTRACT

Attitudes are involved in every aspect of an organizational life. Employees have attitudes about hundreds of things, including their pay, promotion opportunities, their supervisors, top management, the work they do, and their co-workers. An attitude is a hypothetical construct; it is not real and it cannot be touched, seen, etc, thus it has to be inferred by what an individual says or does. The comprehensive and productive way of analyzing how sport management faculty feel about their job is through the use of attitude surveys. Some of the most important attitudes within any organization are attitudes related to job satisfaction. High job satisfaction contributes to job involvement, organizational commitment, greater quality of life and improved mental and physical health. However, job dissatisfaction contributes to turnover, absenteeism, labor grievances, labor problems, attempts to organize labor unions and a negative organizational climate.

There is a dearth of empirical investigation within the field of sport management addressing job satisfaction. The purpose of this study was to determine sport management faculty members’ job satisfaction using the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale. Since this study was exploratory, all of the sport management faculty within the United States were chosen. Utilizing Cawley’s (2000) list of sport management programs in the U.S., a survey was mailed to 234 sport management faculty which also included a demographic section. There were 171 usable surveys, yielding a 73% return rate. A t-test was used to determine mean differences between institution type, gender and tenure status and satisfaction of job in general; institution type, gender and tenure status and pay satisfaction; institution type, gender and tenure status and promotion satisfaction.

Differences were found between the following: institution type concerning satisfaction of job in general, \( t = -3.339, (p = .001) \); male and female faculty concerning satisfaction of job in general, \( t = -3.407, (p = .001) \); tenure and non-tenured concerning satisfaction of job in general, \( t = 635, (p = .526) \); male and female faculty and pay satisfaction, \( t = 2.895, (p = .004) \); institution type and pay satisfaction, \( t = 4.641, (p = .000) \); tenure and non-tenured concerning pay satisfaction, \( t = 1.245, p = .215 \); institution type
concerning promotion satisfaction, \( t=-1.575, (p=.117) \); male and female faculty concerning promotion satisfaction, \( t=-.435, (p=.665) \); tenure and non-tenured concerning promotion satisfaction, \( t=1.029, (p=.305) \). The findings of this study would help sport management as a field to examine its strengths and weaknesses; as well as understand the faculty and their level of satisfaction of job in general, pay satisfaction and promotion satisfaction. Future studies are recommended for investigating the other facets of the Job Descriptive Index (i.e. supervisors, co-workers and work itself) and sport management faculty. It is also recommended for an international study of sport management faculty and their level of pay and promotion satisfaction.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study will examine the overall job satisfaction of selected sport management faculty members throughout the United States of America. This study is also designed to elucidate various factors that may contribute to job satisfaction of self-reporting sport management faculty members. This study is an exploration of the recent and quickly expanding field of sport management and the pressures those faculty may endure on a daily basis.

First, job satisfaction will be defined; its components and relevance to the study will be examined. Secondly, the researcher will investigate sport management as an emerging field of study. Academicians in sport management are urging an increase in empirical research and dissemination of knowledge (Olafson, 1990; Parks, 1992; Zakrajsek, 1993). This field is nebulous in many aspects; in particular, there were no studies found pertaining to faculty job satisfaction in sport management refereed journals and non-refereed periodicals or trade magazines.

The majority of the literature for this study was obtained from various fields of study pertaining to college faculty members and their level of job satisfaction. This study will be of the first to systematically explore the level of job satisfaction of sport management faculty members.

Each person has attitudes on many different topics, such as politics, education and work. When exploring the level of job satisfaction of sport management faculty members, it is important to understand what are work-related attitudes. Work attitudes are “A collection of feelings, beliefs, and thoughts about how to behave, that people currently hold about their jobs and organizations” (George & Jones, 1996, p.66). There are two basic components of work related attitudes: organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This study will focus on the latter; job satisfaction.

Many theorists have defined job satisfaction. Hellriegel, Slocum, & Woodman (1998) defined job satisfaction as “the general attitude toward work or toward a job”
Ivancevich & Matteson (1990) defined job satisfaction as “an attitude that individuals have about their job” (p.81). However, this research will utilize a more in-depth definition offered by Wagner & Hollenbeck (1992) which defines job satisfaction as a “pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of one’s important job values” (p.244).

Job satisfaction is important not only to behavioral scientists, but also to managers and administrators. Some of the most important attitudes within any organization are attitudes related to job satisfaction. “Jobs require interaction with coworkers and bosses, following organizational rules and policies, meeting performance standards, living with working conditions that are often less than ideal, and the like” (Robbins, 1996, p.190). Cherrington (1989) believed that managers for many years have been concerned about the job satisfaction of their employees. Managers believe that high job satisfaction contributes to job involvement, organizational commitment, greater quality of life and improved mental and physical health. However, job dissatisfaction contributes to turnover, absenteeism, labor grievances, labor problems, attempts to organize labor unions and a negative organizational climate. Job satisfaction according to Wagner & Hollenbeck (1992) is “a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of one’s important job values” (p.244).

Cherrington (1989) explains that research on job satisfaction has produced two approaches that allow us to understand it: component satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. The component satisfaction is often referred to as attitudes toward things. This approach assumes that job satisfaction consists of many different attitudes about various components of the job. “Therefore, employees have specific attitudes about their pay, their supervisors, the reports they have to complete, the cafeteria, and dozens of other external objects called referents” (Cherrington, 1989, p.306). The overall satisfaction approach treats job satisfaction as a general internal state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction within the individual. “Positive experiences, as a result of friendly coworkers, good pay, helpful supervisors, and attractive jobs, create a positive internal state” (Cherrington, 1989, p.306). “Negative experiences that stem from low pay, boring jobs, and criticism create a negative internal state” (Cherrington, 1989, p.306).
According to Robbins (1996) there are four primary factors that determine job satisfaction. The first factor is for employees to have mentally challenging work. Employees generally enjoy jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities, as well as offering a variety of tasks, feedback and freedom. Jobs that have too little challenge will often create boredom. However jobs that are too challenging will create frustration and feelings of failure. The second determinant of job satisfaction is equitable rewards. “Employees want pay systems and promotion policies that they perceive as being just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations” (Robbins, 1996, p.192). When employees believe their pay is fair based upon job demands, community pay standards and individual skill level, they are likely to feel satisfied; the same is true for promotion standards. The third determinant of job satisfaction is supportive working conditions. Employees prefer working environments that are safe and comfortable, not dangerous. This comfort level may include issues such as lighting, temperature, noise and other environmental factors. Many employees in addition, prefer to work close to home with adequate tools to perform their tasks. The last determinant of job satisfaction is supportive colleagues. For many employees, work fulfills the need for social interactions. “Not surprisingly, therefore, having friendly and supportive coworkers leads to increased job satisfaction” (Robbins, 1996, p.192).

Developing a measurement for job satisfaction has been important to behavioral scientists and managers in order to assess the effects of organizational change. “Measuring job satisfaction is important to managers because satisfaction is viewed as important indicator of organizational effectiveness” (Cherrington, 1989, p.308). Job satisfaction exists only inside of an individual’s head and therefore cannot be measured as with height or weight. The most common methods for measuring job satisfaction include interviews, observations and written surveys. Since observations and interviews are time consuming, the most popular method is written surveys. The most popular instrument to measure job satisfaction is the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) which measures pay, promotion, work itself, supervision and coworkers (Cherrington, 1989; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990; Wagner & Hollenback, 1992). This instrument is further discussed in the method section of this proposal.
The Field of Sport Management

“Sport management has existed since the time of the ancient Greeks, when combat among gladiators or animals attracted crowds of spectators” (Parkhouse, 1996, p.4). Mullin (1980) defined sport management as “planning, organizing, leading, and evaluating within the context of an organization with the primary objective providing sport- or fitness-related activities, products and/or services” (p.5). A decade later, DeSensi, Kelley, Blanton, and Beitel (1990) defined sport management as “any combination of skills related to planning, organizations, directing, controlling, budgeting, leading, and evaluating within the context of an organization or department whose primary product or service is related to sport and/or physical activity” (p.33).

The sport industry is rapidly growing. The sport industry includes everything from licensing revenues to exercise videos. By 1995, the GNSP or gross national sport product had climbed to $151,964 billion making the sports industry the eleventh largest industry in the United States; above insurance carriers and food products and just below telephone and telegraph communication (Meek, 1997).

The job opportunities are vast (Jackson & Pederson, 2000); professionals in the field of sport are now seeing the importance of hiring someone with a degree in sport management (Pitts & Stotlar, 1996). There is every reason to expect that the sport industry will continue to prosper throughout the decade.

Two professional sport management associations in North America, the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) and the National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) have monitored the rapid growth in this field. Although the field itself is relatively new in academe, its acceptance as a legitimate area of study is documented by many in over twenty years of publications (Hardy, 1987; Parkhouse and Ulrich, 1979; Parks and Zanger, 1990; van der Smissen, 1984).

According to Parkhouse (1996) the first sport management program was established at Ohio University in 1966. By 1980, twenty colleges and universities in the United States offered graduate programs in sport management. By 1985 the number had
grown to 85 programs and in 1993, NASPE reported that there were 201 sport management programs, including six doctoral level programs (Parkhouse, 1996) nationally and internationally.

Sport management faculty members are unique in that sport management is consistently striving to gain recognition and credence from other academic disciplines. Academicians in Sport Management are often urging for the increase in the body of literature and empirical studies (Parks, 1992; Zakrajsek, 1993). There are very few journals devoted to this field and much of the research uses theoretical and/or conceptual frameworks from other more established fields such as psychology, sociology, business administration, and human resource management.

Those of us in sport management-administrators, faculty and students alike-have chosen not to walk that well-worn calf path. Instead, we have made a path of our own. We freely acknowledge that we share commonalities with other areas within the academy, but we also insist that we have our own unique characteristics and contributions that set us apart from them (Parks, 1992, p.221).

Because of the growing number of sport management programs, increasing enrollments, and professional culpability, the need for quality control through systematic assessment warrants continued support and action. Sport management should not fall victim to the same plight of some other subdisciplines, for which the market is inundated with excesses of employment seekers whose preparation runs gamut of inferior to superior (Zakrajsek, 1993, p. 5).

According to Zakrajsek (1993) the rise of the sport culture within the last two decades created numerous specialized personnel needs. “The cultivation of a sports-minded public through media and promotional activities, the advanced development of sport organizations and sport enterprise, and a lifestyle attuned to more discretionary time and disposable income shaped the conditions for a sport ethos and a multibillion dollar industry.” (Zakrajsek, 1993, p.2).
Sport, leisure and fitness management will account for a substantial portion of the academic productivity over the next two decades. Zakrajsek (1993) stated that without an organized body of knowledge in research, sport management would stagger within the academic community. “Although most of us agree that sport management is an applied profession, it is still incumbent upon us to meet the standards of a profession that calls for more than the application of specialized knowledge” (Zakrajsek, 1993, p.4).

According to Olafson (1990) there is a strong need for quantitative empirical research. “Although concern for the lack of empirically based research and for the types of methodologies continues, few if any sport management articles have quantified the extent of such criticism” (p.103). Zakrajsek (1993) strongly urged our professionals to research and create a strong body of literature that will substantiate who we are and where we are going. “Our continuing preoccupation with sport, its resiliency, its bureaucratic infrastructure, and its commercial interests guarantee the future of sport, a future unfortunately controlled and determined mostly from outside the arena of doers and viewers” (p.3).

Because of the lack of extensive body of knowledge unique to our field, our academic colleagues in areas such as exercise psychology, sport psychology and sport sociology tend to think less of us. Some of them may even take on a patronizing attitude toward us. They forget that a few years ago they were ridiculed for lack of specialization, sophistication, and a body of knowledge that they could call their own. But we have to acknowledge that at this juncture they are ahead of us (Chelladurai, 1992, p.216).

Slack (1991) offered several suggestions for the future of sport management. First, it would be beneficial for academicians in sport management to obtain teaching experience in a business school. “This type of experience would be beneficial because it would force us to go back and reexamine some of the central work related to our particular area of the field of management; it would also help us develop contacts with
faculty members in broader field of management” (Slack, 1991, p.97).

Secondly, Slack (1991) suggested sport management academicians should attend and present at conferences in other areas of study. Furthermore, Slack (1991) contends this will allow sport management academicians to receive feedback from other scholars; in addition to being able to publish in expanded journals areas.

In addition, Slack (1991) suggested increasing research within this area. Sport management research is lacking in theory. The author contends that there are some exceptions, but they are few and far between.

Faculty members in sport management have to keep up with the expansion of this demanding field. This includes establishing the field as a credible profession with its own conceptual and theoretical frameworks, as well as producing and organizing a body of knowledge. These issues differentiate sport management from other, more established fields of study, such as psychology, counselor education and others.

**Conceptual Framework**

Various researchers have summarized a collection of concepts pertaining to attitude. The conceptual framework that drives this study is a collection of those concepts on attitudes. Attitudes are involved in every aspect of an organizational life. “Employees have attitudes about hundreds of things, including their pay, their supervisors, top management, the work they do, and their coworkers” (Cherrington, 1989, p.290). Robbins (1992) defined attitudes as “evaluative statements or judgements concerning objects, people or events” (p.180). An attitude is a hypothetical construct; it is not real and it cannot be touched, seen, etc. Attitudes only exist because we define it and it is inferred by what an individual says or does. When investigating attitudes, it is important to note, that attitudes and values are interrelated, however, they are not the same. Values contain a judgmental element that carries an individual’s ideas about what is right or wrong, good or bad. Values lay the foundation for the understanding of attitudes and motivation; as well as influence our perceptions. In contrast, attitudes are
Cherrington (1989) states that learning about attitudes is important for four reasons. The first reason is that attitude influences behavior. For many years administrators and managers have assumed that a happy worker was a more productive worker. They believed that by increasing job satisfaction, productivity would increase. However, research has proven this to not be as simple as it seems. “The relationship appears to be a reciprocal interaction in which attitudes and behavior influence each other, and managers need to understand this interaction” (Cherrington, 1989, p.290). The second reason for studying attitudes is for humanitarian reasons. Creating a positive work environment is worthwhile, regardless of productivity. The third reason for studying attitudes explains that many organizations are designed to create positive attitudes, such as career counseling, job enrichment and leadership training. The final reason for studying attitudes concludes that they are an important component in many organizational theories, especially theories of motivation.

There are three components of an attitude: cognition, affect and behavior (Robbins, 1996). The first component is the cognitive component, which is the opinion and it sets the stage for the more critical part of an attitude. The affective component of an attitude is the emotional or feelings of an attitude. Lastly, the behavioral component of an attitude is an intention to behave in a certain way toward someone or something (Robbins, 1996). The following page (Figure 1) is a model of the three components of an attitude:

Robbins (1996) stated that an individual can have thousands of attitudes, however in reference to organizational behavior, there are three job-related attitudes. The first is job satisfaction; which is an individual’s general attitude towards his/her job. The second is job involvement, which measures the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his/her job and perceives his/her performance important to self-worth. The last attitude is organizational commitment. Organizational commitment refers to an employee’s identification with a particular organization and its goals and wants to maintain membership in the organization (Robbins, 1996).
The Three Components of Attitudes

Stimuli:
Work environment factors

\[\text{Job Design} \atop \text{managerial style} \atop \text{company policies} \atop \text{technology salary} \atop \text{fringe benefits}\]

Cognition
Beliefs and values
“My supervisor is unfair”
“Having a fair supervisor is important to me”

Affect
Feelings and emotions
“I don’t like my supervisor”

Behavior
Intended behavior
“I’m going to request a transfer”

Figure 1
According to Cherrington (1989) individuals may have specific attitudes toward particular objects within an organization; these are attitude objects. The objects include physical objects such as places, people, and things, etc. and nonphysical objects such as beliefs and ideas. “Some of the most relevant attitude objects in the study of organizational behavior are those associated with the job, such as the job itself, pay, working conditions, supervision and one’s co-workers” (Cherrington, 1989, p.291). According to Cherrington (1989), the aforementioned objects are what comprise job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

After analyzing what is an attitude, it is important to understand how are attitudes formed and changed. Attitudes are formed when affective feelings are attached to belief. These feelings are associated with personal values and they indicate what is important and desirable and overall what we feel good about. There are three types of beliefs: observational beliefs, inferential beliefs and external information. The observational beliefs are formed on the basis of an individual’s own observations. The inferential beliefs are logical connections that are made from certain events or thoughts (Cherrington, 1989). “For example, if we think salary is associated with status, we infer that our supervisor earns more than we do” (Cherrington, 1989, p.292). However, inferences are not always correct, although one may feel secure about the inference. “A person’s beliefs need to be internally consistent. Inconsistent beliefs create a state of tension that motivates us to correct the inconsistency” (Cherrington, 1989, p.292). The third source of beliefs comes from external information. These are beliefs that are acquired from external sources. These sources include people, newspapers, television, etc. The beliefs that we acquire through our own observations tend to be more resistant to change. The beliefs that are acquired through inferences and external sources may also be stable and resistant to change if they are part of a mutually reinforcing cluster of other beliefs (Cherrington, 1989).

There are times when managers want to change an employee’s attitude. It is pertinent to remember that attitudes are often resistant to change. “Attitude change can involve the addition, removal, or modification of either the beliefs or the affective
components” (Cherrington, 1989, p.293). According to Cherrington (1989) the four most popular methods of changing attitudes are providing new information, fear arousal and reduction, dissonance arousal and reduction and participating in a group discussion. Providing new information is the most popular method for changing attitudes. The effectiveness of this method depends on whether the individual perceives the source of the new information credible or believable. The second method of changing an attitude is fear arousal and reduction. Mild fear increases the likelihood of attitude change. However, intense fear (threats, punishments) tend to reduce the probability of attitude change. “Apparently, the presence of moderate fear causes individuals to be more attentive and willing to change their attitudes, while extreme conditions of fear causes them to completely ignore or reject the fear message” (Cherrington, 1989, p.294). The third most popular method for changing attitudes is dissonance arousal and reduction. When people behave in a way that is inconsistent with their beliefs or attitudes then they tend to develop tension and the need to reduce tension. The key to this method is to develop cognitive consistency. Participation in a group discussion, which is the final most popular way to change an attitude, is very effective in that it allows for individuals to see others in the same position, make a similar change. “Furthermore, when individuals participate in a group discussion, they are forced to come to a decision point and publicly commit themselves to change” (Cherrington, 1989, p.294).

Since job satisfaction is defined as an individual’s general attitude toward his or her job, it is important to understand attitudes and how they affect an individual’s work environment. This research is designed to analyze sport management faculty members in the U.S.A. and their attitudes toward specific aspects of their job (i.e., pay and promotion). The comprehensive and productive way of analyzing how sport management faculty feel about their job is through the use of attitude surveys. Attitude surveys are given to employees due to the fact that attitudes cannot be measured as with height or weight. Job satisfaction surveys are one type of attitude surveys that are most frequently used by managers to get information about employee attitudes and make critical decisions about their employees (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). This research will
utilize the Job Descriptive Index, which is an example of an attitude survey. This instrument is further discussed in the methods section.

**Statement of the Problem**

There is a dearth of empirical investigation within the field of sport management addressing job satisfaction. This new academic discipline being less than twenty years old is nebulous in many aspects of self-examination. There is a strong need for quantitative empirical research within this field (Olafson, 1990). Zakrajsek (1993) strongly urges our professionals to research and create a strong body of literature that will substantiate who we are and where we are going.

Sport Management academicians are often urging for the increase in the body of literature and empirical studies. There are very few journals devoted to our field and much of our research has used theoretical and conceptual frameworks from other more established fields. What is the overall job satisfaction of sport management faculty members? What is the relationship between the following variables: tenure status, type of institution and gender to job satisfaction? These questions have yet to be investigated within the refereed and non-refereed journals of sport management.

Consequently, there were no studies reported in the *Journal of Sport Management*, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, the *International Journal of Sport Management* or *Sport Marketing Quarterly* regarding sport management faculty and job satisfaction. This exploratory research shall be fundamental in the future literature in investigating the job satisfaction of sport management faculty members.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perception of job satisfaction among sport management faculty when classified by select demographic characteristics using the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) scale.
Research Questions

1. Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and overall job satisfaction?

2. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and overall job satisfaction?

3. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and overall job satisfaction?

4. Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and pay satisfaction?

5. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and pay satisfaction?

6. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and pay satisfaction?

7. Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and promotion satisfaction?

8. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction?

9. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>The level in which an individual is physically incapable of performing one’s job due to exhaustion from mental or physical means (Kelly, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>The extent to which one’s job meets the expectations or wishes of the individual (Herzberg, 1959).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>The driving force that propels or energizes behavior (Herzberg, 1959).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>A system of action by which teachers and other professional employees exert influence upon a policy (Seltzer, 1974).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>Simultaneous consciousness of more than one role expectation such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult (Pavelka, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>Individuals having a number of different roles in which there is a time overlap (Pavelka, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>A collective term that refers to all sporting activities (Parks, Zanger &amp; Quarterman, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport management</td>
<td>A broad concept that includes people, businesses, organizations involved in promoting, producing, facilitating sports (Pitts &amp; Stotlar, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>A complex phenomenon that upsets the overall balance of the body (Selye, 1956).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Limitations**

This study was limited to the following:

1. The questionnaire was used to gather appropriate data for the study; however, even though the instrument was developed to ensure objectivity, some bias was inevitable, and data interpretation was subject to the limitations associated with the use of such data-gathering techniques and methods.

2. There were uncontrollable factors associated with the research such as the researcher was not able to observe the environment in which the surveys were completed.

3. The population included all self-identified sport management faculty within the U.S.A. using the Street and Smith’s Sport Business Journal report. All sport management faculty in Canada was excluded as well as faculty within the state of Florida (The data from the faculty in Florida were used for the pilot study of this research).

4. The study was limited to those participants who were willing to respond.

5. The study was limited to responses to the questionnaire provided.

**Delimitations**

This study was delimited as follows:

1. This study was delimited to self-identified sport management faculty members within the U.S.A.

2. Responses were delimited to those faculty members willing to participate in this study.
Assumptions of the Study

It is assumed for this study, that:

1. All self-identified sport management faculty will complete all portions of the surveys
2. All respondents will answer surveys honestly and to the best of their ability.

Significance of the Study

The primary objective of this study was to contribute to the body of knowledge in sport management. Consequently, the rationale of this study was two pronged: (a) To assist in the development of the knowledge base of teaching sport management in the higher education enterprise, (b) To determine the job satisfaction of sport management faculty members overall. There is a need for an increase in the body of literature for sport management. Due to sport management’s short existence in the academic world, there is a thrust for new knowledge and empirical studies (Parks, 1992). Scientific studies as this, will contribute to this field. Upon an exhaustive search in Dissertation Abstract International, www.the floridastatesystem.edu, there was no research found within the field of sport management that addressed the job satisfaction of those faculty members. This study and other exploratory studies in the field of sport management may encourage others to create a conceptual framework that will better explain our unique field of study and in particular, job satisfaction. There are very few journals devoted to this field and much of the research uses theoretical and/or conceptual frameworks from other more established fields such as psychology, sociology, business administration, and human resource management. This study will hopefully encourage other researchers to conduct more studies on job satisfaction. Investigating job satisfaction of sport management faculty members will allow such faculty members to have written, non-experimental research that will substantiate their level of job satisfaction; whether its is a low or a high
level of job satisfaction. Zakrajsek (1993) strongly urges our professionals to research and create a strong body of literature that will substantiate who we are and where we are going. The intent of this research is to illuminate the overall job satisfaction of sport management faculty members within the U.S. This study was limited to sport management faculty members within the United States of America. Examining job satisfaction among sport management faculty members internationally would be important.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this review of related literature is multi-fold. First, the infrastructure of college teaching will be examined. Second, job satisfaction and its relation to motivation will be discussed. Third, job satisfaction in college teaching will be reviewed (i.e., gender, institution type, tenure status, race, etc.). Fourth, factors that may contribute to overall job satisfaction will be discussed. Finally, job satisfaction in sport management will be examined.

University Infrastructure

The university environment gives an overview of what is expected from a faculty member. It also describes the work setting of the university. An overview of this setting will provide a general foundation of the working environment that may cause job dissatisfaction among faculty members.

The cultural forces will promote distinct faculty behavior based upon the mission of the institution and department. Often non-tenure faculty will enter a social environment that commands correct interpretation of the cultural forces in order to flourish within the academy (Kovar & Overdorf, 1996).

Institutions that are stable provide the clearest understanding to faculty members with regards to tenure, responsibilities, and promotion. The more changes that occur within the university the more likely faculty members will receive conflicting views of the responsibilities and roles (Kovar & Overdorf, 1996). Faculty members are often expected to complete multiple tasks daily (Danylchuk, 1993). Failure to do so may result in failure to obtain tenure and student dissatisfaction. Many faculty members are expected to teach undergraduate and graduate level courses, publish articles in refereed journals according to university guidelines, assist master’s and doctoral level students in theses and dissertation preparations, maintain adequate office hours to assist students, join professional organizations and attend conferences for professional development.
Faculty members are often thought of as the central core of the university. Specifically, due to the fact that they have direct interaction with the university’s administration and with students.

Ideally, the university setting should operate as a co-operative setting. In this setting, the faculty members would be working together with the administration to accomplish the goals of the university. In co-operative settings, individuals view their goals as being positively connected with one another, assisting others reach their goals leads to accomplishing one’s own goals (Jordan & Mertesdorf, 1994). In a co-operative relationship, people strive for an outcome that is helpful to all whose goals are positively connected. Within a co-operative relationship, individuals openly discuss problems and accordingly influence each other. They often interchange information and spawn solutions that utilize a number of ideas. The co-operative goals have been known to relate to positive feelings, progression of tasks, efficiency, successful performance appraisal and interpersonal influence (Jordan & Mertesdorf, 1994).

Different schools and departments within a university have different needs that must be analyzed differently, particularly sport management. This relatively new field of study that is striving to gain recognition and credibility from other fields of study (Zakrajsek, 1993). There is an urgency to increase its body of literature and develop its own theoretical concepts (Olafson, 1990). The field of sport management has grown drastically providing for many job opportunities (Rosner, 1989). Sport management faculty members have to meet and prepare their students for this demand. In order to meet the need for a body of literature, sport management faculty must produce mass amounts of research (Zakrajsek, 1993), in addition to completing all tasks assigned by the university.
In order to determine the job satisfaction of sport management faculty members, it is important to define the setting of the American University System. An overview of this setting will provide a general foundation of the working environment that may cause job dissatisfaction among faculty members. In the American university system a description of compensation and job classification will be given.

Comprehension of compensation further elucidates the setting of the university environment. The goal of a compensation system is to align organizational and individual objectives. When determining compensation there must be balance between contributions made by the individual and rewards received from the government. In the case of faculty members there must be a contribution made by the faculty member and rewards received from the administration. The compensation method most used by universities will be examined. Figure B shows the determinants of pay.

Merit pay is the commonly used form of compensation within the educational setting. It has been used throughout the world as a means to motivate and raise the level of employee performance. Merit pay systems have also increased within physical education settings (Case, 1999).

It is important to note that merit pay is also described in non-monetary terms, such as job incentives and better working conditions. Nevertheless, merit pay is still compensation for recognition of levels of performance or achievements.

In physical education and sport settings within the departments of physical education, 69% use the merit plan and 46% of those who are not using the merit plan, are considering using one (Brynteson, Fratzke & Ernce, 1992).

Although many theories are used to explain the effects of merit pay and employee performance, expectancy theory has been widely used within the educational setting to better describe teacher performance and motivation. “Within the context of expectancy theory, it is postulated that in order to better motivate an employee and increase performance, rewards should be made contingent on reaching higher performance levels” (Case, 1999, p.69).

When determining the job satisfaction of faculty members Balzer, Kihm, Smith,
Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) the creators of the Job Descriptive Index, concluded that compensation was a major factor. There is a growing debate on whether merit pay is an effective way for compensating persons within the educational setting. Nonetheless, compensation is a motivating factor for employee performance and achievement.

It is pertinent to distinguish the expectations associated with job classifications of the university setting. Job classification is defined as “clusters of individual positions with similar characteristics that are organized in a group for classification purposes” (Berman, 2001, p.317). According to Berman, et al. (2001) there are three types of personnel strategies in the American public sectors. Selection is a core principal in each of these strategies and it equally affects the subsequent classification and management of positions. The three strategies are based on any of the following: seniority, merit and representativeness factors.

The American university system is based upon the merit strategy. It is often based upon technical qualifications and competitive selection as judged by experts. Under the merit strategy, there are two personnel strategies, rank-in-job and rank-in-person. Academic departments fall under this category and within the rank-in-person, promotions are prized and expected. “Rank-in-person emphasizes the development of incumbents over time, especially within the organizations and tends to lead to closed systems” (Berman et.al, 2001, p.133). Closed systems provide little to no opportunities for entry for those outside of the institution. For example, very often department chairs are chosen based upon time spent as a faculty member within an institution. On rare occasions, a faculty member is chosen for the position of department chair from another university. In this system, there is a “strong up-or-out philosophy” (Berman et.al, 2001, p.133). Those who do not get promoted may be eventually forced to leave the institution. Faculty members are expected to move up in rank, failure to do so may lead to job termination.

According to Fisher, Schoenfeldt & Shaw (1996) compensation produces the most dissatisfaction among employees within both the public and private sector. The
goal of a compensation system is to align organizational and individual objectives. When determining compensation there must be balance between contributions made by the individual and rewards received from the government. In the case of faculty members there must be a contribution made by the faculty member and rewards received from the administration. This concept is better known as “equity theory”. Equity provides the basis for most pay programs in the U.S.A.

**Motivation**

Job satisfaction is the extent to which ones job meets the expectations or wishes of the individual. Job satisfaction has been often presented in theories of motivation and productivity (Herzberg, 1959; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1992). Motivation is thought of as the driving force that propels or energizes behavior. Motivation gives direction to behavior and it underlies the tendency for actions to persist (Mayo & Jarvis, 1981). The basic principles and theories of motivation stems from psychologists such as Freud who believed that motivation stems from the id, unconscious forces and sexual stages, Adler and Jung believed that individuals are motivated most by striving for future goals. Horney believed people are motivated by anxiety, McDougall, believed that motivation arose by instincts, Skinner stated that motivation comes from the environment; and Maslow, stated that people are motivated as needs are fulfilled (Ray, 1992).

There are three primary factors of motivation: ability, effort and desire. Ability refers to a person’s capacity or ability to do something. Effort is described as the energy, time and drive a person expends pursuing an object. Desire is the want or urge for a particular object.

The literature on theories involving motivation (motivation theory) is rapidly growing due to the increased interest by leaders from all types of organizations in the realm of social psychology, such as internal commitment and motivation to work. When discussing motivation there are three major categories: content theory, process theory and reinforcement theory.
Content theories, such as those created by Maslow, deal with basic concepts of needs that begin, cause or stimulate behavior. Three theories will be discussed: Maslow, Herzberg and Alderfer.

Maslow Hierarchy of needs, which states that individuals are motivated by unmet needs, these needs are arranged in hierarchical order. In order for an individual to obtain self-actualization, lower needs would have to be met (Hodges & Kuratko, 1991).

Herzberg’s Motivation/Hygiene (two factor) Theory, conclude that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on the same continuum and are therefore not opposites. Motivational factors may cause satisfaction or no satisfaction, while the hygiene factors may cause dissatisfaction when absent and no dissatisfaction when present. Both of these have magnitudes of strength (Pardee, 1990).

Alderfer’s ERG Theory provided an extension of Herzberg and Maslow theories. Alderfer only uses three basic need categories: existence, relatedness and growth. The existence needs are relate to safety and survival. Relatedness needs promote interpersonal and social relationships. Finally, growth needs refer to an individual’s want or desire for personal development.

Process theories deal with understanding the reasoning behind choices of a particular behavior pattern to attain or accomplish work goals. Three theories will be discussed in this section: expectancy theory, equity theory and reinforcement theory.

“In contrast to content theories, process theories attempt to identify and explain how behavior is started, initiated, sustained, redirected, and terminated” (Hodges & Kuratko, 1991, p. 419). Expectancy theory is one of the process theories developed in 1964 by Victor Vroom. It was derived from the belief that content theories were not sufficient in explaining the complex process of work motivation. The theories are built on three concepts: valence, instrumentality and expectancy. Valence refers to strength of an individual’s preference for a specific outcome. If an individual has a positive valence, he or she prefers to attaining the outcome as opposed to not attaining the outcome. This valence will range from +1 to a –1. Instrumentality refers to the perceived probability
that a second level outcome will come after a first level outcome. This will range from 0 to +1. Expectancy is the probability that the effort will result in the accomplishment of a first level outcome. This will also range from 0 to +1.

Equity theory deals with the exchange relationships with groups and individuals. The theory holds essentially that people upon deciding whether they are being treated equitably, compare what they are giving to an organization to what they and others are getting from the organization. When a person, feels that in comparison to others that he or she is giving to the organization is equal to what they are receiving, then equity exists. However, when one side of the equation is larger than there is an imbalance. This theory is based upon inputs and outputs (Hodges & Kuratko, 1991).

The reinforcement theory of motivation, developed by Skinner, conclude that people are passive, merely mediating between forces, and that the study of human motivation should focus on observable and measurable behavior rather than needs or goals (Geering, 1980).

Vroom’s model (expectancy theory) is useful in explaining the differences in work motivation. It concludes that each individual has a unique combination of valences, instrumentalities and expectancies. The next section examines stress and role conflict and its relationship to motivation and job satisfaction.

In an attempt to motivate, distribute meaningful rewards or to help employees to cope with daily stress, managers must develop insight into abilities, skills, perception, attitudes and personality. Work attitudes have two dimensions: the first dimension is motivational factors, which may lead to job satisfaction, the second dimension is maintenance factors. Maintenance factors must be present and sufficient in order to permit motivational factors to exist. If it is not sufficiently present, this may lead to dissatisfaction. Consequently, the opposite of satisfaction is dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1959) maintains that it is not proper thinking that reducing the impact of dissatisfaction will enhance job satisfaction. The sources of dissatisfaction according to Metzler (1994) include: salary, fringe benefits, departmental policies, supervision, interpersonal relations
and other extrinsic work aspects. Herzberg (1959) contends that the origins of satisfaction are: achievement, recognition, advancement, growth and the challenge of work itself.

According to Rhoades (1990) faculty members play an increasingly important role in determining how universities behave and are organized. The researcher argues that faculty members have gained increased authority within the academy as a result of professionalization and specialization. “If we are to understand why universities behave the way they do, we must do more to understand faculty behavior and motivation” (Rhoades, 1990, p.189). Understanding motivation allows for administrators and managers to better analyze productivity, absenteeism and turnover.

There must be an adequate level of motivation in order for faculty members to successfully do their job. Motivation is thought of as the driving force that propels or energizes behavior. Motivation gives direction to behavior and it underlies the tendency for actions to persist (Delamare & Wright, 1997). It is described, as an individual phenomenon that is intentional and it involves direction arousal, persistence and is reflective in behavior (Turner, 1984).

Motivation can be classified as the push and pull effect. The push effect suggests that individuals are internally motivated. The push effect is also identified as being socio-psychological in nature. Conversely, the pull effect suggests that individuals are externally motivated. Employees must be motivated to complete all tasks required. This motivation must be a balance of internal and external factors. The faculty member must have the push of internal factors that makes the job enjoyable. Satisfaction from the push effect will occur when the faculty member’s internal expectations are congruent with the outcomes (Delamare & Wright, 1997). The external factors for faculty members would include tenure, enrollment, negotiation rights, departmental policies, fringe benefits, etc.

According to Nogradi & Montelpare (1991) motivation and job involvement, which is often used synonymously with intrinsic motivation, are key determinants of performance.
Expectancy theory had been used to determine job satisfaction and motivation in a wide range of research dating from 1974 to the present. Kopelman (1974) used the expectancy theory to predict work behavior in engineers in the U.S.A. The researcher found that expectancy theory was strengthened by factors such as time, level of rewards, initial level of criterion, and task specific ability.

Kelley & Protsik (1997) examined the Kentucky school-based performance award program in elementary and secondary schools. Teachers were motivated to enhance student performance, however, they were experiencing high levels of stress. The researchers found that the teachers experienced attitudes consistent with expectancy theory. The key factors involved with the research were merit pay, job performance, and incentives.

In a study investigating teacher improvement in junior faculty, Emery (1998) used expectancy theory to analyze areas of faculty interest. The areas of interest were importance of tenure criteria, interest in different instructional improvement practices, and expected outcomes from participating in improvement activities. The research also revealed that faculty members believed that research was more important than teaching.

Bess (1981) examined different theories that examined job satisfaction. The theories were reviewed and applied to university and college professors. The following theories were explored: expectancy theory, equity theory, need and need deficiency theory, job facets theory and two-factor theory. The researcher found that expectancy theory in particularly was useful in separating the contingencies that affect effort performance and performance reward. It was concluded that using expectancy theory employees were able to cognitively appraise their situations and adjustments. Any improvement of satisfaction would lie externally to the individual.

When using motivational theories to investigate job satisfaction, expectancy theory is often used (Blair, 1998; Clements & Lochia, 1982; Miskel, 1982). It provides an understanding of work behavior and achievement. It can also be used to determine student satisfaction. Lincoln (1983) used expectancy theory to predict student
satisfaction within a college environment, student participation at school and academic performance. The author used Vroom’s valence model to predict student satisfaction, the force model to predict student effort and the performance model to predict academic motivation. The results yielded those students who expended more effort into academic work and personal development activities felt a greater sense of satisfaction within the environment as opposed to students in a below average effort group.

**Public vs. Private Institutions**

One of the demographic variables that will be examined in the research investigates the job satisfaction of faculty within the public versus private institutions. There are many differences between public and private sectors, whether discussing organizations or institutions. Perry & Rainey (1988) cite the origins of the word “public” to its Latin roots which means people, referring more specifically to issues pertaining to people of a nation, community or state. The word “private” derives from Latin meaning set apart or deprived, as in being set apart or deprived from public office or government. Perry & Rainey (1988) state that public and private vary among at least three dimensions: (a) the first dimension is interest, which determines whether losses or benefits are restricted to individuals or communal, (b) the second is access (openness of resources, information or facilities), (c) and last is agency, which pertains to whether an organization or person is acting as an agent for the community as a whole or individual.

Perry & Rainey (1988) critiqued comparative literature on the differences between public and private sectors. The researchers state that attention to public and private sectors have increased. There is an increase in the number of studies published on the public administration and management literature. The reasons for this increase the researchers conclude have implications for managerial techniques and merit pay systems.

However, Solomon (1986) states that the private and public distinction is not a clear-cut dichotomy. The differences are primarily based upon ownership and funding. Solomon (1986) did an empirical study on public and private sector managers. The researcher focused on perceptions and satisfaction of 240 top managers in Israel. The
researcher theorized that differences in satisfaction between the two sectors would be associated with differences between the two sectors in conditions that affect satisfaction and motivation. According to Solomon (1986) motivation theories attribute the origins of satisfaction to conditions in the work environment. “Literature on achievement motivation, on goal setting, and the expectancy theories of motivation suggest that challenge, clear goals, feedback, and rewards contingent on performance contribute to positive motivational states and satisfaction” (Solomon, 1986, p.248). The researcher also cites role ambiguity and role stress is a major source for stress and dissatisfaction. The researcher found from the study that there were similarities in studies that highlighted public and private differences in Israel and the United States. The largest differences found between the two sectors were with regards to reward systems. There were higher satisfaction with rewards within the private sector than with the public. “Conversely, rewards represented the area of greatest dissatisfaction among service organizations of the public sector” (Solomon, 1986, p.248).

Mech (1997) investigated the managerial roles of chief academic officers. The researcher found it pertinent to discuss institutional characteristics in order to determine their roles. “When examining CAO’s managerial roles, it is important to have an understanding of the organization in which they work (Mech, 1997, p.286). The study utilized 239 public universities and 110 private universities. Mech (1997) found significant differences between public and private universities. The private institutions were found to be older, less complex, more affluent, had fewer faculty, less enrollment and were less likely to have faculty collective bargaining than the public institutions. Mech (1997) also investigated personal characteristics. The researcher found that women had significantly less time in their current position and had less managerial experience. The women were significantly less affluent than their male counterparts.

In an analysis of factors that affect job satisfaction of public high school business teachers in Ohio, Lacy (1968) found that the factors contributing to job satisfaction were:
community environment, fringe benefits, salary and school administrators. The researchers made the suggestion that teacher educators should provide time in their business curriculum for courses in human relations.

**Occupational Stressors**

Burnout refers to the level in which an individual is physically incapable of performing one’s job due to exhaustion from mental or physical means. According to Kelly (1994) burnout is a multidimensional syndrome. It often affects those working in helping professions. Burnout is a consequence of prolonged and consistent (ongoing) stress. Stress can be perceived as a mismatch between the perceived demand of a situation and one’s perceived capabilities and the resources for meeting those demands (Lazarus, 1990; Smith, 1986).

What are some of the stressors that faculty endure? Cohen (1978) describes stressors as “events in the environment that require greater than usual adaptative responses from the body” (p.617). Stress is a contributing factor in burnout.

Danylchuk (1993) performed a study to determine occupational stressors in physical education faculties. Danylchuk (1993) states that “Occupational stress and its negative consequences result from the interaction between the environmental stressors at work and the characteristics of the person” (p.7). This interaction may cause an individual to deviate from his/her normal daily functioning, which causes stress (Beer & Newman, 1978). It is believed that the most frequent stressors come from “role conflict and role ambiguity” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.7). The Stress Diagnostic Survey (SDS) is used to identify specific stressors associated with specific professions. The SDS has multi-dimensions (17) and it is a self-report inventory. There are two types of organizational stressors (macrostressors and microstressors). Macrostressors include politics (stress created because politics rather than performance affect organizational decisions), human resource development (stress due to lack of training and development opportunities), rewards (stress created by the lack of relationship, etc. Microstressors include role ambiguity (stress created because an individual does not clearly understand what is
expected on the job), role conflict (stress created because an individual is presented with conflicting demands or an unclear chain of command), etc. (Danylchuk, 1993). The purpose of the study was to identify “the environmental stressors that contribute to stress in university physical education faculty. A secondary purpose was to determine which personal characteristics – sex, age, marital status, family status, years of work experience in higher education, and type of appointment (coaching or non-coaching, tenures or non-tenured) are correlates of stress” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.9). The study looked at full-time faculty of Physical Education/Kinesiology departments in 17 Ontario universities. The study showed that overall faculty perceived that the macrostressors were greater sources of stress than microstressors. Many university faculties are operating under macrostressors, which may lead to role ambiguity and role conflict.

There may also be stress associated with accreditation. “The NASPE-NASSM accreditation fosters the attainment and maintenance of excellence in undergraduate and graduate education for sport management” (NASPE-NASSM Joint Task Force on Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation, 1993, p. 160). To obtain accreditation a university must follow the guidelines developed by NASPE-NASSM. “The NASPE-NASSM curriculum standards have been developed to meet the contemporary needs of the sport industry so that students studying sport management have the educational background to function effectively within a sport management setting (NASPE-NASSM Joint Task Force on Sport Management Curriculum and Accreditation, 1993, p. 160). According to NASPE-NASSM a faculty workload may include teaching sport management, administration of the sport management program, research in sport management, doctoral advising, and supervision of sport management practice and internships.

In another study by Danylchuk (1993), the focus was on the presence of occupational burnout and its correlates in university physical education personnel. “Burnout purportedly occurs most often among individuals engaged in the human services or helping professions, possibly because of the ‘stress associated with the social interaction between helper and recipient’” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.107). Danylchuk (1993)
goes on to state that “Numerous occupational factors are associated with burnout; however, individual or organizational factors alone” (p.108).

The purpose of the study was to “examine the prevalence of burnout and the factors relating to burnout in Physical Education/Kinesiology faculty and staff members in Ontario universities” and secondly “to examine the relationships between the degree of stress (in terms of job stressors and job attitudes) and burnout” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.109).

Danylchuk (1993) administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory Form Ed (MBI) a self-reported instrument designed to measure burnout. “High scores for emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and low scores for personal accomplishment reflect high burnout” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.110). The study found that (relating to the effects of tenure status) was significant, indicating that tenure status had a significant effect on emotional exhaustion. The study also showed that three particular macrostressors contributed greatly to emotional exhaustion: work flow, politics and rewards; all of which reflect the relationship between faculty members, student enrollment and multiple tasks.

According to Danylchuk (1993) there are two conclusions that can be drawn from this study:

First, it appears that the stressors that were related to the individual’s job (microstressors) were more significant predictors of emotional exhaustion, whereas the stressors that were related to the general work environment of the organization (macrostressors) were more significant predictors of depersonalization. (Quantitative overload, job scope, and time pressure all refer to an individual” work load and time deadlines, whereas organization structure and human resource development refer to the operation of the organization itself. Also, these results indicate that other factors account for the remaining variance in both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

Secondly, job satisfaction appears to be an important contributor to all three dimensions of burnout, whereas satisfaction with job performance over a period of time is also an important contributor to an individual’s feelings of personal accomplishment (p. 56).
In an international study, teachers in Hong Kong were surveyed to determine factors that lead to stress, burnout and job satisfaction. Tang & Yeung (1999) found that teacher stress resulted from: students behavior and attitudes, supervisors and inspectors, curriculum, non teaching duties, time constraints and work output and lack of recognition for teaching and administrative tasks. All six-stress items resulted in burnout. The biggest stressor was teacher workload. The research also concluded that students had a huge impact on job satisfaction.

According to Herman, McArt and Belle (1993), many faculty members are leaving the profession due to job stress and a high level of burnout. The authors list the reasons faculty members leave the teaching profession completely:

1. limited prospects and possibilities of advancement
2. lack of flexibility and challenge
3. disenchantment with students and teaching
4. money and general conditions of employment
5. not enough faculty involved in decision making
6. insufficient sources (neglected and outdated equipment) (p.245).

A factor that is found to contribute to job stress, burnout and dissatisfaction is tenure. In a study by Danylchuk (1993) to determine the burnout levels of physical education personnel, the researcher found that tenure status had a significant effect on emotional exhaustion. The researcher did not find the results surprising, when considering the expectations and pressure placed on non-tenure faculty that are trying to obtain tenure status. “The pressure of tenure is omnipresent and may contribute to emotional exhaustion” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.116). Danylchuk (1993) continues to state, “Job satisfaction appears to be an important contributor to all three dimensions of burnout, whereas satisfaction with job performance over a period of time is also an important contributor to an individual’s feelings of personal accomplishments” (Danylchuk, 1993, p.117).
Dissatisfaction

Sergiovanni (1966) found that factors reported by teachers as contributing to their job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction were polar in a positive direction and others polar in a negative direction. The factors contributing to job satisfaction primarily had to do with work itself, such as achievement, responsibility and recognition. The factors contributing to job dissatisfaction tended to focus on conditions of work, such as peers, supervision, school policy and administration, status, subordinates and unfairness.

Using Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction, Satterlee (1988) investigated the job satisfaction of engineering and industrial technology faculty at Delgado Community College. The questionnaire was completed by 26 faculty members. The results concluded that the faculty members were overall satisfied with their jobs. However, some aspects of the job that were perceived as dissatisfying were: opportunities for promotion in rank, top management, pay and job securities.

Cavenar (1987) investigated the job satisfaction and retention of faculty members in research university schools of nursing. The sample was drawn from universities that offered doctoral level programs. The research model included variables such as: school reputation, geographic location, salary, tenure and caliber of students. The research found that faculty members who have high communication activity tend to have low ambiguity, which in turn results in high job satisfaction. The author concluded that low role ambiguity decreases job dissatisfaction and that there was a higher retention rate. Role ambiguity is decreased by external and active professional communication.

Ferrara (1998) studied the current state of autonomy and job satisfaction within U.S.A. higher education institutions. Traditionally according to the author, autonomy was seen as a privilege or inherent benefit extended to worthy faculty members. Consequently, any administrative innovations that change or threaten the faculty member’s perceived autonomy on the job have resulted in reduced morale and overall job dissatisfaction. The researcher makes three recommendations for educational policy: autonomy and belonging, hiring and tenure, and technological training needs.

Using Herzberg’s theory on job satisfaction, Diener (1984) investigated job satisfaction and college faculty. The researcher primarily explored attitudes toward
work, job stress, overall job satisfaction and chief job satisfactions and dissatisfactions. Specifically, attention was given to work demands (class load, research opportunities), working conditions (such as class size, adequate facilities), and appreciation and rewards (salaries, recognition of good teaching). The researchers found that working conditions that enhance the life and work of a faculty member, autonomy and flexible schedule, were highly valued. Poor facilities, heavy teaching loads, lack of recognition, low salaries; student and colleague apathy caused dissatisfaction.

**Part Time vs. Full Time**

In an exploration of the job satisfaction of American part-time college faculty, Antony & Valadez (1998) studied 31,354 part time and full time faculty members. The study analyzed fifteen items grouped into three categories associated with job satisfaction: satisfaction with personal autonomy, satisfaction with students, and satisfaction with demands and rewards. The results showed that part-time faculty were statistically less satisfied than full time faculty in terms of students and autonomy. However, they were equally satisfied with demands and rewards. It was also found that part time faculty were more satisfied than full time faculty with their jobs overall. Faculty members at two year institutions were more likely than part time faculty at four year institutions to value tenure enough to leave their present positions to achieve tenure. They were also more research oriented than part time faculty at four-year institutions.

**Teaching Experience**

Teaching experience may also affect job satisfaction. Klecker (1997) studied teacher satisfaction across six categories. The teaching experience ranged from three years of teaching to twenty-six years. The researcher measured job satisfaction by salary and fringe benefits, level of professional/personal challenge, opportunities for professional advancement, level of professional autonomy/ decision making authority, general work conditions, interactions with colleagues and interactions with students. The researcher found that all of the ratings of job satisfaction were positive. There were
statistical differences by years of teaching experience in ratings with salary, interaction with students and general work conditions. It was also found that teachers rated interaction with students highest and general working conditions lowest. The researcher found no differences in job satisfaction after five years of teaching across all six categories.

Job performance and job satisfaction of beginning teachers was investigated by Pigge & Lovett (1985). The study sought to determine whether job satisfaction varied among first year teachers in elementary, secondary, specialized and special education teaching fields. The researchers used the Johnson Scale of Job Satisfaction. The evaluations of job performance were determined by the first year teachers themselves, their students, their supervisors, and the Bowling Green State University faculty who went on-site and observed the teaching personally. The authors suggested that in order to increase job satisfaction there should be a grade level induction committee or organized building with one or more experienced teachers available.

Bode & Menges (1997) investigated the feedback seeking behaviors of faculty members in their third year of employment at five colleges and universities. The results indicated that that faculty members at two-year institutions sought feedback more frequently, reported more credence and satisfaction with feedback from students and colleagues and reported more job satisfaction and less academic stress than faculty members at four-year universities. Male faculty members at four-year institutions reported more credence given to feedback from students and colleagues. They also reported less stress than females. The faculty members with less/ minimal teaching experience reported more feedback from students; faculty members with extensive experience reported more feedback from colleagues and greater satisfaction with feedback from chairpersons.

**Gender Differences**

Are there differences in job satisfaction between men and women? Hill (1983) examined factors affecting job satisfaction of academic women. The researcher studied 752 male and 195 female faculty at Pennsylvania colleges and universities. Using a 45-
item inventory, the following components were identified as factors contributing to job satisfaction: convenience, teaching, associational, administrative, economic and recognitional support. The results yielded little differences on job satisfaction and the sexes. However, the researchers did find that job dissatisfaction was higher among younger faculty members, faculty members with low academic rank and those who teach in the fields of humanities, social and behavioral sciences.

Tack & Patitiu (1992) also studied gender differences. The researcher examined the impact of gender, perceived female isolation and beliefs in traditional roles for women on job satisfaction. The researcher states that previous research has given conflicting results in investigations of gender differences. A survey measuring job satisfaction, beliefs about roles for women, and perceptions of female isolation from power acquisition situations was given to 1,578 employees at a large corporation. The results indicated that the most satisfied group was the traditionally oriented females, who did not perceive isolation, while the least satisfied group was the nontraditionally oriented women who did perceive isolation. The research indicated that sex differences in job satisfaction exist. However, orientation, which is person centered did not seem to have as much impact as gender and isolation.

Minorities and Job Satisfaction

Race differences may attribute to job satisfaction. Patitu & Tack (1991) examined the job satisfaction of African American faculty in higher education in the South and the decline of African American faculty members. Twenty-eight four-year state assisted institutions in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation region. There were thirteen African American and fifteen White institutions that participated in the study. The Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale was used to determine the levels of job satisfaction. Overall there were 355 respondents involved in the survey. The findings were that gender, salary, and rank affected satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for African American faculty. African
Americans at White institutions were more satisfied with opportunities for promotion than their counterparts at predominantly African American institutions. Faculty salaries were competitive at both types of institutions and finally, only a few African Americans were found to have tenure or were on tenure track.

Barclay (1981) researched the job satisfaction of minorities and women. According to the authors, there are faculty shortages and there is a need for diverse college faculty. Institutions must make faculty positions attractive to minorities and women. The current trends were low salaries, few women and minorities in the American university system. In general women are less satisfied than their male counterparts. The stressors include internal workplace and lifestyle factors. Women represent a small percentage of faculty cohort, make less salaries, are found in lower academic ranks, are often employed part time, work in less prestigious institutions, are not tenured and feel that their supervisors do not value their work. The researchers suggest that in order to increase job satisfaction, there must be a variety of recruiting and retention strategies.

**Job Turnover**

Knapp (1993) examined the prediction of military turnover using intentions, satisfaction and performance. Using 5,706 participants, the researcher found that job satisfaction heightened predictive power beyond intention. The results also indicated that lower levels of job satisfaction and job performance indicate a higher probability of attrition for three and four year enlistments.

Hanish & Hulin (1991) conclude that job satisfaction can cause turnover. They also examined turnover and younger employees. Younger employees have higher turnover rates than older employees. The examiners attribute the high turnover of younger people to tenure, job performance, commitment and family responsibilities.

Price (1977) also attributes turnover to job satisfaction along with job performance, pay promotion opportunities, supervision, co-workers, job training, work-group type, communications, supervisor-employee relations, confidence in management,
security of job, status and recognition, effectiveness of administration and identification with the organization.

Youngblood, Mobley & Meglino (1983) found that job satisfaction declined prior to turnover behavior. They concluded that the important dimensions of job satisfaction include work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision and co-workers.

In a study investigating attitudes toward monetary incentives, intrinsic job satisfaction and voluntary turnover, Tang & Li-Na (1996) used a rating scale to measure demographic variables that included age, education, gender, tenure, annual income to measure attitude towards money and intrinsic job satisfaction and turnover. The researchers found that employees with high money ethic endorsement had a negative and non-significant relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and turnover. Employees with low money ethic endorsement and low intrinsic job satisfaction tend to have the lowest turnover. The researchers predict that this is because these people burnout, withdraw psychologically and therefore eventually develop an indifferent attitude.

Berns (1990) explored the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher turnover of practicing and former vocational teachers in Northwest Ohio. There were 745 practicing teachers and 116 former teachers who participated in the survey. The researchers found that there were nine factors that were identified in turnover: school support, public perception, self-perception, job challenge, job satisfaction, effort, status, expectation and job effectiveness.

Nogradi, Yardley, & Kanters (1993) utilized the job characteristics theory, which analyzed the enrichment and the resultant motivating potential of jobs. The resultant motivating potential is determined by core job dimensions. These core dimensions galvanize three psychological states in individuals: a sense of personal responsibility, experience meaningfulness and knowledge of the actual work results. The authors state that employees who experience this are more likely to be satisfied. They will are more willing to apply effort toward task accomplishment and will flourish at work.

Nogradi, et al. (1993) assert that job satisfaction includes appraisal of one’s job or job experience. This appraisal involves comparing what the individual expects to what the individual gets in terms of different aspects of the job.
When referring to faculty job satisfaction, compensation can be grouped into five categories: educational level, gender, age and tenure. Certain job characteristics such as pay level, benefit coverage, last pay raise, cost of benefit to employee, perceived requirement of skill, autonomy and responsibility is noted to influence compensation satisfaction. According to Nogradi, et. al. (1993) pay satisfaction occurs when the expected amount matches the actual amount. If the expected amount is greater than the actual amount, than the faculty member feels underpaid and overworked. However, if the actual amount is greater than the perceived amount, this connoted as overpayment. The faculty member feels guilty, discomfort or inequity with the situation.

**Negotiation**

A problem facing many university faculty members is policy-making. Faculty members do not have negotiation rights when it comes to making decisions concerning the welfare of the university. There is often a drift between university administrators and university faculty members.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) defined the term professional negotiations as “a process by which teachers and other professional employees exert ‘formal deliberate influence’ upon educational policy…it is an orderly step toward democratic school administration” (Seltzer, 1974, p.84). Seltzer (1974) goes on to state:

> The problem of authority in colleges is often a conflict between faculty versus administrators. The faculties promote self-government, academic freedom, and equality of relations among colleagues while de-emphasizing administrative hierarchy. The administrators promote efficiency and effective utilization of men and money (p.84).

According to Locke (1995) administrators attract new faculty members with offers of tenure, rank, salary, equipment, space, staff, space and time. “This last attractor is defined most commonly as time not required for instructing undergraduates” (Locke, 1995, p.513). Thus preferred professors are given the resources needed to complete
research and publish. Publishing creates a positive image for the institution. A positive image generates more external funding for the university. This attracts more productive professors and better academically performing students. “Prestige, it is argued, is the fuel that drives the engine of institutional growth (and growth, one may observe, keeps the administration secure and safe from public question)” (Locke, 1995, p.513).

Often the advice is given to new assistant professors, to stay away from faculty committees and never get involved in applied service projects. Applied service projects may often take away time from generating publications that will insure tenure.

“Negotiation has to do with power, the use of power, and the distribution of power” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.64). The capacity of universities and colleges to achieve its missions is inextricably connected to the organizational relationships between faculty and administrators. Essential to those relations is the allocation of power. Power can be narrowly distributed (autocratic) or broadly distributed (democratic). “The empirical literature of several social science disciplines is replete with evidence that successful performance of job-related tasks and job satisfaction are associated with sharing power and decision making within organizations” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.64). Essentially, with the respect to allocation or distribution of power, the social relationships within an organization are a major determinant in how faculty members feel about their work environment as well as the accomplishments of tasks for the organization. Within the corporate sect, social relationships during the past century can be delineated by centralized hierarchical control, with those in higher positions (management) displaying dogmatic and authoritarian behavior. Orders and directions are given from management to staff. It is definitely clear who has power and who does not. “In a sense, although American society is a political democracy, it is, at the same time, an economic dictatorship” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.64). Many universities have adopted the corporate model for effective management. “First, there is the overwhelming hegemony of capitalist enterprise in American society” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.64). Secondly, many administrators have no formal training in administrative positions; therefore they embrace the only model they know.
Negotiation is simply arriving at a cooperative agreement or willingly agreeing to jointly agree on something. Negotiation. Takes place whenever there is conferring or interaction between people and whenever someone is trying to persuade someone else. The academic community certainly an appropriate place for the process of negotiation. Successful negotiation in higher education represents professionally determined decisions between professionals who have both joint and conflicting interests or points of view. Negotiation is a cooperative process that attempts to produce more freedom, more professional autonomy, and more self-respect for faculty while making colleges and universities more democratically constituted (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.66).

The process of negotiation should be a continuing process between the administration and faculty in higher education. According to Massengale & Sage (1995) faculty members are intelligent and highly capable of contributing to the decision making process in higher education. “No one has greater stake or greater investment in an academic community than the faculty” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.66). Administrators at all levels may come and go, as do students, but the nucleus of faculty members remain working at the institution. Faculty members make a professional commitment to the college or university and devote their careers to the institution. They should not be excluded from decisions that affect their career and the reputation of the institution.

In order for negotiations to be effective, there should be a code of conduct and conditions that must exist. First, negotiations between a group of faculty members or an individual faculty member and the administration should never be secret. There should be no covert or private deals made. All faculty members should have the right to know all agreements and outcomes made. Failure to do so will result in a loss of trust. Second, any decision made should be made on proper and sound reason. Third, the administration should be willing to publicly defend all decisions made as well as the staff. If either party cannot make good and sound decisions with honorable intentions, they should not negotiate any agreements (Massengale & Sage, 1995).

Negotiation if done effectively and fair, can strengthen the professional work relationship. It will also improve communication within the organization.
“Administration activities are likely to become more consistent and predictable because shared governance forces administrators to avoid ad hoc decision making. They must consider faculty responses in the negotiating process and the cost of potential grievances and/or litigation” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.67).

It is common for faculty and administrators to negotiate such items as salary, academic rank, date of employment, multiyear appointments, courses to be taught, the development of specific courses, advising expectations, committee responsibility, scholarly expectations such as publications and research (Massengale & Sage, 1995). In 1948 the American Association of University Professors realized that collective bargaining was an effective negotiation process that allowed them to obtain their objectives such as academic freedom, the strengthening of shared governance, unbiased policies for grievance resolution, etc. The National Education Association (NEA) also promotes collective bargaining in higher education for the purpose of tenure, academic freedom, academic due process, and academic self-governance. According to Massengale & Sage (1995) many faculty members have a basic distrust of administration. This mistrust is caused by job insecurity, administration arrogance, lack of appreciation and recognition and unfavorable faculty comparisons. The NEA (1992) reported that institutions that have collective bargaining have salaries 13% higher than institutions that do not have collective bargaining (Massengale & Sage, 1995).

Having a faculty union may also affect job satisfaction. Dallinger & Beveridge (1993) surveyed faculty members at a mid-western university about their job satisfaction and the influence of the faculty union. There were 203 respondents to the mailed survey questionnaire. The results revealed that were generally more satisfied with union influence on non-monetary issues of their job than union influence on monetary issues. Faculty members overall appeared to be satisfied with their union representation.

It has been difficult to access the success of collective bargaining in departments of physical education due to lack of research pertaining to negotiations in physical education at any level and no national organization has taken a clear stand on collective bargaining. Bosco (1987) identified four factors that hinder negotiation in physical
education in higher education: (1) little political or social consciousness systems of negotiation, collective bargaining, and shared governance, (2) professors in physical education are often antiunion and tend to associate with administration, (3) physical education professors view themselves as self-made individuals who do not need the protection of institutional processes, (4) physical education professors do not feel comfortable and view themselves as unequal with faculty members of other disciplines (Massengale & Sage, 1995). “Although, departments of physical education have fallen victim to a market value perspective in terms of new hires, start-up funding, salary differential, and workload, the negotiation process should remain the same for all faculty members, regardless of specialization” (Massengale & Sage, 1995, p.73).

Within the university community, we now have new mixes of student backgrounds and needs. “The old formulae and pedagogy, which may have served a more homogeneous generation of students now have long graduated, have become more clearly inadequate” (Locke, 1995, p.518). It has become clear that there is a need for a more diverse professorate that will resemble the diverse student cohort.

Faculty participation is sorely needed. Without faculty participation “faculty members, no matter what their competence or rank, are reduced to the ignominious role of cows producing milk under the conditions provided for them. However good, however bad, yet with the quality of their products in large part determined by those very conditions” (Lahti, 1966, p.9). Many faculty members however, believe that their ideas and participation contribute very little to the decision making process. There are those who promote strong faculty participation insist that it aids at maintaining a “reliable academic faculty, single most valuable resources of a college or university” (Seltzer, 1974, p.84).

“Today, however, faculty members are voicing the need to assume a more activist role in structuring the goals, objectives, and incentives related to professional development and curricular change” (McMeen & Bowman, 1984, p.14).

However, administrators have a different view of faculty and policy-making. Administrators maintain that faculty members are too concerned with promoting their
own discipline instead of the overall general welfare of the university. Corson (1960) lists the following four factors as those that limit significantly the capacity of a faculty member to make clear cut, progressive and efficient educational decisions:

(1) Only a few institutions accumulate and have regularly available analytical data about the capacity of applicants for admission and about class size, course proliferation, and faculty work load to facilitate decision-making.

(2) Only a minority among most faculties have thought deeply and analytically about educational programs, teaching methods, or factors influencing instructional costs. Most faculty members are subject-matter specialists; few are educators in a comprehensive sense.

(3) Much educational policy is formulated in bits and pieces, by the approval of a new course, the modification of a requirement for completion of a curriculum or the alteration of an admission requirement. These bits and pieces seldom force comprehensive consideration of the educational program of prevailing practice.

(4) Faculty members tend to resist proposals that, in their opinion, might encroach on the established preserves of each subject-matter discipline (Colson, 1966, p.104).

It is often stated or believed by many administrators that many faculty “would rather cut non-teaching duties to a minimum and concentrate on their teaching and research role” (Seltzer, 1974, p.85). Others believe that faculties “are usually most interested in educational policy questions, courses, curriculums, degrees, academic standards, entrance requirements, and in faculty personnel policy questions” (Newburn, 1964, p. 263). Mills and Hyle (1999) outline the role of the faculties as: “research, teaching and service” (p. 352).
It is important to create an effective form of communication between faculty and administrators. Seltzer (1974) suggests forming a faculty council or faculty senate. Faculty members believe that if they do not have the negotiating rights they need, they maintain that the administration will inundate them with students, for which they do not have the capacity to teach or have quality individual faculty-student interaction.

The state of Florida is unique in that it has a collective bargaining unit that ensures faculty representation for negotiation capabilities. The United Faculty of Florida (2001) promotes high standards of academic excellence while faculty members are protected and have the right to voice any and all concerns pertaining to employment.

The intent of the parties hereto in carrying out their responsibilities to negotiate the terms and conditions of employment of members of the bargaining unit is to promote the quality and effectiveness of education in the State University System and to maintain high standards of academic Excellence in all phases of instruction, research, and service. The parties concur that these objectives are facilitated by amicable adjustment of matters of mutual interest. It is recognized by the parties that mutual benefits are to be derived from continual improvement in the State University System, and that participation of faculty and professional employees in the formulation of policies under which they provide their services is educationally sound (UFF, 2001, pg.1).

“Collegially in academic governance on each campus of the State University System can best be accomplished through Senates selected by representatives of the appropriate campus constituencies in accordance with each institution’s constitution and tradition” (UFF, 2001, p.1). Concerns such as curriculum policy, requirements for degrees and granting degrees, policies on recruiting, admission and retention of students, grading matters and other matters of traditional concern may be brought before the senate by members, the president and representatives (UFF, 2001).

The articles to the UFF constitution are specifically designed to address issues pertaining to faculty negotiation, such as consultation, recognition, privileges, reserved
rights, academic freedom and responsibilities, nondiscrimination, minutes, rules and budgets, appointment, assignment of responsibilities, employee performance evaluations, benefits, salaries, inventions and work, leaves, non-reappointment, disciplinary actions, evaluation file, promotion procedure, tenure and permanent status, layoff and recall, sabbaticals, conflict of interest grievance and procedure and arbitration (UFF, 2001).

Factors that are particularly relevant to this research are tenure, promotion and salary. In Article 14, promotions will be made based upon annual performance evaluations, potential for growth, scholarly contribution and meritorious performance. Promotion must be a written request beginning with the second year of employment. Recommendations should begin with the employee’s supervisor and submitted to the appropriate officials (UFF, 2001).

In the case of tenure, consideration is normally considered during the sixth year of continuous service. Tenure may be granted to employees with the rank of associate professor, assistant professor, professor and any other employee that the board designates. The criteria for tenure include: annual performance evaluations, needs of the department, college and university, contributions of the employee to the employee’s academic unit, and contributions the employee is expected to make to the institution (UFF, 2001).

Employees are provided with a faculty pay plan provided by the board. From June 30, 2001, there is a three percent salary increase annually on the base salary of the employee. There are also faculty performance incentives and promotion increases (UFF, 2001).

Enrollment

Unlimited enrollment affects the faculty-student interaction and student learning. Although there is interaction between student and administrator, it is miniscule compared to the interaction between student and faculty.

Smith (1976) suggests that on college campuses there exist three behavioral exchanges between three groups: students, administrators and faculty. “The ongoing attempt to make faculty-student interaction a classroom phenomenon has been stressed
and institutionalized by universities partly because it provides a comfortable way of handling many of the strains and demands arising with respect to university life” (Smith, 1976, p.27). This interaction allows for the student to measure his/her performance and determine his/her standing of credentials for graduation and future job placements. The faculty-student interaction has been proven to be the most crucial interaction at the university level. “Faculty-student dialogs about issues relating to changes in thinking, feeling, and behaving which have influence, not only on the future actions of the student in some job, but on the total growth and development of the student as an individual” (Smith, 1976, p.27). “Faculty-student interaction is and can be related to four types of activities: the gathering and evaluating of information, the dissemination of information, the making of decisions affecting the university, and the development of personal relationships” (Smith, 1976, p.27).

Since this relation is crucial at a college or university setting, an influx of students hinders the time the professor has with each individual. Students then feel that they are not individuals with personal career goals, but one of many whom gets shifted in the crowd. “Many students believe that it is their right to solicit and receive help, guidance, or other involvements from instructors of various courses in which they are enrolled. Undoubtedly instructors vary considerably in the time in which they have available for students outside the classroom as well as in their inclinations to interact with students on a one to one basis” (Bausell & Magoon, 1976, p.53).

According to Craig, Faye & Bean (1989) found that autonomous and creative nature of academic work itself, perceptions of participation in administrative decision making, perceptions of the fairness of administrative evaluation, perceived esteem by peers in the university community and financial compensation predicted job satisfaction.

The researchers suggest that there should be a reduction of committees, equitable peer evaluations, and that salary and fringe benefits should keep pace with inflation. It is important to note that large student enrollment is not just an issue in the United States. In the U.K. the focus is on contractual research. Many faculty members are expected to not only teach and carry out a full load of multiple tasks, but they are expected to have a contract for research for which they are often times paid less for. Contract research staff
make up a large portion of the academic staff in the U.K. The majority is employed on fixed term contracts. “Much expenditure in contract research is on staff specifically employed to carry out a particular project. Indeed the vast majority of contract research staff (CRS) are employed on fixed term contracts with duration of the contract directly linked to the duration of a particular contract research project” (Bryson, 1999, p.30).

Harvey and Baker (1970) developed an instrument to determine student evaluation of teacher effectiveness. The study concluded that students want more personal attention and outside help. But further research concludes that faculty members do not have the time or capacity to fulfill these needs due to high student enrollment and work overload.

Often faculty members are not able to determine their class size due to little participation negotiation policies. Ferrara (1988) found that an individual’s perception and attitudes of the workplace, internal job motivation, and job ambiguity did differ among sizes and work shifts. “The results of the study support a conclusion that size has a great impact on an employee’s feelings of job ambiguity, quality of life, and internal motivation” (Ferrara, 1988, p.11).

Although it may appear very obvious, smaller class sizes are ideal for professors for a number of reasons. For one it gives students more individual attention, secondly, it provides professors with less overload and more job satisfaction. Professors are able to implement many learning techniques that will allow the students to get the maximum level of understanding from the course.

Despite empirical evidence that smaller classes appear more desirable for performance courses and traditional arguments that such courses should maintain a maximum student-teacher ratio of twenty to one, the spiraling costs of higher education make the maintenance of such low ratios all but impossible. The failure of higher education budgets to expand proportionately with increased college enrollments, coupled with the inflationary economy of the past decade, has prompted a re-evaluation of costly programs and the accompanying
demand that departments innovative teaching techniques
designed to lessen the financial burden (Cheatham & Jordan, 1976,
p.251).

Universities have even started to utilize graduate students an “inexpensive
teachers” to handle the load. Chrisp and Aven (1970) even suggested doing a research to
determine how large a class should be in order to maintain its effectiveness.

In cases of classes of 100 or more students Baumann (1976) admits having to
develop group study. Baumann (1976) was aware that under such circumstances he
could not work effectively unless he developed a technique that would allow students to
have some level of satisfaction from the course. He admitted not being able to memorize
names and finding it difficult to give grades to such a large number of students.

Many professors have to reformat their teaching styles to accommodate such large
groups of students. Ruffer (1976) stated: “In terms of being small, if a biology
department has 1,000 majors plus graduate students, it cannot offer independent study
programs of any magnitude to all students. Indeed, it must develop a non-individualized
curriculum merely because of the numbers of persons to be served” (p.139).

Job Satisfaction in Sport Management

Parks and Parra (1994) examined job satisfaction of sport management alumnae
of an undergraduate sport management program. In particular the researchers compared
the job satisfaction of alumnae employed in areas related to sport as opposed to alumnae
employed in areas unrelated to sport. According to the researchers there are only two
published studies of sport management programs that have included measures of job
satisfaction. The first study by Ulrich and Parkhouse (1982) used a regression analysis to
identify the course that leads to job satisfaction and increased work performance. “The
study revealed that the respondents’ assessments of their curricula were related to their
satisfaction with graduate education and with employers’ assessment of their work
performance but not significantly to their job satisfaction” (Parks and Parra, 1994, p.50).
The second study by Kjeldsen (1990) surveyed graduates of a sport management master’s
program, who were employed in areas/positions related to sport. The researcher found a very high level overall of job satisfaction. For their study Parks and Parra (1994) used the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale to measure job satisfaction. The researchers found no significant differences between the two groups. The respondents from both groups reported job satisfaction on the job. However, on the facet of pay of the JDI, the respondents on jobs unrelated to sport expressed greater satisfaction than the alumnae in jobs related to sport.

The aforementioned studies were examples of the research that has been done in the field of sport management in relation to job satisfaction. However, none of the research has investigated the job satisfaction of sport management faculty members. The literature reviewed intended to provide the many factors within the education and sport settings that may cause job satisfaction. Some of the research listed factors that contribute to this dissatisfaction, while others contradicted the same factors, concluding that they did not contribute to job dissatisfaction. Researching job satisfaction among employees is an interesting, yet complicating issue that is constantly being studied.

However, there was no research found in refereed journals in sport management, i.e. Journal of Sport Management, International Journal of Sport Management, Sport Marketing Quarterly investigating the job satisfaction of sport management faculty members. There is definitely a need for an empirical study for this topic or related topics.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Research Design

The following chapter defines the subjects for the study, the instrumentation that was used to collect the data, procedures, which were followed in conducting the study and the data analysis.

The quantitative methods utilizing cross sectional survey procedures guided the analysis for this non-experimental investigation. The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perception of job satisfaction among sport management faculty when classified by select demographic characteristics using the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) scale.

Participants

The population consisted of all individuals who identify themselves as faculty in sport management degree programs. The population was selected from a recent study compiled by Cawley (2001). Based on these findings, 123 institutions were identified that offered a degree or certificate in sport management in the U.S.A. and were composed of 234 faculty members. The number of faculty members found may be arbitrary due to various issues (i.e., relocation, retirement, etc.).

Data Collection Procedures

Initially the researcher made certain that the list of potential participants was updated. First the researcher conducted a website search of each institution listed by Cawley (2001). The list compiled by Cawley (2001) includes sport management programs whether accredited or not; as opposed to using a list compiled by NASSM-NASPE. The list compiled by NASSM-NASPE only lists those programs that are
accredited. For institutions that did not have a web site listing of their sport management faculty, a call was placed to the departmental secretary or department chairperson for a list of the current sport management faculty. This list by Cawley (2001) was also cross-referenced with the list compiled by Stier (2001) on the institutions that offered degrees in sport management. Using this method, it was found that there were 234-sport management faculty. The above steps were taken to insure the accuracy of sport management faculty listing. This research was exploratory and the researcher wanted to give as many sport management faculty members a chance to respond to the survey. This listing does not include the entire sport management population.

After the listing was acquired, an application was mailed to Human Subjects to obtain approval to complete a study. This process took approximately two weeks. A copy of this approval is provided in Appendix A.

After the institutional selection process, a carefully designed cover letter with a statement of confidentiality, the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index the Job in General scale, a demographic survey and a consent form was sent to each potential sport management faculty member. The survey was mailed to the total population. Since the researcher wanted to survey a sample population, it is more cost effective and convenient to mail the surveys as opposed to doing personal face-to face or telephone interviews.

The participants were informed that there were no right or wrong answers to the survey and the participants were asked to complete the surveys to the best of their ability. They were also informed that they have a right to not answer any or all of the questions asked. To insure this, participants were asked to read and sign the informed consent form (See Appendix B). The participants were asked not to write their name on any of the surveys. Each survey was coded by a subject number to insure confidentiality. The surveys were chosen so that they could be completed by the participant in approximately 15 minutes. After completion of the surveys, the participants were asked to place all completed items in the self-addressed and stamped envelope provided. After the initial mailing, the researcher used a 2-step procedure: (a) two weeks after the initial mailing a
postcard reminder was sent (b) three weeks later, a letter and replacement questionnaire was sent to those who did not respond. This detailed process was to ensure the maximum potential responses are collected for data analysis. This process took approximately five weeks. The time frame of the initial mailing began March 31, 2003 and concluded on May 14, 2003.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument was comprised of two sections. Section one included demographic data, such as: current academic rank, institution type, race/ethnicity, age, faculty union membership, degree earned, percentage of time spent in academe, gender, marital status, tenure status, salary, location, student enrollment, college teaching experience and faculty representation. A demographic section of the survey was used to obtain characteristic data from participants. The section contains 15 items: 2 open-ended questions and 13 closed-ended questions (See Appendix C).

Section two was the instrument itself. The Job Descriptive Index was used to measure the job satisfaction of the sport management faculty members. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was created at Bowling Green State University by a collection of researchers in 1997 (Balzer, Kihm, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar & Parra, 1997). Permission was granted for this researcher to use their instrument. This instrument has been previously used in a wide variety of job classifications, such as university professors, nurses, janitors, etc. The JDI contains 72 items that includes subscales to measure job satisfaction. The subscale includes five facets. The facet scales were designed to measure different aspects of the job. The five facets cannot be added together due to the fact that they are all discriminately different from one another. One cannot be sure that more satisfaction in one aspect compensates for less in another. The JDI distinguishes five facets of satisfaction plus a general satisfaction scale (JIG). The five facets are: work itself, pay, promotion, supervision and co-workers.
Satisfaction with work will examine an employee’s satisfaction with the work itself. The characteristics of work (itself) are: variety of tasks, changes in responsibility, autonomy, job complexity, creativity opportunities, job enrichment, amount of work and the ability to increase one’s knowledge.

Satisfaction with pay will investigate an employee’s attitude toward pay and the difference between expected pay and actual pay. Additionally, pay satisfaction is influenced by the economy, personal financial situation of the employee, and the amount of pay an employee previously received.

Satisfaction with supervision will analyze an employee’s satisfaction with his/her supervisor. The more obliging and employee-centered a supervisor, the greater the level of employee satisfaction with the supervisor. This will include the praising of good performance, providing feedback, listening to subordinate opinions, and taking personal interest in employees (Balzer, et. al., 1997).

Satisfaction with people on the present job will refer to the level of employee satisfaction with fellow employees. This level of satisfaction is determined by work-related interaction and mutual understanding, liking and fellow employee admiration.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher only used the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale.

“Scores well above 27 (i.e., 32 or above) indicate satisfaction, while those well below 27 (i.e., 22 or below) indicate dissatisfaction” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p.26).

Validity for the JDI was established by using evidence for both convergent and discriminant validity within and across samples. The JDI distinguishes each facet with job satisfaction. “Convergent validity requires that the JDI facet measures and other measures using maximally different methods to assess the same satisfaction facet (e.g., ratings of interviews focused on critical incidents of satisfaction, different rating techniques, other measures of satisfaction, etc.) should be significantly similar in their evaluations” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p.49).
The reliability is reflected using the Cronbach Alpha in Table 1. An example of the Job Descriptive Index can be found in Appendix C.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Subscale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Balzer, et. al., 1997, p.55)

**Sampling Techniques**

The study used a non-probability method. The sample elements were chosen from the population by non-random methods. The most frequent reasons for the use of non-probability samples involve convenience and the desire to use available participants (Cozby, 1997).

Of the non-probability method, a convenient census was taken. A convenient sample involves choosing readily available people or objects for a study (Cozby, 1997). Convenient sampling is often chosen because of savings of time and money. However,
the research utilized a census, which included all participants listed in the Street and Smith’s Sports Business Journal (Cawley, 2001).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

The data were collected and analyzed by the Florida State University computer system using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program.

A descriptive analysis was used for all independent variables (demographic section), as well as the pay facet, promotion facet and the Job in General scale. This included the mean, standard deviations and range of scores for these variables. A t-test and an ANOVA were utilized to answer the research questions. Difference questions were asked. According to Baumgartner, Strong & Hensley (2002) difference questions seek to make comparisons between or within groups. In this study we wanted to find differences between a group of sport management faculty and their perception of job satisfaction based on the JDI and the JIG.

Further analyses will be manipulated to investigate other related significance using a MANOVA and Chi-Square. For research question number one, public and private institutions were used to determine the relationship. The Job in General scale was used to measure this question. Research question number two examined tenured and non-tenured faculty to determine the relationship using the JIG. Research question number three investigated male and female faculty to determine the relationship using the JIG. For research question number four, public and private institutions were used to determine the relationship with the pay facet of the JDI. Research question number five used tenured and non-tenured faculty to determine the relationship using the pay facet of the JDI. For research question number six, the researcher examined male and female faculty to determine the relationship utilizing the pay facet of the JDI. Research question number seven explored public and private institutions to determine the relationship using the promotion facet of the JDI. Tenured and non-tenured faculty were used to determine the relationship using the promotion facet of the JDI for research question number eight.
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Finally, for research question number nine male and female faculty were used to determine the relationship with the promotion facet of the JDI.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The population consisted of self-reported sport management faculty. It was found there were 123 institutions that offered degrees in sport management within the U.S.A. using the Street and Smith’s Sports Business Journal’s listing (Cawley, 2001). The listing does not include all sport management programs in the U.S.A. The researcher conducted a website search of each institution listed by Cawley (2001). For institutions that did not have a web site listing of their sport management faculty, a call was placed to those institutions, specifically to the departmental secretary or department chairperson for a list of the current sport management faculty.

A t-test and an ANOVA were utilized to answer the research questions. The Job in General scale was used to measure the first three questions. For research question number four, five and six, the pay facet of the Job Descriptive Index was used. The final remaining questions utilized the promotion facet of the JDI.

The analysis of data and the discussion of findings to carry out the objective of this study are presented in this chapter in the following order:

1. Participation
2. Descriptive of Demographic data
3. Overall job satisfaction of sport management faculty
4. Overall pay satisfaction of sport management faculty
5. Overall promotion satisfaction of sport management faculty
6. Findings of research questions and discussion

The researcher identified 234-sport management faculty throughout the U.S. Of the 234 faculty, 173 self-identified sport management faculty members returned the surveys. Only 171 surveys were deemed usable, yielding a 73% return rate. One of the participants did not complete the JDI/JIG section of the survey and one participant
partially completed the pay and promotion sections of the JDI and partially completed the JIG section of the survey. According to Balzer, et al. (1997), if more than four responses are left unmarked for an 18-item scale, or more than three responses are left unmarked for a 9-item scale, it is recommended that those surveys are not scored.

**Demographic Data**

The demographic section of the survey consisted of 15 items. There were 13 items that were closed-ended and 2 items were open-ended questions. This section included data, such as: gender, marital status, race/ethnicity, current academic rank, institution type, tenure status, program location, age, salary, faculty union membership, college teaching experience, satisfaction of faculty representation, degrees earned, student enrollment and percentage of time spent in academe.

Three-fourths of the respondents (74%) were self-identified as males. The other one-fourth (26%) were self-identified as female sport management faculty members. Regarding marital status, 59.4% of the respondents were married, with 32.7% never married and 7.9% reporting themselves as divorced.

The overwhelming majority of responding sport management faculty participants were Caucasian-Americans (86.1%). There were 4.2% of the respondents reporting themselves as African-American sport management faculty. Latino/Latina sport management faculty participants represented 4.8% of the respondents, with another 4.8% sport management faculty indicating that were listed in the “other” category (See Table 2).

More faculty members that participated in the study were associate professors (32.1%) than any other academic rank (n=53). Fifty-one (30.9%) faculty members self-reported their rank as professor, one-fourth (26.1%) of the respondents reported their rank as assistant professor, while nearly eleven percent (10.9) listed their rank in the “other” category (This may have included faculty ranks of lecturer, instructor and various “visiting” designations). There were more sport management faculty participants in public institutions (64.2%) than were sport management faculty participants employed at
private institutions (35.8%). Slightly over one-half of the respondents had obtained tenure status (58.2) while the remaining were at tenure earning status (41.8%). Faculty members were asked to list which college location their sport management program was housed. Only 21.8% of the self-reporting sport management faculty listed their sport management program in the college of business and 32.1% of the participants listed their program in the college of education. Nearly half (46.1) reported their sport management program in the “other” category (See Table 3).

The age of the responding sport management faculty ranged from 28 years of age to 70 years of age, with a mean of 45 years of age. The salary mean for sport management faculty participants was $61,213.29 while ranging from 2,000 to 140,000. There were more sport management faculty participants that were not part of a faculty union (54.5%) than were part of a faculty union (45.5%). The surveyed participant’s college teaching experience ranged from first time teaching experience to 35 years of experience. The average (mean) college teaching experience was 14 years (See Table 4).

The sport management faculty participants were also asked to rate their satisfaction of faculty representation. The scale was a five point Likert scale ranging from Very Satisfied to Very Dissatisfied. The mean for sport management faculty participants and their satisfaction of faculty representation was 3.35 indicating neutral. However a mode and median were taken for an in depth look at faculty representation satisfaction. The mode was 5, indicating very dissatisfied and the median was 4, indicating dissatisfied (See Table 5).

The self-reporting sport management faculty participating in the study were asked to list their earned degree dates. The range for degree attainment was from 1954 to 1997 (bachelor’s), 1955 to 1999 (master’s) and from not yet earned to 1999 (doctorate).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian-American</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Secondary Characteristics of Sport Management Faculty Participants (N=171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Union Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Member</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The surveyed participants were asked to list the number of students within their academic program (sport management). The range for the undergraduate program was from 0 to 500, with a mean of 192.4. The range for the master’s degree program was from 0 to 700, with a mean of 69.7. The range for the doctoral degree program was from 0 to 80, with a mean of 18.6 (See Table 6).

The respondents were asked to indicate a percentage of time spent in various areas in academia. The list included: research, teaching, service, administration, and other. The range indicated for time spent in research was from 0% to 80%, with a mean of 18.1%. While time indicated spent in teaching was from 10% to 95%, with a mean of 49%, the range for time spent in service was from 0% to 44%, with a mean of 17.49%. Regarding time spent for administration, the range was from 0% to 50%, with a mean of 18.93%. Lastly, the range of time spent for the category of “other” was from 5% to 50% with a mean of 13.2% (See Table 7).

Job Descriptive Index/Job in General Scale

The sport management faculty participants were asked to complete the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) as well as complete the Job in General (JIG) scale. The range for the pay facet of the JDI was 6 to 54. The mean for the pay facet was 32, indicating satisfaction. The range for the promotion facet was 0 to 54. The mean for the promotion facet was 32.2, indicating satisfaction. Lastly, the range for the JIG was 12 to 54. The mean for the JGI was 42, again indicating satisfaction (See Table 8).
Table 4

Characteristics of Sport Management Faculty Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n=161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>45.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Age</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range in Age</td>
<td>28-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>(n=143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Salary</td>
<td>61,213.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Salary</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range in Salary</td>
<td>2,000-140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Experience</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Experience</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range in Experience</td>
<td>0-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing a t-test and an ANOVA, the researcher investigated all nine-research questions. The alpha level was set at .05 for each research question. The first three questions utilized the Job in General scale to supply the response. The first question asked:

Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and overall job satisfaction?

The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The Levene’s test yielded an F value of 11.679 and a significance level of .001. Hence, equal variances were not assumed (t= -3.339, df=92.509, p=.001). The
Table 5

Satisfaction of Faculty Union Representation (N=171)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction of Faculty Representation

- Very Satisfied: 10.5%
- Satisfied: 26.3%
- Neutral: 13.2%
- Dissatisfied: 21.1%
- Very Dissatisfied: 28.9%
Table 6

**Student Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s enrollment</td>
<td>192.46</td>
<td>139.158</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s enrollment</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>104.569</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate enrollment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.309</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

**Mean Average of Time Spent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

**Job Descriptive Index and Job in General Scale Summation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mean for faculty at public institution was 44.89 and the mean for those at private institutions was 38.38. The standard deviation for those at private institutions was 13.16 and the standard deviation for the remaining at public institution was 9.54. A significant difference was found between sport management faculty of public and private institutions regarding satisfaction with job in general. A significant difference was also found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 9 and 10). Faculty employed at public institutions had a mean of 44.89 and faculty employed at private institutions had a mean of 38.38. The faculty of the public institutions had a higher rate of satisfaction with their job in general. Analyzing the standard deviation for both public and private institutions suggests there were more variation with private institutions than public institutions.

Utilizing a t-test and an ANOVA, the researcher investigated all nine-research questions. The alpha level was set at .05 for each research question. The first three questions utilized the Job in General scale to supply the response. The first question asked:

Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and overall job satisfaction?

The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The Levene’s test yielded an F value of 11.679 and a significance level of .001. Hence, equal variances were not assumed (t= -3.339, df=92.509, p=.001). The mean for faculty at public institution was 44.89 and the mean for those at private institutions was 38.38. The standard deviation for those at private institutions was 13.16 and the standard deviation for the remaining at public institution was 9.54. A significant difference was found between sport management faculty of public and private institutions regarding satisfaction with job in general. A significant difference was also found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 9 and 10). Faculty employed at public institutions had a mean of 44.89 and faculty employed at private institutions had a mean of 38.38. The faculty of the public institutions had a higher rate of satisfaction with their job in general.
Analyzing the standard deviation for both public and private institutions suggests there were more variation with private institutions than public institutions.

The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group due to the fact there were unequal groups. The Levene’s test yielded an F value of 3.929 and a significance level of .049. Equal variances were not assumed (t= .635, df=152.553, p=.526), there were no significant differences found between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty concerning satisfaction with job in general. The mean for tenured faculty was 43.04; and the mean for non-tenured faculty was 41.91. There were no differences found using a one-way ANOVA as well. However it is important to note that tenured sport management faculty reported a slightly higher mean for satisfaction of their job in general (See Tables 9 and 10). Tenured faculty had a mean of 43 and non-tenured faculty had a mean of 41.9.

Research Question #2:

2. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and overall job satisfaction?

Table 9

Differences on Faculty Satisfaction using the Job in General Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job in General scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Public</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>-3.339*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Nontenured</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-3.407*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Table 10

One Way Analysis of Variance on Faculty and Satisfaction using the Job in General Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1947.45</td>
<td>1947.45</td>
<td>16.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>19276.99</td>
<td>118.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1604.55</td>
<td>1604.55</td>
<td>13.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>19619.89</td>
<td>120.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>21173.31</td>
<td>129.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Further analysis regarding tenured and non-tenured faculty was investigated using a Chi-Square statistical analysis. First differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty and male and female faculty were examined. The Chi-Square statistic yielded a 11.813 significant difference (p= .001). There was a difference found between tenure status and gender (See Table 11).

Second, differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty and marital status were examined. The value for tenure status and marital status was 14.124 with a significance level of .001. There was a difference found between tenure status and marital status (See Table 12).

Finally, to ascertain whether a significant difference existed between race/ethnicity and tenure status, a Chi-Square was computed and placed in Table 13. As shown in Table 13, a Chi-Square of .311 was found to be significant (p=.000).
Question#3:

3. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and overall job satisfaction?

The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The Levene’s test yielded an F value of 11.356 and a significance level of .001. Hence, equal variances were not assumed (t= -3.407, df=55.093, p=.001). The mean for female faculty was 36.69 and the mean for male faculty was 44.57. There was a significant difference found with sport management female faculty concerning satisfaction of job in general and sport management male faculty concerning satisfaction of job in general. A significant difference was also found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 9 and 10). Female faculty had a mean of 36.6 and male faculty had a mean of 44.5. In addition, it is important to note the standard deviation for females was 13.9 and the standard deviation for males was 9.64, suggesting females had more variation in their responses to their job in general.

Table 11
Prevalence of Tenured and Non-tenured Sport Management Faculty Among Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Female n=45</th>
<th>Male n=126</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05
Table 12

Prevalence of Tenured and Non-tenured Sport Management Faculty Among Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Never Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=99</td>
<td>n=59</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05

Table 13

Prevalence of Tenured and Non-tenured Sport Management Faculty Among Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>A-A</th>
<th>C-A</th>
<th>L-L</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=146</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05

A-A = African American; C-A = Caucasian American; L-L = Latina/Latino

The next three research questions utilized the pay facet of the Job Descriptive Index to identify the response.

Question # 4 asked:

4. Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and pay satisfaction?
For this question equal variances were assumed, the Levene’s test yielded an F value of 2.465 and a significance level of .118. The t-test yielded the following results: (t=-4.641, df=163, p=.000). The mean for faculty in a private institution was 25.59 and the mean for faculty in a public institution was 35.64. There was a difference found with sport management faculty in a private institution and sport management faculty in a public institution in regards to pay satisfaction. A significant difference was also found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 14 and 15). Faculty employed at public institutions had a mean of 35.64 and faculty employed at private institutions had a mean of 25.5. The standard deviation for public institutions was 14.2 and the standard deviation for private institutions was 11.5, yielding more variation for public institutions.

Question #5:
5. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and pay satisfaction?

For this question equal variances were assumed, the Levene’s test yielded an F value of .359 and a significance level of .550. The t-test yielded the following results: (t=1.245, df=163, p=.215). The mean for tenured faculty was 33.20 and the mean for non-tenured faculty was 30.43. There were no differences found with tenured sport management faculty and non-tenured sport management faculty pertaining to pay satisfaction. Also, there were no differences found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 14 and 15). Tenured faculty had a mean of 33.20 and non-tenured faculty had a mean of 30.43.

Question #6
6. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and pay satisfaction?

For this question equal variances were assumed, the Levene’s test yielded an F value of 1.016 and a significance level of .315. The t-test yielded the following results: (t=-2.895, df=163, p=.004). The mean for female faculty was 26.71 and for male faculty
was 33.86. There were significant differences found with sport management female and male faculty in regards to pay satisfaction. A significant difference was also found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 14 and 15). Female faculty had a mean of 26.7 and male faculty had a mean of 33.86.

Further analysis of the data occurred to analyze annual salary utilizing an ANOVA. The following variables were investigated concerning annual salary: marital status, gender, academic rank, institution type, program location, faculty union membership, tenure status and race.

The first analysis investigated annual salary and marital status. The F value for salary and marital status was 4.073 with a significance of .019. There were differences found between annual salary and marital status. Using the Tukey test to determine where those differences lie, it was found there were differences between sport management faculty who were never married and sport management faculty who were divorced by annual salary (See Table 16). The Bonferroni test (post hoc) yielded the same results. Divorced faculty reported the highest salary mean (over $75,000 annually). Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

Next, annual salary and gender were investigated. The F value for annual salary and gender was 16.980 with a significance of .000. A post hoc test (Tukey) was not used due to the fact that gender only consisted of two variables. There were differences found between annual salary and gender (See Table 16). Male faculty reported earning exactly $19,536.57 more than female faculty. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

Annual salary and academic rank were examined. The F value for salary and rank was 33.300 with a significance of .000. There were differences found between annual salary and academic rank. Using the Tukey test to determine where those differences lie, it was found that there were differences found between the ranks of professor and associate professor, professor and assistant professor, professor and rank of “other” in addition to associate professor and rank of “other” (See Table 16). The Bonferroni test (post hoc) yielded the same results. Faculty with rank of professor ($85,261.36) reported
### Table 14

**Differences on Faculty and Pay Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job in General scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Public</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>-4.641*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Nontenured</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>33.86</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.895*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.

### Table 15

**One Way Analysis of Variance on Faculty and Pay Satisfaction using the Job Descriptive Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>1603.12</td>
<td>1603.12</td>
<td>8.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1603.12</td>
<td>1603.12</td>
<td>8.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>31188.49</td>
<td>191.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>3826.99</td>
<td>3826.99</td>
<td>21.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3826.99</td>
<td>3826.99</td>
<td>21.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>28964.61</td>
<td>177.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>308.82</td>
<td>308.82</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308.82</td>
<td>308.82</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>32482.79</td>
<td>199.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
earning more than associate professors, assistant professors and faculty in the category “other”. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

Annual salary and institution type were then investigated. The results yielded an F value for salary and rank was 32.835 with a significance of .000. There were differences found between annual salary and public and private institutions. A post hoc test was not necessary since institution type only consisted of two variables (See Table 16). Faculty in public institutions ($69,770.83) reported a higher salary than faculty in the private institutions. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

An analysis of annual salary and program location was analyzed. The F value for salary and program location was 4.789 with a significance of .010. Using the Tukey test to determine where those differences lie, it was found there were differences found between the college of business and the category of “other” (See Table 16). The Bonferroni test (post hoc) yielded the same results. Faculty listing their program in the school of business reported earning a higher annual salary ($73,000.00) than faculty listing their program in the school of education and “other”. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

An examination of annual salary and faculty union membership provided an F value for salary and faculty union membership of 8.596 with a significance level of .004. A post hoc test was not performed due to the fact, faculty union membership only consisted of two variables (part of a union or not part of a union). Differences were found between salary and faculty union membership (See Table 16). Faculty that were part of a union reported earning exactly $12,984.10 more than faculty that were not part of a union. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

Further analysis of annual salary and tenure status yielded an F value for salary and tenure status of 48.033 with a significance of .000. A post hoc test was not necessary since tenure status for this study only consisted of two variables (tenured or not tenured). Differences were found between annual salary and tenure status (See Table 16). Faculty that obtained tenure status ($71,728.26) reported a higher salary than faculty that had not obtained tenure status. Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.
Finally, salary difference among race was investigated. The F value for salary and race was 3.995 with a significance level of .009. A post hoc test (Tukey) was used to determine exactly where the differences lie. Specifically, differences were found between African American sport management faculty and Latino/Latina sport management faculty, therefore differences were found between salary and race (See Table 16). The Bonferroni test (post hoc) yielded the same results. African American faculty reported earning the highest salary ($82,444). Table 17 and 18 displays the means for these two variables.

The final three research questions utilized the promotion facet of the Job Descriptive Index to answer.

7. Is there a difference between sport management faculty of public and private institutions and promotion satisfaction?

The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The Levene’s Test yielded an F value of 10.431 and a significance level of .001. Hence, equal variances were not assumed (t= .1.575, df=139.981, p=.117). The mean for sport management faculty of private institutions was 29.66 and the mean for faculty employed at public institutions was 33.64. There were no differences found with sport management faculty of private and public institutions regarding promotion satisfaction. Using a one-way ANOVA, there were no differences found (See Tables 19 and 20).

8. Is there a difference between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction?

The mean for tenured sport management faculty was 33.29 and the mean for non-tenured sport management faculty was 30.72. The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The Levene’s Test yielded an F value of 11.462 and a significance level of .001. Equal variance was not assumed for this question.
There were no differences with sport management tenured faculty and sport management non-tenured faculty concerning promotion satisfaction. There were no differences found using a one-way ANOVA (See Tables 19 and 20). There was more variation found with tenured faculty than with non-tenured faculty. However, tenured faculty rated their promotion satisfaction higher than non-tenured faculty.

9. Is there a difference between male and female sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction?

The mean for female sport management faculty was 31.33 and the mean for male sport management faculty was 32.41. The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to test the variance from each group. The F value was 4.383 and the significance level was .038. Therefore, equal variances were not assumed (t= -.435, df=82.773, p=.665). There were no differences found with sport management female and male faculty concerning promotion satisfaction. An ANOVA yielded the same results (See Tables 19 and 20).

The standard deviation for male faculty was 17.1; the standard deviation for female faculty was 14.5. Male faculty members had a higher mean for satisfaction for promotion.

Further analysis of the data examined differences with the following variables concerning pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general: academic rank, marital status, race/ethnicity, program location, faculty union membership, age, annual salary and teaching experience. A MANOVA was used for the aforementioned variables due to the fact there were three dependent variables. The first analysis investigated academic rank regarding pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general. A MANOVA was used to analyze this cross tabulation. The F value for pay satisfaction was 4.123 with a significance of .007. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was .606 with a significance of .612. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was .281 with a significance of .839. Since pay satisfaction was the only variable that had a significant level lower than the alpha level; it was found there were significant differences between academic rank
Table 16
One-Way Analyses of Variance of Salary and Marital Status, Gender, Rank, Institution Type, Program Location, Faculty Union Membership, Tenure Status and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.69E+09</td>
<td>2844122489.8</td>
<td>4.073*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.01E+11</td>
<td>698262721.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11E+10</td>
<td>11140863370</td>
<td>16.980*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9.58E+10</td>
<td>65613398.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.38E+10</td>
<td>14600171666</td>
<td>33.300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6.31E+10</td>
<td>438432225.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96E+10</td>
<td>19633837924</td>
<td>32.835*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>8.73E+10</td>
<td>597962339.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.63E+09</td>
<td>3312882614.3</td>
<td>4.789*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.00E+11</td>
<td>691797064.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Union Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.95E+09</td>
<td>594610351.17</td>
<td>8.596*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.01E+11</td>
<td>691713945.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.65E+10</td>
<td>2647229818.4</td>
<td>48.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>8.05E+10</td>
<td>551123570.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.22E+09</td>
<td>273874226.0</td>
<td>3.995*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9.87E+10</td>
<td>685556338.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 17

Mean Amount for Salary Regarding Marital Status, Gender, Rank and Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>$75,076.92</td>
<td>$14,761.784</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>$63,570.09</td>
<td>$31,843.451</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>$53,840.00</td>
<td>$16,571.872</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$66,574.07</td>
<td>$28,682.993</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$47,037.50</td>
<td>$14,110.433</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$85,261.36</td>
<td>$33,969.932</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>$58,633.64</td>
<td>$12,282.299</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>$48,366.67</td>
<td>$11,394.140</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$36,285.71</td>
<td>$9,762.904</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>$69,770.83</td>
<td>$27,254.543</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$45,644.23</td>
<td>$18,114.853</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Mean Amount for Salary Regarding Program Location, Faculty Union Membership, Tenure Status and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$73,000.00</td>
<td>$36,837.070</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$60,804.88</td>
<td>$19,332.899</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$56,116.44</td>
<td>$23,740.535</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Union Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$69,189.66</td>
<td>$30,518.017</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>$56,205.56</td>
<td>$23,199.991</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>$71,728.26</td>
<td>$28,234.926</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>$44,151.79</td>
<td>$11,998.360</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>$82,444.44</td>
<td>$28,718.945</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian-American</td>
<td>$60,957.36</td>
<td>$26,824.646</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina</td>
<td>$39,500.00</td>
<td>$1,603.567</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Differences on Faculty and Promotion Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job in General scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/Public</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>-1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/Nontenured</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>-.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05.

Table 20

One Way Analysis of Variance on Faculty and Promotion Satisfaction using the Job Descriptive Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>44556.03</td>
<td>273.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600.54</td>
<td>600.54</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>43999.59</td>
<td>269.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264.54</td>
<td>264.54</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>44335.60</td>
<td>271.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
concerning pay satisfaction. However, since there were four ranks listed on the demographic section of the survey, the MANOVA only investigated whether there were any differences; yet it did not indicate where the differences lie. The Tukey test (post hoc) was given to determine where the differences lie. It was found that differences lie between the rank of professor and the category listed as “other” concerning pay satisfaction. It was also found there were differences between assistant professor and the category “other” concerning pay satisfaction. The means and standard deviations of the multivariate analysis are listed in Table 21.

The second analysis investigated marital status regarding pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general. A MANOVA was used to analyze this data. The F value for pay satisfaction was 2.100 with a significance of .126. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was .6.597 with a significance of .007. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was 9.762 with a significance of .000. The satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and satisfaction with the job in general were the only dependent variables that had a significance level lower than the alpha level; it was found regarding marital status there were differences between opportunities for promotion and satisfaction with job in general. Using the Tukey test to determine where those differences lie; differences were found with the following: between married faculty and divorced faculty and promotion satisfaction, faculty that were never married and faculty that were divorced and promotion satisfaction, married faculty and divorced faculty and satisfaction of job in general, faculty that were never married and faculty that were divorced and with satisfaction of job in general, and finally, faculty that were married and faculty that never married and satisfaction of job in general. The means and standard deviations are listed in Table 22. Investigating race/ethnicity by pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general yielded an F value for pay satisfaction of 1.372 with a significance of .253. A MANOVA was used to analyze this data. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was 5.301 with a significance of .002. The
Table 21

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Academic Rank and Pay Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction and Satisfaction of Job in General (JIG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Promotion Satisfaction</th>
<th>JIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>31.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>34.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>30.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>32.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F value for satisfaction of job in general was 2.252 with a significance of .084. Since opportunities for promotion was the only variable that had a significance level lower than the alpha level; it was found there were differences between race and ethnicity concerning opportunities for promotion satisfaction. The Tukey test yielded more specifically, that the difference occurred with Caucasian Americans and the category of “other” and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. The means and standard deviations are listed in Table 23.

Examining program location concerning pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general produced an F value for pay satisfaction of 7.239 with a significance of .001. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was 5.370 with a significance of .005. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was .913 with a significance of .403. The satisfaction of pay and satisfaction for opportunities for promotion were the only dependent variables that had a significance level lower than the
Table 22

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Marital Status and Pay Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction and Satisfaction of Job in General (JIG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Promotion Satisfaction</th>
<th>JIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>32.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>29.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>47.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

alpha level; it was found there were differences between program location and pay satisfaction and program location and satisfaction of opportunities for promotion. The Tukey test yielded that the specific differences were found with faculty in the college of business and faculty listing their program in the category of “other” and pay satisfaction, faculty in the college of education and faculty listing their program in the college of “other” category and pay satisfaction. There were also differences found with faculty in the college of business and faculty in the college of education and promotion satisfaction, and faculty in the college of business and faculty listing their program in the college of “other” category and promotion satisfaction. The means and standard deviations are listed in Table 24.

Investigating age regarding pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general yielded an F value for pay satisfaction of 3.192 with a significance of .000. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was 4.630 with a significance of .000. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was
7.016 with a significance of .000. There were differences found between age regarding pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction with job in general (See Table 25). A regression was run to determine the causal relationship between age and pay satisfaction, age and promotion satisfaction, and age and satisfaction of job in general. Age and pay satisfaction yielded the following results: (r = .053, r² = .003, p = .496, B = -9.32E-02). The significance level indicates that age does not predict pay satisfaction. Age and promotion satisfaction yielded the following: (r = .121, r² = .015, p = .122, B = -.244). The significance level indicates that age does not predict promotion satisfaction. Age and satisfaction of job in general yielded the following results: (r = .148, r² = .022, p = .057, B = -.205). The significance level indicates that age does not predict satisfaction of job in general.

An examination of annual salary concerning pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general provided an F value for pay satisfaction of 7.770 with a significance of .000. The F value for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was 11.495 with a significance of .000. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was 5.940 with a significance of .000. There were differences found between annual salary concerning pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction with job in general (See Table 25). A regression was run to determine the causal relationship between annual salary and pay satisfaction, annual salary and promotion satisfaction, and annual salary and satisfaction of job in general. Annual salary and pay satisfaction yielded the following results: (r = .340, r² = .116, p = .000, B = 1.842E-04). The results indicate that there is a causal relationship between salary and pay satisfaction. Annual salary and promotion satisfaction yielded the following: (r = .101, r² = .010, p = .224, B = 6.269E-05). The significance level indicates that salary does not predict promotion satisfaction. Annual salary and satisfaction of job in general yielded the following results: (r = .130, r² = .017, p = .115, B = -5.644E-05). The significance level indicates that salary does not predict promotion satisfaction.

The final analysis of data using a MANOVA examined teaching experience concerning pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general. The F value for pay satisfaction was 4.597 with a significance of .000. The F value for
satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was 3.803 with a significance of .000. The F value for satisfaction of job in general was 5.622 with a significance of .000. There were differences between teaching experience and pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction with job in general (See Table 25). A regression was run to determine the causal relationship between teaching experience and pay satisfaction, teaching experience and promotion satisfaction, and teaching experience and satisfaction of job in general. Teaching experience and pay satisfaction yielded the following results: (r = .224, r² = .059, p= .002, B = -.168). The results indicate that there is a causal relationship between teaching experience and pay satisfaction. Teaching experience and promotion satisfaction yielded the following: (r = .178, r² = .038, p=.026, B= .140). The results indicate that there is a causal relationship between salary and promotion satisfaction. Teaching experience and satisfaction of job in general yielded the following results: (r = .055, r² = .003, p=.490, B= -2.89E-02). The significance level indicates that teaching experience does not predict satisfaction of job in general.

Discussion

The conceptual framework that guided this study was a collection of concepts pertaining to attitude. According to Robbins (1992), attitudes cannot be seen or touched. Attitudes only exist because we define it and it is inferred by what an individual says or does. Job satisfaction is an individual’s attitude towards his or her job. This research was designed to analyze selected self-reported sport management faculty members in the U.S. and their attitudes toward specific aspects of their job (i.e., pay, promotion, etc.). These are called attitude objects. According to Cherrington (1989) some of the most relevant attitude objects in the study of organizational behavior are those associated with the job, such as the job itself, pay, working conditions, supervision and one’s co-workers.
Table 23

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Race and Ethnicity and Pay Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction and Satisfaction of Job in General (JIG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Promotion Satisfaction</th>
<th>JIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>43.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino-American</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>39.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>48.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comprehensive and productive way of analyzing how sport management faculty feel about their job is through the use of attitude surveys. Job satisfaction surveys are one type of attitude surveys that are most frequently used by managers to get information about employee attitudes and make critical decisions about their employees (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). In this case an attitude survey was used by a researcher to determine job satisfaction of sport management faculty. This research used the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale to examine such attitudes.
Table 24

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Program Location and Pay Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction and Satisfaction of Job in General (JIG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Promotion Satisfaction</th>
<th>JIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

Multivariate Analyses of Annual Salary, Age and Teaching Experience for Pay Satisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction and Satisfaction of Job in General (JIG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Promotion Satisfaction</th>
<th>JIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.770</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Selected sport management faculty in the U.S. were given an opportunity to express their attitude toward pay, opportunities for promotion and their satisfaction of their job in general. From this study varying attitudes were reported by male and female sport management faculty that were tenured and non-tenured, and employed at public and private institutions of higher education.

Most of the sport management faculty participants were Caucasian-American males employed at a public institution. This is an indication of very little diversity in the field of sport management academia with regard to ethnicity/race and gender. This lack of diversity was very similar to the studies aforementioned within the review of related literature for this study. For example, Tack & Patitu (1992) found that women represented a small percentage of the faculty and they made less in annual salaries and were found in lower academic ranks, often employed part time, worked in less prestigious institutions, were not tenured and felt that their supervisors did not value their work. Patitu & Tack (1991) also found that only a few African Americans were found to have tenure or were on tenure track.

The majority of the sport management faculty participants were married and had attained tenure status. There were some faculty participants that did not list their age or their salaries. Since the cover letter for the survey stated that faculty had a right not to complete any or all parts of the survey, some participants may have thought that age and salary were personal and private issues.

Unexpectantly to the researcher, there were more faculty participants not members of a faculty union than participants that were members of a faculty union. It is also important to note regarding faculty representation satisfaction, based on the median and mode scores, the participants were overall not satisfied with their representation. This however, contradicts the study by Dallinger & Beveridge (1993) which surveyed faculty members at a mid-western university about their job satisfaction and the influence of the faculty union. The results revealed that although faculty were generally more satisfied with union influence on non-monetary issues, the faculty overall appeared to be satisfied with their union representation.
The responses from the sport management faculty participants yielded that most of the sport management programs were located in colleges other than the college of business or the college of education. This is definitely an issue that needs to be addressed by sport management academicians. Finding a standard location to place sport management programs may be critical in establishing it as a solid and credible field of study.

Some of the faculty participants received their bachelor’s degree as early as the 1950s and some participants received their doctorate degrees as recent the late 1990s. However, there were some faculty participants that did not receive their terminal degree at all.

Amazingly, there were bachelor degree programs with over 400 students enrolled as majors, however, the average student enrollment for the undergraduate programs was less than 200. The average enrollment in master’s degree programs had less than 70 and the average doctoral program had less than twenty students enrolled.

The participants varied in their responses to the time spent in academia. However, service and the category of other had the lowest mean, indicating the lowest importance to the sport management faculty.

There were participants who were just beginning their college instructional experience and some who had 30+ years of experience. The average teaching experience was 14 years.

Sport management faculty participants were on the average satisfied with their pay, promotion and their job in general. It is also important to note that unexpectedly to the researcher, some faculty reported absolutely no satisfaction with pay and promotion; yet still there were sport management faculty that reported complete satisfaction with pay and promotion. These results were similar to studies by Kjeldsen (1990) and Parks & Parra (1994). Kjeldsen (1990) surveyed graduates of a sport management master’s program, who were employed in areas/positions related to sport. The researcher found a very high level overall of job satisfaction. Parks and Parra (1994) used the JDI and the JIG scale to measure job satisfaction of sport management alumnae of an undergraduate
sport management program. These researchers found no significant differences between the two groups. Their respondents from both groups reported job satisfaction on the job. However, on the facet of pay of the JDI, the respondents on jobs unrelated to sport expressed greater satisfaction that the alumnae in jobs related to sport.

The first three research questions of this study analyzed sport management faculty and their satisfaction of their job in general. There were differences found between faculty in public and private institutions; which may be contributed to Perry and Rainey (1988) differentiation between public and private institutions. According to the researcher, one major difference is that private institutions were found to be older and less likely to have faculty collective bargaining than the public institutions.

Although this research did not yield differences between tenured and non-tenured faculty and their satisfaction of their job in general, several researchers mentioned in this study have contributed one aspect of job satisfaction to tenure (Cavenar, 1987; Hanish & Hulin, 1991; Danylchuk, 1993; and Tang & Li-Na 1996). There was very little variation between the two groups. However, tenured faculty tended to state their satisfaction of job in general higher than non-tenured faculty.

The last question regarding satisfaction of job in general with sport management faculty investigated gender. There was a significant difference between male and female faculty and their satisfaction of their job in general. This was consistent with the research found by Tack and Patitu (1992). The researchers found in general that women are less satisfied than their male counterparts. Barclay (1981) found that sex differences in job satisfaction do exist. In contrast, Hill (1983) researched the differences between the genders and job satisfaction. The results yielded little differences on job satisfaction and the sexes.

When analyzing sport management faculty with regards to pay satisfaction, the researcher investigated whether differences existed between public and private institutions, tenured and non-tenured faculty and male and female faculty. There were differences found between sport management faculty employed at public private
institutions. This was consistent with the study performed by Solomon (1986) which stated the largest differences found between the two sectors (public and private) were with regards to reward systems. However, there were higher satisfaction levels with rewards within the private sector than the public.

There were no differences found with tenured and non-tenured faculty concerning pay satisfaction. Although the review of related literature stated that tenure and the attainment of tenure is related to job satisfaction (Danylchuk, 1993; Nogradi, Yardley, & Kanters, 1993; Satterlee, 1988) there were no differences found with tenured sport management faculty and non-tenured sport management faculty concerning pay satisfaction. More specifically, Nogradi et. al. (1993) stated that when referring to faculty job satisfaction, compensation can be grouped into five categories: educational level, gender, age and tenure. However, tenured sport management faculty did report a higher mean of pay satisfaction. There was very little differences found between the standard of both groups.

The last question examining pay satisfaction with sport management faculty found that there were significant differences between male and female faculty. This finding was actually consistent with the varying findings on gender and pay satisfaction. Barclay (1981) stated that previous research has given conflicting results in investigations of gender differences. The researcher measured job satisfaction and beliefs about roles for women at a large corporation. The research indicated that sex differences in job satisfaction exist. The results from this study did yield such a difference. Yet, male sport management faculty did report a higher mean for pay satisfaction.

The final three research questions investigated sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction. The first question investigated public and private faculty and promotion satisfaction and found there were no differences between the two groups. Solomon (1986) researched the differences between public and private institutions and concluded that private institutions were found to be older, less complex, more affluent, had fewer faculty, less enrollment and were less likely to have faculty collective bargaining than the public institutions. Even with the differences between public and
private institutions, according to Solomon (1986) there were no differences found with regard to promotion satisfaction in this study.

There were also no differences found between tenured and non-tenured sport management faculty concerning promotion satisfaction. This may be that tenured faculty have already attained the highest professorate status and therefore are satisfied with the process.

Finally, the last research questions examined whether there was a difference between male and female sport management faculty and promotion satisfaction. There were no differences found with female and male faculty and promotion satisfaction. The findings from this study were different from the research study done by Tack and Patitu (1992) and Barclay (1981) which, found no differences between gender and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.

There were many differences found using the residual variables from the demographic section. These differences indicate a need to make many strides in the field of sport management. Such differences are outstanding and numerous. These differences include the following concerning pay satisfaction: male and female faculty, public and private institutions, rank of professor and category of “other”, rank of assistant professor and category of “other”, faculty in college of business and sport management faculty listing their programs in the “other”, faculty in the college of education and sport management faculty listing their programs in the “other”, annual salary, age and teaching experience.

Further differences were found regarding promotion satisfaction: married and divorced faculty, Caucasian American faculty and category “other”, faculty in the college of business and faculty in the college of education, faculty in the college of business and faculty listing their programs in the “other”, annual salary, age and teaching experience.

Regarding satisfaction of job in general, differences were found between: public and private institutions, female and male faculty, and pay satisfaction never married faculty and divorced faculty, married faculty and faculty never married, age, and teaching experience and satisfaction.
There were also found regarding annual salary: faculty never married faculty divorced, female and male faculty, rank of professor and rank of associate professor, rank of professor and assistant professor, rank of professor and rank of category of “other”, public and private institutions, faculty in college of business and faculty listing their programs in the “other” category, and tenure status.

Finally, there were differences found regarding tenure status between female and male faculty, marital status and race. These differences call for solutions from sport management’s many academicians.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in perception of job satisfaction among sport management faculty when classified by select demographic characteristics using the pay and promotion facets of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job in General (JIG) scale.

To obtain necessary information to carry out the objectives, one survey was used. The instrument was comprised of two sections. Section one included demographic data, such as: current academic rank, institution type, race/ethnicity, etc. A demographic section of the survey was used to obtain characteristic data from participants. The section contains 15 items: 2 open-ended questions and 13 closed-ended questions (See Appendix C).

The Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale were used to measure the job satisfaction of the sport management faculty members, with regards to pay, promotion and job in general.

Seventy-three percent of the sport management faculty members responded to the nationwide survey. Regarding pay satisfaction, differences were found between the following: male and female faculty, public and private institutions, rank of professor and category of “other”, rank of assistant professor and category of “other”, faculty in college of business and sport management faculty listing their programs in the “other”, faculty in the college of education and sport management faculty listing their programs in the “other”, annual salary, age and teaching experience.

Concerning promotion satisfaction, differences were found between the following: married and divorced faculty, Caucasian American faculty and category
“other”, faculty in the college of business and faculty in the college of education, faculty in the college of business and faculty listing their programs in the “other”, annual salary, age and teaching experience.

Pertaining to satisfaction of job in general, differences were found between: public and private institutions, female and male faculty, never married faculty and divorced faculty, married faculty and faculty never married, age, and teaching experience.

When referring to annual salary, differences were found between: faculty never married faculty divorced, female and male faculty, rank of professor and rank of associate professor, rank of professor and assistant professor, rank of professor and rank of category of “other”, public and private institutions, faculty in college of business and faculty listing their programs in the “other” category, and tenure status.

Finally, there were differences found regarding tenure status between female and male faculty, marital status and race.

There were no differences found between the following: tenured and non-tenured faculty and pay satisfaction, tenured and non-tenured faculty and satisfaction with job in general, female and male faculty and promotion satisfaction, faculty in public and private institutions and promotion satisfaction and tenured and non-tenured faculty and promotion satisfaction.

Conclusions

In interpreting the findings of this research study, the following conclusions were reached:

- males and females in sport management are different with regard to pay satisfaction, satisfaction with job in general and tenure status
- tenured and non-tenured faculty in sport management are not different with regard to satisfaction with their job in general, pay satisfaction and promotion satisfaction
- sport management faculty in public institutions and private institutions are different in their job in general and pay satisfaction
• sport management faculty are different with regard to academic rank and pay satisfaction and annual salary
• sport management faculty and their marital status are different with regard to promotion satisfaction, satisfaction of job in general, annual salary and tenure status
• the race and ethnicity of sport management faculty show differences with satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and tenure status
• there are differences with the sport management program location with regards to pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and annual salary
• there are differences with sport management faculty and annual salary and promotion satisfaction, satisfaction of job in general, pay satisfaction, gender, institution type and tenure status
• the age of a sport management faculty member differs between promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general
• sport management faculty’s teaching experience differs between pay satisfaction, promotion satisfaction and satisfaction of job in general

Recommendations

The researcher strongly recommends from this study, first, is that in order to attain credibility from other more established fields of study, the academicians in sport management has to decide exactly where sport management should be housed within the university. It was found from the research that sport management was located in various colleges within the university (i.e., college of education, college of business, etc.).

Secondly, from this study it was found that there are far more male faculty in sport management than female faculty and there were far more Caucasian-Americans than other minorities. There should be more attempts from the administration of the university to employ more female and minority faculty to obtain more diversity. There were more Caucasian-American males with the rank of professor than female and minorities. More attention should be paid to promote these groups of faculty.
Finally, it is encouraging to know that the sport management faculty are satisfied with their pay, promotion and job in general. This is very encouraging for students who are deciding upon obtaining a degree within the field of sport management. The field will grow and more research will be conducted. This will move sport management closer to its goal of credibility and dissemination of knowledge. This research should be investigated again by other graduate students to help make this happen.

The following research is recommended from this study:

- an international investigation which will include Canada and other countries with sport management programs (i.e., Korea)
- a study to determine exactly what sport management faculty do not like about their faculty representation
- a study which will utilize all facets of the Job Descriptive Index to determine which facets sport management faculty find most satisfying
- a burnout section of the survey utilizing the same demographic section
- regional differences of satisfaction of sport management faculty
- another study comparing sport management job satisfaction and the job satisfaction more a more established field of study (i.e., psychology, sociology, public administration).
APPENDIX A

HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL
APPROVAL MEMORANDUM (for change in research protocol)
From: the Human Subjects Committee

Date: 11/18/2002

Chevelle Hall
1950 N Pointe Blvd. Apt 212
Tallahassee FL 32308
challie@gate.net

From: David Quadagno, Chair

Dept: Physical Education

Re: Use of Human subjects in Research
Project entitled: Demographic Variables Contributing to Job satisfaction of Sport Management Faculty Members.

The memorandum that you submitted to this office in regard to the requested change in your research protocol for the above-referenced project have been reviewed and approved. Thank you for informing the Committee of this change.

A reminder that if the project has not been completed by 5/22/2003, you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to assure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Dr. E. Newton Jackson
chgapp.doc
APPLICATION NO. 2002.246
Pay

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your pay  
N for “No” if it does not describe it  
? for “?” if you cannot decide

………………………………………

__ Income adequate for normal expenses  
__ Fair  
__ Barely live on income  
__ Bad  
__ Income provides luxuries  
__ Less than I deserve  
__ Well paid  
__ Insecure  
__ Underpaid

Opportunities for Promotion

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present promotion? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your promotion  
N for “No” if it does not describe it  
? for “?” if you cannot decide

………………………………………

__ Good opportunities for promotion  
__ Opportunities somewhat limited  
__ Promotion on ability  
__ Dead-end job  
__ Good chance for promotion  
__ Unfair promotion policy  
__ Infrequent promotions  
__ Regular promotions  
__ Fairly good chance for promotion
Job in General

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write

Y for “Yes” if it describes your job
N for “No” if it does not describe it
? for “?” if you cannot decide

............................................................
__ Pleasant
__ Bad
__ Ideal
__ Waste of time
__ Good
__ Undesirable
__ Worthwhile
__ Worst than most
__ Acceptable
__ Superior
__ Better than most
__ Disagreeable
__ Makes me content
__ Inadequate
__ Excellent
__ Rotten
__ Enjoyable
__ Poor

Adopted from the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scale by Balzer, Kihm, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar & Parra, 1997.
**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Academic Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Professor</td>
<td>□ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Associate Professor</td>
<td>□ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other _________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Private</td>
<td>□ Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Public</td>
<td>□ Never Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other ____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ African-American</td>
<td>□ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ American Indian</td>
<td>□ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Asian-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Caucasian-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Latino/Latina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other _________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Age _______________           |                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Union Membership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please list your earned degree dates, and major or specialization.</th>
<th>Approximate number of students enrolled in academic program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Degree</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Actual Time Spent</th>
<th>Full time college teaching experience (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TIME</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Representation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue completing the next section of the survey on back and place in self-addressed envelope.
My name is Chevelle Hall and I am a doctoral student at Florida State University. As stated previously in the cover letter, I am conducting a survey of Sport Management faculty members throughout the United States as part of a study. Please read the following and sign if you wish to continue with the surveys.

I understand that I will be asked to fill out paper and pencil questionnaires. I understand that if I chose to, I have the right to not complete any and all portions of the surveys. I understand that all information given is strictly confidential to the extent allowed by law and identified only with a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual responses will be reported. Only group responses will be reported. All information obtained will be destroyed by July 1, 2003.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me, Chevelle Hall at chall6@gate.net or Dr. E. Newton Jackson at Florida State University (850) 644-5773 or via e-mail njackson@coe.fsu.edu. I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

I have read and understand this consent form.

________________________________________________________________________

Subject      Date
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPATION LETTER
April 21, 2003

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student at Florida State University. I am currently conducting a survey of Sport Management faculty members throughout the United States. According to previous literature, sport management is a relatively new and growing field of study. There is a need to produce more research to add to the body of literature. Sport management faculty members are expected to keep up with this growing demand. In addition, studies in higher education reveal faculty members are in need of negotiation rights to negotiate issues such as tenure obtainment, student enrollment, research publication and teaching. The information you provide will contribute to a better understanding of sport management faculty members and their level of job satisfaction.

This study is one of the first efforts to examine sport management faculty specifically pertaining to their needs and issues that may contribute to their overall perception of their careers. This study is also designed to not only add to the body of literature, but as a means to distinguish sport management as a new field with issues that faculty members must address daily. Therefore, your response to the attached surveys will provide extremely valuable data.

Completion of this survey will indicate your participation. Please do not sign your name anywhere on the survey. Your responses are strictly confidential to the extent allowed by law. The data collected will be stored in a locked file cabinet. Only my committee chairperson and I will have access to this information. Results will be presented as group statistics and never so that anyone person could be identified. This information will be destroyed by July 1, 2003. You have the right to not participate at any time throughout the survey. If you chose to participate, please complete all forms and place them in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please return it to me by May 14, 2003. Thank you for your time and consideration.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at chall6@gate.net or Dr. E. Newton Jackson at Florida State University (850) 644-5773 or via e-mail njackson@coe.fsu.edu. I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chevelle Hall
Doctoral Student
Florida State University
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