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Recruitment and retention of competent and motivated faculty are concerns of college and university administrators. These are especially important for home economics administrators because as Evans documented in 1972 they are faced with an undersupply of doctoral graduates to fill the positions available. Evans (1972) found that the projected demand for doctoral graduates in home economics was 7,188 for 1972-1981, and that projected supply during this period ranged from 1,507 to 1,960.

This undersupply of doctoral graduates creates another problem for home economics administrators, how to motivate faculty so they are creative and productive on their jobs. If faculty are dissatisfied with their jobs, or selected aspects of their jobs, this can affect both their level of productivity and creativity. An individual's self-concept and the satisfaction the individual experiences with life in general can also influence the individual's behavior on the job. If home economics administrators are to be effective in the recruitment, motivation, and retention of qualified faculty, they need to know more about the factors resulting in satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job, and the relationships of self-concept and life satisfaction to job satisfaction for home economics college faculty.

Modern administrative theories have provided one approach to answering the question on how an individual's performance on the job is affected by satisfaction with the job, satisfaction with life in general, and self-concept. These theories have drawn heavily from social systems theory and
from role theory. Systems theory has been useful in analyzing the factors which influence behavior in organizations.

Getzels (1958) presented a theory which described administration as a social process. According to Getzels, there are two dimensions which are significant factors in producing organizational behavior: the personal or idiographic dimension and the organizational or nomothetic dimension. The idiographic dimension consists of the individual, his personality, and his need-disposition; and the nomothetic dimension consists of the institution, the role and the role expectation. The model presented by Getzels is shown below:

\[
\text{Institution} \rightarrow \text{Role} \rightarrow \text{Expectation} \rightarrow \text{Observed Behavior} \\
\text{Social System} \rightarrow \text{Individual} \rightarrow \text{Personality} \rightarrow \text{Need Disposition}
\]

It can be seen from the model that a given act is derived simultaneously from both dimensions. How do the dimensions interact? It depends on the individual and the role and is expressed as a function of the interplay between the two. The general equation which expresses this interaction is:

\[B = f(R \times P)\]

where

- \(B\) = observed behavior
- \(R\) = institutional role
- \(P\) = personality of the role incumbent (p. 157)

Getzels' model introduces the concept of role theory. The dynamic interaction of people with varying psychological makeups in the organiza-
tional setting is the domain of role theory. Role theory has been used in many kinds of organizations to better understand and predict organizational behavior.

A person plays more than one role in life, and may well play more than one role in an organization. Because individuals occupy more than one role, role conflicts can result. These conflicts inhibit optimum performance by the role incumbent.

Home economists have recognized the need to study the interrelationships between roles assumed by individuals. Long-term research goals in home economics (Schlater, 1970) included the need for research in the following areas:

1. Analysis of interrelationships within and among varying role constellations.
2. Personal and situational factors which make various role constellations compatible or stressful.
3. Effects of multiplicity of roles and varying role priorities upon family relationships.
4. Effects of role conflict on mental and physical health (p. 22).

Roles commonly played by individuals include the work role, the marital role, and the parental role. Conflicts between roles and satisfaction or dissatisfaction in a role are related to performance in and satisfaction with the other roles played. Because performance or behavior is also related to the interaction between the idiographic and nomothetic dimensions (Getzels, 1958), the individual's concept of himself is also related to his performance in and satisfaction with the roles he plays.
Home economics administrators are concerned with the productivity and creativity of their faculty in the work role. Since performance in and satisfaction with this role are related to performance and satisfaction in the other roles played by the individual and to the concept the individual has of himself, administrators need to know more about the interrelationships of self-concept, satisfaction with the work role, and satisfaction with other roles to be more effective administrators.

Purposes of the Study

The major purpose of the study was to ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Additional purposes of the investigation were to describe home economics college faculty on selected characteristics; to investigate the relationships between these characteristics and level of self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction; and to investigate the relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction and life satisfaction for home economics college faculty.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction are constructs which have been the subjects of numerous investigations. Studies focusing on the relationships between any two of these constructs have been fewer in number. Only four studies were found which investigated the relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction, and none were found which examined these interrelationships for college faculty.

Therefore, the review of literature focuses on studies examining each of these constructs and the relationships between and among them. Specifically this chapter will include seven sections:

1) self-concept,
2) job satisfaction,
3) life satisfaction,
4) relationships between self-concept and job satisfaction,
5) relationships between self-concept and life satisfaction,
6) relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction,
7) relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Self-Concept

There is evidence that man has been concerned with self-concept as a determinant of human behavior throughout recorded history. An individual's estimate of himself strongly influences his goals and his behavior in reaching these goals. One behavior influenced by one's
self-concept and life goals is the selection of an occupation. Super (1957) noted that work roles are among the most important in modern society and provide a focus for studies of self-concept and the processes of development of selfhood. It is not within the purpose of this review to expand on self-concept research; however, it is pertinent to examine the present status of self-concept measurement and research on the self-concept in vocational development.

Few empirical studies were conducted in the area of self-concept prior to 1949; however, a myriad of studies have been conducted since that time. Reviews of literature on the measurement of self-concept have been conducted by Wrenn (1958), Crowne and Stephens (1961), Strong and Feder (1961), and Wylie (1961, 1974).

In a review of literature on self-concept research in counseling, Wrenn (1958) found that: the study of self-concept and the use of self and other perceptions had increased; recent self theories were operational in nature and subject to testing; the study of self and other concepts in relation to clinically judged and measured concepts had been begun; some proof existed that a change in self-acceptance was accompanied by increased acceptance of others and was associated with independently appraised improvement in adjustment; the uses of self-concept in counseling practice and evaluation had been demonstrated; and some excellent and serious research had been conducted along with a number of poorly designed studies.

Crowne and Stephens (1961) critically reviewed self-acceptance research methodology. Several problems were found to exist in research
on self-acceptance: the use of the empirically unsupported assumption of equivalence of assessment procedures; the absence of any clear construct-level definition of self-acceptance; the lack of evidence of the generality of self-acceptance; and the possible influence of the social desirability factor in self-report tests. The need for systematic efforts in test development, standardization, and validation in this area was emphasized.

Four techniques utilized to measure self-concept and studies on the relationships among these techniques were reviewed by Strong and Feder (1961). Results of this review indicated that some of the instruments needed improvement, particularly in the area of validity. Characteristics of self-concept measurement considered promising were the tendency to approach personality in terms of a totality of response and the reliable objectification of a construct that previously had been measured essentially by projective techniques. An analysis of the relationships among techniques indicated that essentially the same elements of personality were measured by several of the tests, but that the unique points of departure resulted in a lack of significant correlation among several of the approaches.

The most comprehensive review of the measurement techniques employed in research on the self-concept was conducted by Wylie in 1961 and revised and extended in 1974. The general purposes of these reviews were to analyze the requirements of adequate measurement and research designs in the area; to point out frequently recurring limitations in the methods employed; to summarize reasonably safe conclusions in the area; and to
bring out what was needed in future self-concept research.

Wylie's (1974) analysis of personality theories emphasizing constructs concerning the self revealed serious shortcomings in self-concept theories. She found that constructs concerning the self had been stretched to cover so many inferred cognitive and motivational processes that their usefulness for analytic purposes had been diminished. The following recommendations were made for improving the situation: improvement of constructs and hypotheses, addition of more variables, inclusion of unconscious self-concept variables, and more attempts to develop lower-order hypotheses.

A review of the measurement situation emphasizing self-referent constructs by Wylie (1974) indicated that several improvements had been made during the sixties. Among these improvements were a more widespread recognition of the need for using instruments with acceptable levels of reliability and construct validity, a decline in the use of undefended measures, and considerable validity-relevant work on several instruments. Despite these improvements, serious shortcomings were still found to exist in the measurement of self-concept. These included a lack of clarity of basic construct definitions and a failure to apply multi-trait-multimethod analyses and other techniques for establishing discriminant validity.

Wylie (1974) concluded that the present state of affairs of self-concept research left much to be desired and differed little from the situation that existed in 1961. Only two defensible alternatives remained: abandon theorizing and research involving self-referent
constructs or make the necessary theoretical and methodological improvements.

Although Wylie's (1974) review was thorough and scholarly, no reference was made to the terms, occupation, vocation, and work, and their relationships to self-concept. The relationships of these variables to self-concept are central concerns of the present investigation.

The constructs of self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction and their interdependence were recognized in a theory of vocational development postulated by Super (1953). Super's theory of vocational development included the following propositions:

1. People differ in their abilities, interests, and personalities.

2. They are qualified, by virtue of these characteristics, each for a number of occupations.

3. Each of these occupations requires a characteristic pattern of abilities, interests, and personality traits to allow both some variety of occupations for each individual and some variety of individuals in each occupation.

4. Vocational preferences and competencies, the situations in which people live and work, and hence their self-concepts, change with time and experience, making choice and adjustment a continuing process.

5. This process may be summed up in a series of life stages characterized as those of growth, exploration, establishment, maintenance, and decline.

6. The nature of the career pattern is determined by the individual's parental socioeconomic level, mental ability, and personality characteristics, and by the opportunities to which he is exposed.

7. Development through the life stages can be guided, partly by facilitating the process of maturation of abilities and interests and partly by aiding reality testing and in the development of the self-concept.
8. The process of vocational development is essentially that of developing and implementing a self-concept.

9. The process of compromise between individual and social factors, between self-concept and reality, is one of role playing, whether the role is played in fantasy, in the counseling interview, or in real life activities such as school classes, clubs, part-time work, and entry jobs.

10. Work satisfactions and life satisfactions depend upon the extent to which the individual finds adequate outlets for his abilities, interests, personality traits, and values; they depend upon his establishment in a type of work, a work situation, and a way of life in which he can play the kind of role which his growth and exploratory experiences have led him to consider congenial and appropriate (pp. 189-190).

Propositions in Super's theory have been the bases for a number of research studies on the self-concept in vocational development. Literature on this topic was reviewed by Super (1963). The review included studies in the following areas: self-concept and occupational concept; self-concept and occupational role requirements; self-concept and insight; self-concept, parent identification, and vocational interests; crystallization of the vocational self-concept; and vocational self-concept and professional status.

As a result of this review, Super (1963) concluded that: agreement between self-concept and one's occupational concept was related to occupational preferences, success, and satisfaction; agreement between self-concept and occupational role concepts of the ideal person in an occupation tended not to be related to success; agreement between self-concept and other measures of the same characteristics increased with age and was related to the strength of selected needs; vocational self-concept was a function of occupational role expectations of the ideal person in an
occupation and was related to level of attainment in an occupation; and agreement between self-concept of adolescents and concept of parents was related to type of vocational interest. The need for more and better research on these topics was emphasized.

Specific studies on the relationship of self-concept to job satisfaction to life satisfaction, or to both will be reported in other sections of this review.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been the subject of numerous investigations over the last four decades. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) surveyed more than 2000 writings in eight areas of job satisfaction: prevalence of job satisfaction, characteristics of dissatisfied workers, effects of job attitudes, factors related to job attitudes, social aspects of the job, supervision and the job, vocational selection and job attitudes, and mental health in industry. Although the review by Herzbert et al. synthesized research on job satisfaction, it did not deal directly with the job satisfaction of college faculty, the occupational group of interest in the present investigation. Because of the volume of research on job satisfaction and the objectives of the present study, only those studies directly concerned with the job satisfaction of college faculty will be reported.

One part of a study conducted by Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen (1959) explored the attitudes of faculty members about college teaching as a career for themselves. Data were collected by mailed questionnaires on 706 full-time faculty at 32 Minnesota institutions and by follow-up personal interviews with 87 randomly selected respondents.

Respondents were asked to list two or three major satisfactions and two or three dissatisfactions they experienced in faculty service. These free-response comments were then analyzed and categorized.

The largest number of reasons given for liking college teaching centered around the nature of the work college teachers do. Next frequently mentioned were favorable working conditions, including flexible schedules and pleasant associates. Least often reported were rewards for service--salaries, tenure, and fringe benefits.

Cited repeatedly as a source of dissatisfaction by faculty was the low salaries received. A second major dissatisfaction expressed was the heavy workload which resulted in less time available for professional study, reading, and significant nonacademic interests. Complaints were also registered concerning pyramiding committee and administrative duties, inadequate facilities, practices governing academic promotions, and faculty-administrative tensions.

Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen (1959) concluded that most college teachers were reasonably well satisfied in their profession and would choose the field again given an opportunity to do so. Although many complaints were reported, few college faculty felt these frustrations outweighed the satisfaction the profession affords.
The satisfaction and dissatisfaction of full-time faculty at New York University were studied by Russell (1962). Sent to all full-time faculty was a six-part questionnaire consisting of items on the characteristics of faculty members, the general satisfaction of faculty, the reactions of faculty to suggested innovations in university services, the reactions of faculty to uses to which increased university income might be put, the professional attitudes of faculty toward service at New York University, the economic status of faculty, and attractions away from New York University. Faculty were asked to indicate on a nine-point scale their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the items. Responses were obtained from 580 faculty, 45 percent of those who were asked to report. Although an attempt was made to stress that the respondents were representative of the entire faculty by comparing them on known personal characteristics, the high nonresponse rate and the lack of a follow-up of nonrespondents suggest that the findings reported should be viewed with some caution.

Average response-values for the entire group were computed for each item. Respondents were also categorized according to school or college within the university, academic rank, age, and salary. Average response-values were computed for each group on the part of the questionnaire concerned with general feelings of satisfaction.

An inspection of the average response-values for the entire group indicated that faculty held slightly unfavorable attitudes toward physical plant facilities and faculty personnel policies, neutral attitudes toward administrative practices and policies, slightly favorable attitudes
toward personnel services and characteristics of students, and more favorable attitudes toward relationships with colleagues.

A comparison of the average response-values for groups of faculty revealed wide differences in reported feelings of satisfactions among faculty in the various schools and colleges; associate professors were the least satisfied group and full professors the most satisfied; older respondents tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than younger faculty members; and respondents with higher incomes reported higher levels of satisfaction.

Reactions of faculty to suggested innovations in university services were all favorable. Faculty viewed improvement in salaries and improvement in research facilities as the most important areas in which increased university funds might be used. About half the respondents indicated that they would welcome another job offer and one in six indicated they were currently considering another job.

Russell's conclusion that faculty members at New York University differed a great deal among themselves in their feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction should be accepted with some reservation for the reasons mentioned earlier. This implied that almost any decision or course of action by administrators would meet widely differing reactions among faculty members.

Kratcowski (1970) investigated the professional role satisfaction of faculty members at five Catholic colleges. The purposes of the study were to determine the relationships between job satisfaction and organizational structure of the colleges and the relationships between job
satisfaction and professional orientation of faculty members.

Questionnaires were sent to 393 full-time faculty at five Catholic colleges with student bodies ranging in size from 800 to 4000. Responses were obtained from 295 faculty members. Goals and operating policies of the colleges were analyzed, and colleges were categorized as multiple goal structure, transitional goal structure, or traditional goal structure. Faculty were divided into three categories based on their response to a professional orientation index. The purpose of this index was to obtain a rating of the specific orientation faculty had internalized regarding their profession.

A significant relationship was found between professional role satisfaction and organizational structure of the college. Faculty at multiple goal structure colleges reported higher levels of satisfaction with most facets of their professional role, particularly with the facets related to faculty-administrator communications, cooperation, and decision making. Faculty at transitional goal structure and traditional goal structure institutions were found to be less satisfied with faculty remuneration, tenure and promotions, opportunities for sabbatical leaves, opportunities for professional growth, faculty-administrator communications, and opportunities to participate in making academic policies.

Professional orientation of faculty was also found to be associated with level of satisfaction. Faculty classified as having a high professional orientation reported higher levels of satisfaction than faculty with middle or low professional orientations.
Job satisfaction of college faculty in selected disciplines was investigated by Buxton (1971), Bess (1971), and Borck (1972). Buxton studied the job satisfaction of professors of education; Bess, the patterns of satisfaction of organizational prerequisites and personal needs of social science faculty; and Borck, the relationships between job satisfaction and leaving the job for social science faculty.

Objectives of the study by Buxton (1971) were to examine the job satisfaction of professors of education, to examine the relationships between job satisfaction and seven independent variables, and to examine institutional variations in job satisfaction.

The sample consisted of full-time college teachers of education holding the rank of assistant professor or higher at four Big Eight schools and incumbents in the same level positions at four smaller state institutions in the same states. A total of 227 college professors of education participated.

An attitude scale consisting of a series of forced-choice items was developed to measure job satisfaction. Five items were found to be associated with higher levels of satisfaction: degree of freedom and independence in their work, rate desired goals were attained, cultural and recreational opportunities offered by the communities, teaching load, and quality of scholarly publications readily adaptable to their teaching needs. Items associated with low degrees of satisfaction included amount of recognition other professionals give to the education profession, top salaries obtainable in the profession, opportunity for research, and overall aims of the education profession.
Independent variables found to be significantly related to job satisfaction were age, rank, and salary. A linear relationship was found between age and job satisfaction, with faculty 30 and under being the least satisfied. Level of job satisfaction reported by faculty was found to increase as rank increased. The variable found to be most highly correlated with degree of job satisfaction was salary, with faculty earning higher incomes expressing greater satisfaction. No significant relationships were found between job satisfaction and sex, marital status, social class origins, and length of teaching experience in lower schools.

Faculty at the four Big Eight schools reported higher levels of satisfaction than those at smaller schools, especially on items concerned with teaching load, top salaries obtainable, participation in decision making, and social and cultural opportunities available in their communities.

Buxton concluded that college teachers of education were more satisfied than dissatisfied with their jobs, although not appreciably so.

Bess (1971) examined the patterns of satisfaction of organizational prerequisites and personal needs of 137 faculty members in 30 university social science departments, 15 of high quality and 15 of low quality. Quality of the departments was determined by the American Council of Education report, application of Maslow's need theory, and a set of systems prerequisites outlined by Talcott Parsons. Faculty in high quality departments rated high in the satisfaction of external prerequisites and low in satisfaction of internal needs while the reverse
was true for faculty in low quality departments. No significant differences were found in the levels of satisfaction of any of the personal needs between faculty in high and low quality departments.

The purpose of Borck's (1972) study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and leaving the job for social science faculty. Questionnaires were sent to faculty at two midwestern universities, one of which was considered to be more advanced in professionalism. Satisfaction was measured as a general response and in terms of a lack of discrepancy between perceived and desired work aspects. Faculty members found to be the most satisfied were those in the high reward, low investment category at the university advanced in professionalism. At the university less advanced in professionalism faculty in the high reward, low investment category reported the highest levels of satisfaction. Faculty in the low reward, low investment category at both institutions reported lower levels of satisfaction and higher levels of leaving the job. No faculty were found in the low reward, high investment category indicating that these individuals had left their jobs.

The relationship between faculty satisfaction and the dean's influence was studied by Bachman (1968). Two broad hypotheses based upon research studies conducted with account executives and office managers were considered: first, the effective college administrator is one with relatively high influence at all levels; and second, the effective dean's influence is based on a relatively high degree of competence and personal attractiveness and a relatively low dependence on his "legitimate authority" and coercion.
Respondents selected for study were 1210 full-time faculty at twelve liberal arts colleges belonging to a regional association of colleges. Questionnaire data were obtained from 685 faculty, a response rate of approximately 60 percent. The questionnaire measured amounts of administrative influence, bases of influence for the dean and faculty, and levels of faculty satisfaction. Means and standard deviations among individuals and among colleges were computed for all items. Correlations between administrative characteristics and mean faculty scores for each college and between administrative characteristics and individual faculty satisfaction ratings were also computed.

Bachman found that faculty satisfaction was greatest in those colleges having the highest total influence across all levels of the academic hierarchy. Faculty also indicated most satisfaction with deans who were influential in college affairs and whose influence was based upon expertise rather than upon legitimate influence and coercion. These findings lent support to the two hypotheses.

Bachman concluded that faculty satisfaction was positively related to the total amount of influence at all levels and that college faculty were less likely to see themselves as subordinates than were account executives and office managers.

Aebi (1973) tested the applicability of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory¹ to college educators using both free-choice and forced-

¹The motivation-hygiene theory states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate dimensions caused by different sets of factors. Factors which determine job satisfaction are job content factors and are referred to as motivators, while factors which cause job dissatisfaction are job content factors and are called hygienes (Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman, 1959).
choice methodologies. It was hypothesized that:

1) Both techniques show that for college educators motivators contribute more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction, and hygienes contribute more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction.

2) Both techniques show that for college educators all motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than do all hygienes combined, and all hygienes combined contribute more to job dissatisfaction than do all motivators combined.

3) Both techniques show that for college educators each motivator contributes more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction, and each hygiene contributes more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction (p. 6).

Questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 250 full-time faculty and two top administrators from 15 private church-related liberal arts colleges in 11 states. Responses were obtained from 220 college educators, however usable data were available for only 153 faculty and administrators.

Results were reported in terms of the three hypotheses. The first hypothesis was accepted under both the free-choice and forced-choice methodologies. Hypothesis two was rejected because Herzberg's theory was supported only by the free-choice method. Hypothesis three was also rejected. The results supported Herzberg's theory in the case of motivators, but not for hygienes.

Aebi found that differences existed between faculty and adminis-
Aebi concluded that Herzberg's theory was generally applicable to the college educators studied and that the greatest source of job satisfaction for college educators was the work itself.
their jobs (Farley, 1974). Although the work force was half male and half female, only 26 percent of the professional workers were female while 69 percent of the nonprofessional workers were female.

The results of the survey indicated that work satisfaction was correlated with sex, time on the job, and job level. Women tended to hold lower level jobs, to have served the university shorter periods of time, and to be less satisfied with their work than men. Five subgroups of women were less likely to be satisfied than were their co-workers: wives of faculty, wives of undergraduate students, wives of graduate students, women holding undergraduate degrees from Cornell, and women holding master's degrees.

Farley concluded that the work force at Cornell remained segregated, that men do men's work and women, women's. Women were found bunched at the bottom of career ladders wherever they were. Remedies suggested include recognition by administration that promotions based on merit will be an advantage to the organization and opportunities for upgrading workers (especially women workers) who are overqualified might increase the job satisfaction of these workers.

Part of a recent study by Centra (1974) was concerned with determining the job satisfaction of women and men with a doctorate. Individuals who received their doctorates in 1950, 1960, and 1968 were surveyed to determine how the experiences and views of women with doctorates differed from their male counterparts. Women and men were matched on field of study, institution that awarded the doctorate, and year of degree. Over 81 percent of those who received the questionnaire responded.
A letter and telephone follow-up of women nonrespondents indicated that unemployed women were less likely to respond than employed women.

Items on graduate school, employment activities and interests, reasons for unemployment, job satisfaction, marriage, and views on women's rights were included in the questionnaire.

Because principles of good research design were utilized by Centra, the following findings represent an important contribution to the research literature on men and women doctorates in America.

No significant differences were found between men and women in their retrospective views of the interest shown them while in graduate school or after earning the doctorate. A comparison of the full-time employment of women and men since obtaining the doctorate showed that women were employed full-time 78 percent of the time and men 95 percent of the time. Reasons given by women for unemployment were largely related to marital and family life responsibilities. Most respondents were employed in colleges and universities, with more women indicating teaching as their major job activity and more men indicating management and administration.

Incomes differed considerably for men and women. Men were found to earn significantly more than women even when rank and number of years of experience were the same. Several possible reasons for the income disparity were given: more men were in higher paying administrative positions, men were more mobile and could gravitate to higher paying positions, men published more than women, and men were more likely to supplement their salaries with outside activities.
Although the vast majority of women and men reported they were satisfied with their current jobs, women were less satisfied with such extrinsic factors as salary and promotions. Women were as satisfied as men with intrinsic features of their jobs, such as the work itself and relations with colleagues.

Centra found that men with a doctorate were more likely to marry than their female counterparts, and recent women graduates were more likely to be married than earlier graduates. He concluded that combining the roles of wife and professional had become more common among women doctorates.

Differences were also found between men and women with doctorates in their attitudes towards women's rights and opportunities for women. Men from the 1968 group were less involved and interested in women's rights than earlier male graduates, while women graduates of 1968 were more involved than earlier women graduates.

Centra concluded that women with doctorates should not be thought of as a single, homogeneous group. The data suggested that four types of women with doctorates existed: those who generally have worked full-time and have made substantial contributions to their fields; those who have been employed full-time most of the time and have performed competently, often as teachers; those whose professional careers have been marred by long and frequent interruptions; and those few who have not been employed or seldom have used their graduate training.
Life Satisfaction

Most researchers and professionals seem to agree that life satisfaction is a major component of any comprehensive conception of adjustment of mental health, e.g. Sells (1969). Other terms such as competence, morale, and happiness have also been used to describe this construct. Because of this consensus there has been considerable research on life satisfaction. Many studies in recent years have been concerned with the life satisfaction of middle aged and older adults (Neugarten, Havighurst, and Tobin, 1961; Palmore and Luikart, 1972; Spreitzer and Snyder, 1974; and Bell, 1974).

Purposes of the study by Neugarten, Havighurst, and Tobin were to devise a measure of successful aging for use in the Kansas City studies and to devise a short, easily-administered instrument that could be used in other studies and to validate that instrument against the Kansas City data.

The sample for the study was composed of 177 individuals ranging in age from 50 to 90 in Kansas City. Data on the respondent's life pattern, attitudes, and values were collected for all 177 participants by interviews. Clinical psychologists interviewed 80 of the participants to validate the life satisfaction ratings obtained by the first interviews. Two short self-report instruments were also administered to 92 respondents.

Two judges read each respondent's replies to the interview questions and rated each respondent on five operationally defined components of life satisfaction: zest, resolution and fortitude, congruence between desired and achieved goals, positive self-concept, and mood. An item
analysis was performed on the two self-report instruments to determine which items differentiated between individuals with high and low satisfaction ratings based on their interview responses.

No significant differences were found between life satisfaction and age, between life satisfaction and sex, or between life satisfaction and socioeconomic status. Nonmarried respondents reported significantly lower levels of life satisfaction than married respondents.

The correlations between the two self-report instruments and the life satisfaction ratings obtained from the interviews were .55 and .58 respectively. The lapse of time between administration of the self-report instruments and the time of the interviews and the expectation that self-report findings would only partially agree with evaluations by outside observers were given as possible explanations for the moderate correlations.

Neugarten, Havighurst, and Tobin concluded that the life satisfaction ratings collected by the interview method appeared to be relatively satisfactory and might prove useful in measuring the psychological well-being of older persons. Efforts to devise and validate self-report instruments to measure life satisfaction were regarded by the investigators as only moderately successful. They recommended that the two self-report instruments be used with caution.

Palmore and Luikart (1972) analyzed the relative influence of health, activity, social-psychological, and socioeconomic variables upon life satisfaction in early and late middle age. The relationships between self-rated health, organizational activity, and internal control
orientation were also studied.

Data for the analyses came from a longitudinal study conducted by the Duke Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development. Subjects were randomly chosen from the membership lists of a local major health insurance association and were representative of the middle and upper socioeconomic levels of the community. Of the persons selected for inclusion in the study, 52 percent did not participate. A telephone survey and hospitalization study of noninterviewed persons showed no significant differences between them and persons interviewed in terms of age, sex, health, or socioeconomic status. The main reasons for nonparticipation were too busy to spend a day in tests and interviews or not interested in free medical examination.

Life satisfaction was measured by presenting the subjects with a picture of a ladder numbered from zero on the bottom rung to nine on the top rung and asking them to indicate where they presently stood on the ladder if the top represented the best possible life for them and the bottom the worst possible life. A similar ladder was used to measure self-rated health. Activity measures included the number of religious services and meetings the respondents usually attended each month, the number of hours spent in a typical week on social activities, the number of hours in a typical week spent working, and the total number of social contacts per month. Social-psychological variables measured were internal control orientation, career anchorage, confidence, marital status, sexual enjoyment, number of times moved in the last ten years, and intelligence. Socioeconomic variables studied were income, age, education,
and sex.

Linear correlations and step-wise multiple regression were the primary methods of analysis employed. Self-rated health was the variable found to be most strongly related to life satisfaction and it accounted for two-thirds of the unexplained variance for all groups analyzed. The second most important variable was organizational activity, and the third most important was belief in internal control. Several variables showed little relationship to life satisfaction: age, sex, social contacts, career anchorage, marital status, and intelligence.

Conclusions made as a result of these findings were that life satisfaction in middle age was most strongly related to perceived health and secondly to involvement in social organizations. Palmore and Luikart cited the need for further research on the puzzling relationships found between life satisfaction and some of the other variables in the study such as sex, age, and marital status.

Correlates of life satisfaction among the aged were studied by Spreitzer and Snyder (1974). Data analyzed were from the National Data Program for the Social Sciences conducted by the National Opinion Research Center. Each year a national probability sample of persons 18 or older living in noninstitutional arrangements in the United States are interviewed. For this study, the 1972 and 1973 surveys were pooled to obtain a sufficient number of persons age 65 or over for statistical analysis.

Interview items on life satisfaction, self-assessed health, financial satisfaction, and subjective social class were used to make oper-
ational the key variables in the study. Other variables analyzed were age, sex, race, marital status, church attendance, education, level of occupation, family income, and socioeconomic status.

An interaction effect was found between age, sex, and life satisfaction. From age 18 through age 65 women reported a higher degree of life satisfaction than men; however, after age 65 men were more likely to report a higher degree of life satisfaction. Four independent variables were significantly stronger predictors of life satisfaction among persons over 65 than among younger persons: financial satisfaction, self-assessed health, sex, and level of occupation. The results of a multiple regression analysis showed that self-assessed health and economic sufficiency were the strongest predictors of life satisfaction for persons age 65 and over. The results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that the variables used accounted for 32 percent of the variance in life satisfaction among persons over 65. The restricted range of values, one to three, in the dependent variable was given as one possible explanation for the relative weakness of these variables in predicting life satisfaction.

Spreitzer and Snyder concluded that perceived health and financial adequacy were the most important predictors of life satisfaction for the group studied. Perceived financial adequacy was a better predictor of life satisfaction than objective indicators of socioeconomic position. The need for further research in the area was emphasized.

The implications of consistency theory, an extension of Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance, with regard to the life satisfac-
tion of older adults was investigated by Bell (1974). It was hypothe-
sized that expectational disconfirmation, a low degree of congruency be-
tween pre-retirement expectations and post-retirement behavior, would be
accompanied by negative changes in life satisfaction.

Pre- and post-retirement interviews were conducted with 114 males
in an urban area of central Missouri. The individuals ranged in age from
53 to 72 years and were overly representative of upper occupational levels.

During the pre-retirement interview the respondent was asked to indi-
cate the amount of time he expected to spend in three life role areas:
family, voluntary association, and community. The amount of time actual-
ly spent in each area was obtained during the post-retirement interview.
Life satisfaction was measured at both interviews by asking the respond-
ent to indicate on a five-point scale how satisfied he was with his way
of life at the present time.

Support for the consistency hypothesis was found in the family area
but not in the areas of voluntary association and community. The lower
the degree of congruency between pre-retirement expectations and post-
retirement behavior in the family area, the more negative the change
evidenced in life satisfaction. The findings showed that if the indi-
vidual spent more time with family in post-retirement than he expected
to in pre-retirement, the more negative the changed evidenced in life
satisfaction. In the case of associational orientations the correla-
tion of expectational disconfirmation, degree of congruency between
pre-retirement expectations and post-retirement behavior, with subse-
quent changes in life satisfaction was weak and insignificant. Although
the correlation of expectation disconfirmation with subsequent changes in life satisfaction was insignificant for the community area, it was in the predicted direction.

The relatively short time period between the pre- and post-retirement interviews, less than six months, and the need for improved methods and revised instrumentation were cited as limitations of the study. Bell concluded that the type of disconfirmation might be more central to explaining life satisfaction than disconfirmation per se.

Studies on avowed happiness were reviewed by Wilson (1967). Results of the studies reviewed indicated that the following variables were found to be correlated with happiness: age, health, education, income, religion, marital status, self-esteem, job morale, aspirations, optimistic outlook, and intelligence. Wilson made these suggestions for further research on avowed happiness, i.e. life satisfaction: consistent use of the same measure; use of a nine-point scale rather than a three-point scale; validation of happiness scales; and development of indirect, non-fakable measures.

Important contributions to literature on life satisfaction have also been made by Wessman (1956), Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960), Bradburn (1969), Hulin (1969), and others. Studies by these researchers have investigated the relationships between life satisfaction and self-concept, life satisfaction and job satisfaction, and among life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and self-concept. Therefore, these studies will be reported in other sections of the review.
Relationships Between Self-Concept and Job Satisfaction

A theory that offers some hypotheses about the relationship between self-concept and job satisfaction is Super's (1953) theory of vocational development discussed earlier. This theory states that satisfaction on one's job depends on the extent to which the job and the way of life that goes with it enable the individual to play the kind of role he wants to play, the kind of role which is consistent with his concept of himself.

Various studies have investigated the relationship between self-concept and job satisfaction. Korman (1970) presented and tested a theoretical hypothesis which argued that self-concept in relation to the task at hand determines the outcome an individual will seek to attain and the outcomes which will satisfy him. A study by London and Klimoski (1973) tested Korman's theory by examining the effects of self-esteem and job challenges as moderators of attitudes toward work and effectiveness on the job. The relationships between job satisfaction, self-concept, and interests of managers in a medium-sized insurance company were studied by Dore (1970). Thompson (1971) investigated the interrelationships of favorable self-perception, perceived supervisory style, and job satisfaction of state department of instruction personnel; and Wurtz (1973) studied the effectiveness of self-concept and selected independent variables in predicting the job satisfaction of teachers. A more detailed report of these studies follows.

The following hypothesis about the nature of work behavior was offered by Korman:

All other things being equal, individuals will engage in and
find satisfying those behavioral roles which will maximize their sense of cognitive balance or consistency (p. 32).

Two derivations of this hypothesis were also presented. First, the motivation an individual has to perform on a job is consistent with the self-image with which he approaches the job; and second, the jobs found most satisfying by an individual are those consistent with his self-concept.

Three controlled laboratory experiments were conducted to test the hypothesis and its derivations. In the first experiment subjects whose self-esteem had been measured previously were asked to set their goals on two separate tasks of creative thinking. These goals were classified as either hard goals or easy goals by the experimenter. It was predicted that there would be a difference between individuals with high and low self-esteem in level of achievement of the hard-goal task but not in the achievement of the easy-goal task. The prediction was supported in both cases. For the hard-goal tasks subjects with high self-esteem were more likely to succeed than subjects with low self-esteem. On the other hand, no differences were found in easy-goal achievements between subjects with high and low self-esteem.

The second experiment expanded and replicated the first by asking the subjects to achieve four tasks, rather than two; goals were set by the experimenter rather than the subjects; and self-perceived competence of the subjects was based on experimental indiction rather than measured by a personality measure. The outcomes of the experiment supported the prediction that subjects with high performance expectancies achieved more
goals than subjects with low performance expectancies.

A third experiment was designed to see if the second experiment's findings would be replicated if subjects were not provided immediate feedback on their goal achievement. The prediction that high self-esteem subjects would get more right items than low self-esteem subjects was supported at the .06 level of significance. Not having knowledge of results during performance appeared to be an impediment.

Korman reported that these experiments supported the hypothesis because the following conclusions seemed to be warranted: Self-perceived competence for a task seemed to facilitate performance; social evaluations of one's competencies appeared to become internalized by the individual in such a way that his performance was affected; and utilizing task goals to increase performance seemed to be effective in increasing performance if the individual was interested in success.

Several other derivations of the hypothesis were presented. First, the higher a person's self-esteem, the more likely he would be to attempt to influence others toward change. A second derivation concerned job satisfaction as a predictor of performance. At high levels of self-esteem performance would predict satisfaction, while at low levels satisfaction would predict performance. Another derivation predicted that high self-esteem individuals would find situations of internal control more satisfying than situations of high external control, whereas this would not be the case for low self-esteem individuals.

London and Klimoski (1973) investigated the effects of self-esteem and job challenge on level of effectiveness on the job and attitudes
toward the job for 153 registered nurses at four hospitals. Data were
collected by questionnaires consisting of items designed to measure self-
esteeem, job complexity, job satisfaction, and self ratings of effective-
ness on the job. Peer and supervisor effectiveness ratings were also ob-
tained.

The sample was divided into two self-esteem groups and three job
complexity groups. Three 2 x 3 ANOVAS were performed on each type of
rating. No main effect for self-esteem was found, nor were there any
interactions with complexity. No significant effects were found for peer
ratings, however, main effects due to complexity were found for self
and supervisor ratings. Supervisors rated low complexity and optional
complexity subjects higher than those in high complexity conditions.
Self ratings of effectiveness were highest for nurses in optimal complex-
ity positions and lowest for those in high complexity jobs. Significant
differences were found between complexity groups, with those in optimal
complexity situations being most satisfied and those in low complexity
jobs least satisfied.

The investigators concluded that level of self-esteem did not mod-
erate performance or satisfaction or their relationships to the extent
suggested by Korman (1970). The important variable was the felt com-
plicity of the task with job satisfaction and effectiveness higher for
those in optimal complexity positions.

The variables, self-concept and vocational interests, were investi-
gated to see if they could be used to predict job satisfaction of a group
of managers (Dore, 1970). Four hypotheses were tested:
1) The greater the agreement between a self measure and a required self measure, the greater will be the job satisfaction.

2) The greater the agreement between a self measure and an ideal self measure, the greater will be the job satisfaction.

3) The greater the agreement between a required self and an ideal self measure, the greater will be the job satisfaction.

4) The greater the managerial interest patterns, the greater will be the job satisfaction (p. 12).

Five questionnaires including a self-concept instrument, an ideal self-concept instrument, a required self-concept instrument, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and a job satisfaction instrument were sent to 183 managers in a medium sized insurance company. Responses were obtained from 140 managers, a response rate of 77 percent.

Correlations between the four predictor variables and job satisfaction ranged from .21 to .38, with all significant at the .05 level. All four hypotheses were supported by the findings. The best single predictor of job satisfaction was the manager scale of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and the most effective combination of variables was the manager scale and the self-required self difference.

Dore suggested that further research be conducted on how self-concept and job satisfaction relate to general satisfaction. He speculated that self-ideal self differences might be more highly related to general satisfaction than to job satisfaction.

A two-factor analysis of variance design was used by Thompson (1971) to compare the relationships of favorable self-perception, perceived
supervisory style of the boss, and job satisfaction of 128 administrators and professional employees of a state department of public instruction. Thompson hypothesized that subjects with high self-perception would experience less job satisfaction from a given supervisory style than those with low self-perception.

Survey forms consisting of a cover letter guaranteeing anonymity, general information questions, and two questionnaires were completed by subjects during a bimonthly meeting of the department. One of the questionnaires was designed to measure job satisfaction and supervisory style of the boss and the other self-perception.

Subjects in the high favorable self-perception subgroup perceived their boss as displaying a less supportive style of supervision than those in the low self-perception subgroup. Job satisfaction scores decreased as favorable self-perception increased and increased as supervisory style of the boss became more supportive. The highest level of job satisfaction was reported by subjects whose boss was supportive and whose level of favorable self-perception was classified as medium or low.

From these results, Thompson concluded that supervisory style of the boss and favorable self-perception scores jointly acted in determining job satisfaction scores.

Wurtz (1973) looked at situational aspects of work, i.e. job level, degree, marital status, years of experience, and job classification, along with personal aspects of the individual, i.e. age, sex, and self-concept, and their relationships to teacher job satisfaction.

Questionnaires on job satisfaction and adjustment were returned by
318 administrators, supervisors, and teachers, 94 percent of whose asked to participate.

The following independent variables were found to be significantly related to job satisfaction: self-ideal self discrepancy score, age, job level, degree, job classification, and experience. The self-ideal self discrepancy score was the most powerful variable for predicting job satisfaction. When used in combination with other variables, the self-ideal self discrepancy score accounted for 45 percent of the variance in job satisfaction, experience accounted for one percent, and all other variables less than one percent.

As a result of this study, Wurtz concluded that teachers who are female, hold an advanced degree, and whose self-ideal self discrepancy score is small were the most satisfied with their jobs.

The relationships between self-concept and job satisfaction were also studied by Brophy (1959), Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960), Kornhauser (1965), and Bradburn (1969). However, since these studies were concerned with life satisfaction as well as self-concept and job satisfaction, they will be reported in another section of this review.

Relationships Between Self-Concept and Life Satisfaction

The relationship of self-concept to life satisfaction was also postulated by Super (1953) in his theory of vocational development. Super theorized that life satisfaction and work satisfaction were dependent on the individual finding adequate outlets for his interests, abilities, personality traits, and values. These outlets, work being an important
outlet, provide opportunities for the individual to implement his self-concept. Therefore, life satisfaction as well as job satisfaction is related to self-concept. Because of the interrelationships among self-concept, life satisfaction, and job satisfaction, studies which investigated only the relationships between self-concept and life satisfaction appeared to be few in number. Only one study will be included in this section of the review and it was selected because it studied these relationships for the occupational group of interest in the present study, college faculty.

Birnbaum (1971) investigated the differences in life patterns, personality, and self-esteem between family-oriented and career-committed women. Purposes of the study were to determine the extent to which homemaking and child rearing offered sufficient satisfaction to bright college educated women and to determine what psychologically distinguishes women who seek professional career satisfaction instead of the more traditional feminine pattern.

A group of "distinguished" alumnae who graduated between 1945 and 1955 from the University of Michigan and who were homemakers were compared with married and single university faculty in their responses to an autobiographical questionnaire and projective cues.

Different patterns of feminine development and different levels of satisfaction characterized the three groups. Homemakers usually came from middle class backgrounds, had a mother who did not work, did well in school, avoided aggressive play, and currently described themselves as conventional, dependent, and not competitive. Motherhood was viewed as the focal life role, and achievement and satisfaction came from having
a large family. Currently individuals in this group were undergoing some distress, had a low self-esteem, and perceived themselves as neither attractive to men nor especially competent.

The second group, married university faculty, usually came from non-traditional upper middle class homes, had highly educated parents, had a competitive mother who often worked, were assertive as children, had anticipated marriage and yet maintained professional aspirations. They currently considered themselves unconventional, competitive, not self-sacrificing, and had a high level of energy. They found their work pleasurable and intrinsically satisfying. This group currently considered themselves attractive, competent, and had a high self-esteem.

University faculty who were single tended to come from a traditionally oriented lower class family, dated infrequently, and capitalized on school achievement and occupational distinction for upward social mobility. As adults, these women were involved in their work and community and received satisfaction from being considered helpful, compassionate experts. Their level of self-esteem was high at the present time and they felt productive and worthwhile.

Birnbaum concluded that gifted homemakers were less satisfied and had lower levels of self-esteem than married or single faculty. A reason suggested by Birnbaum for this situation was that homemakers were faced with a kind of premature retirement as their children grew up and left home. They had viewed motherhood as their focal life role and the time now spent in this role was decreasing.
Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

The importance of the relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction has been noted by Super (1953), Roe (1956), and Oberle (1971). Roe concluded that "it is in point of fact impossible to separate occupational satisfaction from satisfaction with life. One is a measure of the other, neither is prior to nor independent of the other, both are implications of the person in the world" (pp. 284-285). Studies assessing the magnitude of the relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction have been conducted by Brayfield, Wells and Strate (1957), Hulin (1959), Haavio-Mannila (1971), Mansfield (1972), Iris and Barrett (1972), Burke (1973), Starcevich (1973), and Ronan, Cobb, Garrett, Lazarri, Mosser, and Racine (1974).

The investigation by Brayfield, Wells, and Strate (1957) assessed the magnitude of the relationship between attitude toward the job and attitude toward life in general and compared two different scales which measured each of these attitudes.

Two instruments representing an overall measure of job satisfaction and two indexing general satisfaction were administered by two of the investigators to civil service employees. Subjects were 52 women and 41 men employed in three departments of the city government in a large midwestern city. The men predominately were in higher level jobs and earned higher salaries than the women. The average man employee was in his forties, while the average woman employee was in her thirties.

Intercorrelations among the four measures of satisfaction for men and women employees were reported. The two measures of job satisfaction
were significantly related, $r = .40$, for men but not for women, $r = .20$. These findings lent support to the generalization that the two instruments represented somewhat different approaches to the measurement of job satisfaction and were not interchangeable.

Correlations between the two measures of general satisfaction were significant for both groups, $r = .57$ for men and $r = .43$ for women. The investigators stressed that there was considerable independence in the two methods of measuring general satisfaction despite these significant intercorrelations.

Each measure of job satisfaction was correlated with each measure of general or life satisfaction. No statistically significant relationships were found between job satisfaction and life satisfaction for women employees. However, significant correlations were found among all four instruments for men employees.

Brayfield, Wells, and Strate tentatively concluded that job satisfaction and general satisfaction were fairly highly related among males in comparable work situations. They emphasized that generalizations regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and general satisfaction must be qualified by consideration of the type of measures used.

Two sets of hypotheses relevant to the analysis of the effects of community characteristics on job satisfaction were tested by Hulin (1969). The first set of hypotheses was concerned with the differences in the workers' reactions to the two communities, and the second set was related to the relationships between the workers' reactions to the communities and their job satisfaction.
All salaried workers in two "company" towns in British Columbia, Canada, were asked to participate in the study. Although both towns were controlled by the same company, they differed considerably. Town A was larger than Town B, had better medical and dental facilities, provided more recreational facilities, and had better schools than Town B. Housing in Town B was company owned and rented to workers for a small amount, while housing in Town A was not company owned and considerably more expensive.

Questionnaires which included items on personal background, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, attitudes about the community, and the importance of community and job characteristics in determining general feelings were distributed to individual workers by work-group representatives. Completed questionnaires were mailed to the investigator by 442 workers from Town A and only 28 workers from Town B, a response rate of 76 percent.

The data demonstrated that differences between communities resulted in differences in the workers' satisfaction with these communities. Secondly, it was shown that the workers' satisfaction with the economic characteristics of the community had a significant effect on their satisfaction with pay. Thirdly, significant relationships were found between the workers' satisfaction with community and job characteristics considered jointly and their general satisfaction with their job and with their life. Finally, differences were found between male and female workers in the variables which were related to overall job and life satisfaction.
The following suggestions for further research on job satisfaction and life satisfaction were made by Hulin. Situational variables should no longer be considered nuisance parameters to be controlled or partialed out. These variables should be regarded as valid and meaningful sources of variance and their effects should be analyzed. Not only must the effects in differences in preferences for work role outcomes be considered but also differences in standards for judging any given level of any work role outcome.

Haavio-Mannila (1971) examined the satisfaction derived from three major institutions in the life of an adult man and woman: family, work, and leisure. The data analyzed were collected for a larger study on the status and roles of men and women in Finland.

Interviews were conducted with randomly selected individuals aged 15 to 64 living in Helsinki and in five rural communities. Subjects indicated their degree of satisfaction using a four-point scale with different aspects of their lives: status at work, work in general, family life in general, relationship to spouse, possibilities for leisure time use, and overall life. Respondents were also asked to indicate which life sector gave them the most satisfaction: occupation, work, and studies; home and family life; or leisure activities.

The findings discussed below should be accepted with some reservations because of the influence of interviewer bias mentioned by Haavio-Manilla. The question arises as to whether true satisfaction or different norms concerning the expression of it were being measured in this study.
The results showed that the family life sector was particularly im-
portant in the satisfaction of the needs of low status married men and
women. Upper status individuals and unmarried persons tended to rely on
a wider range of institutions for their central life satisfaction.

A comparison of employed and nonemployed wives indicated that the
marital relationship was more important to home-staying than to working
wives. Even for working wives, satisfaction with family life was found
to be an important determinant of both work and life satisfaction.

Finally, it was found that women in low status occupations were more
satisfied with their work and family than men in similar positions.
Haavio-Manilla stated that women have been socialized to accept subordi-
nate positions in society which may have created in them some kind of
"false consciousness". Women may also get compensative satisfaction from
other life sectors than from work. For the reasons mentioned earlier,
these results should be accepted tentatively at the present time. Further
research needs to be conducted to verify the findings.

Three alternative hypotheses on the relationship between a person's
work and out of work activities were tested with data from a sample of
managers (Mansfield, 1972). The hypotheses were: the compensatory
leisure hypothesis which proposes that individuals will be motivated to
seek satisfactions out of work which are denied them on their jobs; the
spillover leisure hypothesis which proposes that individuals deprived of
satisfactions at work will lose their motivation to achieve these satis-
factions out of work; and the integrated man leisure hypothesis which
proposes that if the individual's life is largely integrated, the im-
The importance attached to needs in an area at work will be positively related to need importance in the same area out of work.

Data were gathered by an anonymous questionnaire completed by the 52 participants in a one-week course in the behavioral sciences at work. The participants ranged in age from late twenties to late fifties, with 40-50 years old being the modal age category, and all could be described as managers.

Respondents were asked to make three ratings on nine characteristics in the context of their work and with regard to their out of work activities. The nine characteristics were opportunity for personal growth and development, feeling of self-fulfillment, feeling of worthwhile accomplishment, opportunity for independent thought and action, feeling of self-esteem, prestige, opportunity to give help to other people, opportunity to develop close friendships, and feeling of security. These characteristics were designed to be relevant to needs for self-actualization, for autonomy, for esteem, for sociability, and for security.

Mean scores for need importance and need satisfaction both in and out of work were computed. No significant differences were found between in work and out of work situations in four of the five areas: self-actualization, autonomy, esteem, and security. The only area where a significant difference was found was social needs, with more dissatisfaction experienced out of work.

Correlations between need importance and need satisfaction in and out of work did not reach the five percent level of significance. This meant that little support existed for the first two hypotheses, the
compensatory leisure hypothesis and the spillover leisure hypothesis. The correlations did provide support for the third hypothesis that need importance in and out of work was positively related, at least for higher order needs. A significant positive correlation was found between satisfaction of needs for self-actualization at work and satisfaction out of work in each of the five need areas, and between satisfaction with self-actualization, autonomy, and social needs at work and satisfaction of self-actualization needs out of work.

Mansfield concluded that the research suggested that the same persons are likely to regard particular needs as important both in and out of work. Also, those whose higher order needs are satisfied in or out of work are likely to be the ones who are satisfied in most need areas in and out of work. The need for further research to examine these relationships was stressed.

Iris and Barrett (1972) examined relations among employee job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and the importance of job factors for two groups of foremen differing in level of job satisfaction.

Subjects were samples of first-level supervisors selected at random from two departments, A or B, of a chemical plant. Sample A consisted of 34 men who were younger, had less education, had been with the company less time, and earned less per month than the 35 men in Sample B. Foremen in department A were identified by management as having low morale, while foremen in department B were not considered by management as having low morale.

A job importance questionnaire, a job satisfaction questionnaire, a
life satisfaction questionnaire, and a biographical questionnaire were administered to the participants. Responses were anonymous but were coded by department.

Foremen in department A attached significantly more importance to the job aspects of pay and promotions than did foremen in department B. No other significant differences were found between the two groups on the importance questionnaire.

Satisfaction scores were significantly higher for Sample B foremen than for Sample A foremen on every job aspect: promotions, pay, co-workers, supervision, and work. Similarly, Sample B foremen indicated higher levels of satisfaction on each question of the life satisfaction questionnaire. Sample B foremen were significantly more satisfied with life, leisure, and job but not significantly more satisfied with family than foremen in Sample A.

Correlation coefficients between the importance of and satisfaction with the five job factors and satisfaction with life, leisure, family, and overall job satisfaction for foremen in the two groups were computed. Five significant negative correlations were found between job importance factors and life satisfaction for Sample A foremen, while all correlations between these two areas were positive for Sample B foremen. These negative correlations between importance factors and life satisfaction were interpreted to mean that those believing elements of the job were important to their satisfaction were less satisfied by the dimensions measured by the life satisfaction questionnaire. In general, a positive relationships was found between satisfaction with job factors and life
satisfaction.

From the results of this study, it would appear that when men are in a job situation providing little job satisfaction, disavowing the importance of the job may be a healthy response. If a worker does not negate the importance of the factors and he perceives them as unsatisfactory, his self-esteem may be negatively affected. The conclusion reached by Iris and Barrett was that an individual's evaluation of the importance of job factors is important in understanding the relationship between job and life satisfaction.

The relative amount of time spent in five life roles, the time an individual desired to spend in each role, and the individual's satisfaction with his performance in each role were examined by Burke (1973). The roles included work, family member, friends, leisure, and organizational member.

Questionnaires dealing with job pressures and employee feelings of tension and anxiety, various methods of coping with job tensions, and the amount of time spent in various life roles were distributed to 43 managers employed in an engineering department of a large corporation. All were married, and all but two had children. All managers asked to participate responded.

Most time was spent by the managers in the work role, followed by the family role. The remaining life roles received about equal time. Managers indicated that they would like to spend less time in the work role but more time in each of the other four roles. The decreased time desired in the work role did not equal the increased time desired in the
nonwork roles. Although managers indicated they desired to spend less time in the work role, the life roles receiving the most time were the same roles which would receive the most time if the managers were free to choose.

The work role was the role which the participants reported as presenting the greatest satisfaction, followed by the family member role, the friends role, the organizational member role, and the leisure role. Correlation coefficients between the discrepancy scores between time spent and time desired in the life roles and satisfaction with the life roles were computed. Two of the five correlations were significant at the .05 level, leisure role and organizational member role. For these two roles the smaller the gap between time now spent and time desired the greater was the manager's satisfaction with his performance in these roles. No relationship between the size of the gap and satisfaction with performance was found for the other three roles.

Intercorrelations among the time spent on various life roles and time desired on various life roles showed that managers who spent more time in the work role tended to spend less time in the nonwork roles and that managers who spent more time in one of the nonwork roles tended to spend more time in all of the nonwork roles.

No significant or systematic relationships were found between any of the time measures and measures of managerial mental and psychological well-being.

Burke noted that the results of this study provided strong support for the notion that work is the only activity other than sleep to which
a man gives most of his time. Many managers in this sample spent most of their time in the work roles and were extremely satisfied with their performance in this area.

The purpose of a study by Starcevich (1973) was to examine the relationship between the respondents' central life interest and the importance ascribed to various job factors as sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Distinctions were made between individuals whose central life interest was considered to be either job-oriented or nonjob-oriented. The job-oriented person centers his life on the job and finds major rewards and frustrations in connection with his work. The nonjob-oriented person has his life centered on institutions outside the job and the job is viewed as a means to an end rather than an end in itself.

A three part questionnaire was mailed to 600 employees of a large manufacturing firm. The rate of return from the respondents was 86.3 percent. The first part of the questionnaire measured the central life interest of the respondents, the second part measured the importance ascribed by the respondent to each of 18 job factors as sources of satisfaction, and the third part measured the importance ascribed to the lack of the same 18 job factors as sources of dissatisfaction.

Respondents were classified either as job-oriented or nonjob-oriented based upon their responses to the first part of the questionnaire. Analyses of variance were performed to identify job factors which served as the greatest satisfiers and those which served as the greatest dissatisfiers.
The most important sources of satisfaction for job-oriented employees were achievement, work itself, and use of best abilities. The factors ranked as the most important sources of dissatisfaction for job-oriented individuals were achievement, recognition, challenging assignments, responsibilities, and use of best abilities. Working conditions, merit increases, employee benefits, and effect of job on home and family life were ranked consistently as least important sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction by this group of employees.

Sources of satisfaction for non-job-oriented respondents were achievement, work itself, use of best abilities, recognition, and challenging assignments. The three most important sources of dissatisfaction for non-job-oriented employees were achievement, use of best abilities, and challenging assignments. Factors which contributed least to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction for this group were merit increases, employee benefits, management policies, effect of job on home life, and working conditions.

Based on these findings, Starcevich concluded that the central life interest of respondents does not appreciably affect their job expectations. Both job-oriented and non-job-oriented employees appeared to want basically the same things from their jobs.

Ronan, Cobb, Garrett, Lazarri, Mosser, and Racine (1974) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and mental health for military and civilian personnel at three military installations. It was hypothesized that the relationship between job satisfaction and mental health existed only on the lower skill, routine work level.
Personal interviews were conducted with 75 regular military and 25 full-time civilian personnel at grades E-2 through O-5. The sample was considered by the investigators to be representative of job levels, however, the small number which would be in any one level indicates that any findings by level should be interpreted carefully.

The direct relation of job satisfaction and mental health was low and the two emerged as separate factors upon analysis. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction appeared to be independent of each other to a large extent. The investigators stated that this relationship might only become apparent when the job is seen as frustrating or demeaning. Because these findings ran counter to the findings of other studies in the area, the need for further research was stressed.

Several other studies were found which investigated the relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Brophy, 1959; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Kornhauser, 1965; Bradburn, 1969). Because these studies were also concerned with the relationship of self-concept to these two constructs they will be reported in the next section of this review.

Relationships Among Self-Concept, Job Satisfaction, and Life Satisfaction

Although the interrelationships of self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction have been mentioned frequently in literature on satisfaction (Super, 1953; Wrenn, 1964; Wilensky, 1964; and Oberle, 1971), empirical studies on these interrelationships have been few in number. Four studies will be reported which have investigated these interrelation-
ships. Brophy (1959) tested portions of the theory of satisfaction he presented; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) surveyed the mental health of Americans; Kornhauser (1965) studied the mental condition of workers in modern mass production industries; and Bradburn (1969) investigated the nature of various dimensions of psychological well-being and social pressures.

Brophy (1959) presented a theory of satisfaction believed to be relevant to the phenomena of general happiness and of satisfaction in specific life areas and tested hypotheses derived from the phenomenological portions of the theory.

The theory postulated by Brophy viewed satisfaction as a function of the degree of congruence between personal concepts and environmentally focused concepts within three categories of frame of reference—manifest, latent, and external. The theory stated that satisfaction is maximized when congruence exists between a person's objectively determined characteristics, his manifest and subliminal perceptions of self, and his manifest and subliminal conception of the kind of person he would like to be in fulfilling environmental demands, and when these perceptions are appropriate to the actual environmental situation and the situation as perceived manifestly and subliminally by the individual.

Portions of the theory tested in the study postulated that satisfaction was a function of the relationship between self-concept and manifestly imposed role and of the relationship between manifest concept of ideal self and manifestly perceived imposed role. Five self-report inventories were used to measure the concepts appearing in the hypotheses:
general satisfaction, vocational satisfaction, self-concept, ideal self, perceived life role, self-acceptance, and vocational role acceptance.

Respondents were 81 female nurses at a large metropolitan hospital, 77 percent of those to whom questionnaires were distributed. The subjects tended to be young, with half of them being 20 to 24 years of age and having had less than four years experience in nursing. The sample also contained proportionately more head nurses and supervisors and fewer staff nurses than were employed at the hospital. Brophy noted that the results could not be generalized beyond this population.

Scores representing discrepancies between pairs of concepts appearing in the hypotheses were computed. These discrepancy scores and the self-acceptance and occupational role acceptance scores were correlated with measures of general satisfaction and vocational satisfaction.

Significant negative correlations were found between general satisfaction and the discrepancy between ideal self and imposed life role and the discrepancy between self-concept and ideal self. The discrepancy between self-concept and imposed life role was not found to be significantly related to general satisfaction. Vocational satisfaction was negatively related to the following hypothesized discrepancies: self-concept and imposed occupational role, ideal occupational role and imposed occupational role, self-concept and ideal occupational role, and self-concept and ideal self. No significant relationship was found between general satisfaction and self-acceptance. A significant positive relationship was found between vocational satisfaction and occupational role acceptance. General satisfaction and vocational satisfaction were
also significantly correlated. Partial correlational analysis indicated that some of these relationships would not be maintained if the variation associated with the self-concept and ideal self discrepancy was eliminated.

Brophy concluded that the significant correlations found between the discrepancy scores of pairs of concepts and general and vocational satisfaction supported the phenomenological portions of the theory of satisfaction. The findings suggested that congruence between self-concept and ideal self was a fundamental condition for general happiness and for satisfaction in specific life areas. Finally, it was stressed that although phenomenological analysis was important in understanding feelings of satisfaction, it did not provide by itself a sufficient explanatory system. Further research on other portions of the theory was suggested.

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) reported the results of a survey of the mental health of Americans. Two broad areas were covered by the data collected: feelings of adjustment and methods of handling emotional problems. The first area explored the satisfaction and dissatisfaction people derived from the life roles of marriage, parenthood, and work; attitudes toward the self; and psychosomatic and anxiety symptoms. Variables investigated under the second broad area included readiness to turn to professional help, general approach to handling problems, and sources of help to which people turn when faced with emotional and adjustment problems.

Personal interviews were conducted with 2460 randomly selected American adults during the spring of 1957. The sample was restricted
to individuals over 21 years of age living in private households. Eight percent of those contacted refused to participate.

The findings were reported in two parts: part one was concerned with feelings of adjustment and the relationships of these feelings to demographic characteristics, and part two dealt with methods of solving problems of adjustment. Only the findings in part one will be reported in this review because findings in part two are not directly related to the present study on the relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction for home economics college faculty.

Participants responded to a series of questions on sources of happiness and unhappiness in the past, present, and future. Two broad categories of reasons were given for gratification and distress: economic and material considerations and the central life relationships of marriage, children, and family. Over half the respondents referred to marriage and family as an area that gave them happiness in life. Only a small minority mentioned personal and interpersonal problems as reasons for unhappiness. People tended to externalize their problems, to locate them in concrete material things or a job.

The relationships between general adjustment and sex, age, and education were analyzed. Women generally expressed more distress than men. Older people tended to be unhappier, but worried less, than younger people, suggesting that problems of old age tend to be problems more of apathy than anxiety and insecurity. More highly educated individuals were happier and worried less than less educated persons. Education seemed to be associated with greater expectations and aspirations in life.
Respondents' perceptions of self were based on their responses to three open-ended questions designed to elicit a general picture of self, perceived shortcomings, and perceived sources of strength. Certain aspects of self-attitudes, introspection and positive-negative orientation to self were examined and complexities were found in the relationships between the two dimensions. Introspection tended to heighten sensitivity to negative as well as positive aspects of self and consequently reduced the positiveness of the self-percept.

Relationships between self-perception and the variables of sex, age, and education were reported. Women were found to have a more negative orientation to self and to be more introspective than men. Men placed more blame for shortcomings on external events, while women stressed personality and interpersonal weaknesses. Older people had a more positive self-image, they saw fewer shortcomings in themselves and rated higher in general self-acceptance. It appeared that with age people seemed to come to terms with themselves. More highly educated individuals, like women, were more negative in their self-image and more introspective.

The findings suggested that social and cultural conditions that lead to introspection and heightened self-awareness may also lead to realistic self-criticism and as a result generally a more negative self-percept. Thus, groups more positively adjusted in one component tended to be less adjusted in terms of the other.

Three aspects of adjustment in the life roles of marriage, parenthood, and work were singled out for study: feelings of gratification,
major problems, and feelings of adequacy in the role. In the marriage role, little relationship was found between unhappiness and feelings of inadequacy, but both were found to be related to the experience of problems in the role.

Women tended to be more dissatisfied and evidenced more problems in marriage than men but did not express greater feelings of inadequacy in the marriage role. Women also blamed their husbands for marital unhappiness more often than men blamed their wives. Older people expressed fewer problems and fewer feelings of inadequacy suggesting that aging brings adaptation, acceptance, and minimization of stress. More highly educated individuals reported a greater investment and involvement in their marriages making them more sensitive to both positive and negative aspects. As with self-perception, heightened involvement and expectations result in greater potential for gratification and for tensions and distress.

Feelings of inadequacy and the experience of problems in the role of parent were also correlated with the variables, sex, age, and education. Women expressed more feelings of distress, saw more of the negative aspects, sensed more feelings of inadequacy, and perceived more problems in the parent role than men. Older parents tended to have a more positive picture of the parental role and to report fewer problems than younger parents. Parents with higher educational levels were more involved in the parental role and with this involvement came more introspection about parental adjustment and a greater sense of inadequacy in the role. The investigators noted that the parental role represented an
area where cultural values have undergone considerable changes in recent years.

Adjustment in the work role was measured in terms of satisfaction, feelings of adequacy, and history of problems. Little relationship was found between feelings of inadequacy and number of problems reported, however both were related to job dissatisfaction. Relationships between adjustment and the demographic variables, age and education, were reported. Older men were more likely to be satisfied and to report no work problems, pointing to the growing adaption that comes with age. Persons with more education felt less inadequate, were more involved in their jobs, expressed more job satisfaction, and experienced more problems. The lack of self-fulfillment in lower level jobs appeared to be less of a problem than was anticipated. Lower educated groups which were less involved and less satisfied seemed less conscious of distress on the job.

Respondents replied to a symptom checklist. A factor analysis yielded four dimensions: psychological anxiety, immobilization, physical health, and physical anxiety. Consistent differences were found between the sexes, with women exhibiting more symptoms on all four factors. Older people reported more physical symptoms than younger persons. On the psychological factor of immobilization, the relationships was reversed. No clear picture between symptom patterns and age was found for the psychological anxiety factor. Less educated persons had higher scores on the physical factors and a lower score on the immobilization factor.
Demographic variables seemed to differ in two ways: the extent of their relationships with feelings of adjustment and their relationships with the different kinds of adjustment experienced. Two sets of factors were found which differentiated the demographic variables related to adjustment (age, sex, education, income, marital status) from those not related. First, demographic variables which differentiated subgroups in terms of potential rewards were important; and second, variables which represented differences in the expectations and demands subgroup members make of themselves and of life were important.

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld concluded that to explain the varying patterns of adjustment the distinction between the meaning of the variable in terms of gratification potential and its meaning in terms of involvement and aspirations should be stressed. The greater feelings of satisfaction and inadequacy expressed by more educated respondents can be interpreted in terms of higher aspirations and greater potential for gratification; while the lower feelings of inadequacy and fewer problems, but not gratification, among older-aged groups reflected minimized aspirations and a lowered potential for gratification with age.

Subgroups of the population differed not so much in their level of adjustment as they did in the ways they experienced gratification and adjustment problems. This creates problems in attempts to make overall judgments about the adjustment in a group because the judgments vary with the criteria used. The use of multiple criteria for describing adjustment patterns in population subgroups was recommended by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld.
A study by Kornhauser (1965) was designed to obtain evidence regarding the mental condition of workers in modern mass-production industry. The central purpose of this investigation was to add to present knowledge and interpretations that may help guide public opinion and the policies of industry, labor, and government in respect to the well-being and fullest possible development of industrial workers.

Mental health was conceptualized as a loose descriptive designation for an overall level of success, personal satisfaction, effectiveness, and excellence of an individual's functioning as a person.

Detailed interviews averaging three to four hours in length were conducted with employed men in the Detroit area during late 1953 and early 1954. Purpose of the interview was to secure information about the respondent's usual feelings, attitudes, and behavior to determine how well he was getting along psychologically. The content of the interview was classified as follows: life satisfaction; attitudes toward self, accomplishments, and other persons; aspirations and values; job characteristics and work relationships; attitudes and satisfaction pertaining to work, employing organization, and union; life history; current nonjob conditions, activities, and attitudes; use of leisure time; emotional adjustment; and social attitudes.

The case sample of Detroit manual workers was selected by systematic sampling techniques from the personnel files of 13 automotive manufacturing plants in Detroit. Supplementary samples for comparison purposes were selected in the same way from manual workers in six Detroit non-manufacturing companies, from factory workers in eight plants in small
toms outside Detroit, and from office workers in six Detroit automotive companies and three nonmanufacturing companies. All individuals included met certain predetermined criteria: prescribed job categories, white, on payroll at least three years, and either between 20 and 29 years of age or between 40 and 49 years of age. Interviews were conducted with 655 individuals, 75 percent of the potential sample of 875.

Information from the interviews was coded according to a code developed through logical analysis, anticipation of dimensions likely to prove promising, and grouping of ideas that emerged from the empirical material itself. Six component indexes were constructed to provide a general measure of mental health: index of manifest anxiety and emotional tension, index of self-esteem, index of hostility, index of sociability and friendship, index of overall satisfaction with life, and index of personal morale. The validity of these indexes was assessed by comparing the results of overall evaluations of mental health made by several experienced, highly qualified clinical psychologists and psychiatrists for 40 cases with evaluations based on the indexes for the same cases. Agreement between the evaluations was relatively high.

The principal results of the study indicated that large numbers of automobile workers manifest feelings, attitudes, and behavior which signify a not too satisfactory life adjustment. From one-fourth to one-half of the men studied stated they were often worried and upset, often felt restless, felt either dissatisfied with life or were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, were not accomplishing what they would like in life, and felt there was little they could do to make their future what they
wanted it to be. These and other responses revealed feelings of inadequacy, low self-esteem, anxiety, hostility, dissatisfaction with life, and low personal morale.

Mental health of the industrial workers studied was found to vary consistently with the level of jobs held. The higher the occupational level, the better the average mental health. Workers in skilled jobs had the highest mental health scores, while workers in routine, repetitive jobs had the lowest scores.

Analysis of data indicated that observed differences in mental health could not be accounted for merely by amount of education and other prejob characteristics of the men in the different job categories. The relationship between mental health and occupational level was genuine. The importance of situational factors was emphasized by the results. Persons differently situated in the economic system enjoyed better mental health or suffered poorer mental health according to their position. The Detroit factory group had poorer mental health than the white-collar workers, small-town workers, and young, nonfactory workers surveyed.

The relationship of mental health to job satisfaction was also discussed. Job feelings were construed as an intervening link between the job and its impact on mental health. Differences in the prevalence of job satisfaction were found between higher and lower occupational groups, with workers in routine, repetitive jobs exhibiting greatest dissatisfaction. In each occupational category better satisfied individuals enjoyed better mental health. The following job characteristics were found
to contribute to high or low mental health: most important was the opportunity the work offers for use of abilities, personal growth, and sense of accomplishment; next most important were feelings regarding income; feelings toward the job aspects of pace, intensity, repetitiveness, supervision, and opportunities for advancement were irregularly related to mental health; and job security and physical conditions were not related to mental health.

Large differences in employees' mental health, job satisfaction and job-related attitudes were found when industrial establishments were compared. Companies ranked lower in mental health if they were larger, if they had a large proportion of employees in skilled jobs, if the quality of personnel services was below average, and if workers' attitudes toward use of their abilities and opportunities for promotion were unfavorable.

Characteristics of individuals were also analyzed to determine the relationships between personal factors and mental health. Personal factors of four kinds were examined: descriptive facts, prejob personality attributes, childhood goals and values, and current life goals. Mental health was found to be most clearly associated with differences of education, childhood economic advantages, and childhood personality traits.

The effects of personal attributes and situational variables tended to be additive. A combination of good childhood conditions and skilled occupation yielded the best mental health.

Analyses of workers' orientations in regard to work and the job, in regard to lives away from the job, sociopolitical orientation, and attitudes toward themselves were also reported. The predominant orientation
of workers toward their jobs was moderately positive. Factory workers expressed predominant satisfaction and a positive outlook in their lives away from the job. This outlook differed little from one job level to another or between factory and nonfactory workers. Respondents' socio-political orientations were strongly in favor of labor unions, government aid to needy, public regulation of business, and collective actions which they believed benefited the common man. Finally, factory workers' attitudes toward themselves and their life goals revealed many negative factors: low self-esteem, feelings of ineffectiveness, inadequacy, lack of accomplishment, self-blame, and discouragement.

The major conclusion reached by Kornhauser was that men's position in the occupational hierarchy substantially affects their mental health, that low-level jobs have especially adverse effects, and that this occurs largely because personality needs are incongruent with the nature of job characteristics, opportunities, and demands.

A study reported by Bradburn (1969) focused on the relationship between an individual's life situation and his psychological reactions to that situation. The goal of the investigation was to determine the nature of the relationships between various dimensions of psychological well-being and social processes.

Samples were drawn from several communities in which there was some likelihood that social change would occur during the one year period of the study. Five samples were included in the study: a Detroit suburb; a Detroit inner city area; a Chicago working class neighborhood; a suburban county near Washington, D.C.; and a sample of residents from the
ten largest metropolitan areas in the country. Respondents were randomly
selected from members in the households which had been selected using
area sampling techniques. The response rates in the various samples
ranged from 74-85 percent.

Two interviews were conducted with each respondent in four of the
sample areas between January, 1963, and February, 1964. Four interviews
were conducted with individuals in the Detroit suburb during this same
time period.

The five samples varied significantly with respect to income, occupa­
tion, and education. People in the Washington suburban county were
more educated, had better jobs, and earned more money than individuals in
the other four samples. Individuals in the Detroit inner city tended to
be the least educated, held more unskilled or semi-skilled jobs, and
earned less than respondents in the other samples.

Differences were also found among the samples with respect to age,
family structure, sex, and housing. People in the poorest communities,
the Detroit inner city and the Chicago neighborhood, tended to be older
than those in the suburbs. A substantial majority of respondents in the
suburbs came from families where both spouses were present, while in the
Detroit inner city sample only 37 percent were from families where both
spouses were present. Women were more predominant in the inner city
sample than in the other four samples. A majority of participants in
the suburbs owned their own homes, while in the inner city sample and the
Chicago sample a majority rented their homes.

Data were collected through personal interviews with respondents in
their own homes. The interview schedule contained mostly close-ended questions with a few open-ended questions.

Responses to three general life satisfaction items indicated that respondents in the samples reported different levels of happiness. Approximately one-third of the individuals in all samples except the Detroit inner city sample reported that they were "very happy" with their life these days. The Detroit inner city sample reported lower levels of happiness. The demographic variables—sex, age, income, education, and race—were correlated with avowed happiness. No significant differences were found between men and women in level of happiness reported. A small relationship was found between age and happiness with the youngest group more likely to report being "very happy". A relationship was also found between more education, higher income, and the probability of reporting one is "very happy". Blacks were less likely to indicate that they were "very happy" than whites even when income was controlled.

Each respondent was asked a series of questions concerning pleasurable and unpleasurable experiences in the recent past. Positive feelings were recorded when the individual indicated that he had accomplished something, things were going his way, someone had complimented him on something he had done, he was particularly excited about something, or he felt on top of the world. Being bored, depressed, lonely, restless, upset at being criticized were considered negative feelings. The clusters of positive and negative dimensions showed little relationship to one another, and each was related in opposite directions to the respondents'
self-reports of happiness.

Sex, age, education, and income were correlated with psychological well-being as reflected by the positive and negative feelings respondents expressed. Women were more likely to report both positive and negative feelings than men. Little difference was found between age groups, however the positive dimension did tend to decline as age increased. Respondents with more education reported more positive feelings. No differences were found in negative feelings expressed between educational levels. Income was associated with both positive and negative dimensions of psychological well-being. The results indicated that individuals who had achieved the socially valued characteristics of high income and education or who were young, well educated, and with the potential to achieve these characteristics had the added bonus of a sense of well-being.

Adjustment in the roles of marriage and work was examined. Not being married was found to be strongly associated with a decreased sense of psychological well-being, particularly for individuals who had been married but were currently separated, widowed, or divorced. Not being married appeared to have a greater impact on the well-being of men than that of women. Bradburn advanced two explanations for these differences: first, men with a lower sense of well-being select themselves out of marriage; or second, men react more negatively to the unmarried state. An examination of the relationship between satisfaction in the marriage role and psychological well-being revealed an overall association between measures of psychological well-being and measures of marriage happiness. Some evidence was found which pointed to the possibility that
dissatisfaction in marriage may have a greater impact on well-being than experiences leading to satisfaction in marriage. For almost all measures, the relationship between psychological well-being and marriage happiness was stronger for women than for men.

Relationships between aspects of the work role and psychological well-being were also examined. Some items associated with work were related to the positive dimension of well-being and others were related to the negative dimension. Income, promotions, chances for advancement, and perceptions of how others view his job had a greater association with positive feelings for those in higher status positions. Work satisfaction and feeling inadequate in one's work role were consistently related to negative feelings for individuals at all job-status levels. Bradburn suggested the broader scope of life experiences and opportunities as well as more interesting job activities for those in higher positions might be a reason for the status differentials that were found.

Bradburn summarized this study of psychological well-being by noting that it could be usefully organized in terms of two independent dimensions of positive and negative affect. Six unresolved problem areas which Bradburn stated as needing further research were: the independence of the dimensions of positive and negative affect, the number of dimensions necessary for a complete accounting of variations in psychological well-being, correlates of positive affect, cross-role analysis, the question of individual differences, and the effects of major social change on psychological well-being.
Summary

The review of literature has included seven major topics: a) self-concept, b) job satisfaction, c) life satisfaction, d) relationships between self-concept and job satisfaction, e) relationships between self-concept and life satisfaction, f) relationships between job satisfaction and life satisfaction, and g) relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Literature reviewed on the measurement of self-concept and self-concept in vocational development suggests that improvements are needed in several areas of self-concept measurement and that job satisfaction appears to be related to the agreement between self-concept and occupational concept. The results of the studies reviewed on job satisfaction of college faculty indicate that college faculty are generally well satisfied with their jobs, particularly with the type of work they do. Degree of job satisfaction was found to be related to sex, age, academic rank, and salary. Findings from studies on the correlates of life satisfaction suggest that life satisfaction is correlated with health, age, sex, income, marital status, self-esteem, and job morale.

Reports of studies on the relationships between and among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction indicate self-concept is positively related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction and that job satisfaction is positively associated with life satisfaction. The results of four studies on the relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction showed that congruence between self-concept and ideal self was related to general happiness and to job
satisfaction; that selected variables such as sex, age, and education were related to job satisfaction and life satisfaction; that position in the occupational hierarchy affects satisfaction; and that psychological well-being could be organized into a positive and a negative dimension.

Although studies have investigated self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction for various groups, none were found which investigated these constructs for home economics college faculty. Studies on life satisfaction in recent years have been more oriented to retired persons than to individuals who are still working. Studies on the inter-relationships of self-concept, job satisfaction and life satisfaction have been concerned either with industrial employees or with cross sections of the population and not with college faculty and especially not with home economics college faculty.

On the basis of this review, it would seem that data on the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward their jobs, their life in general, and themselves would provide valuable information to home economics administrators in the recruitment and motivation of competent faculty and to persons considering home economics college teaching and/or research as a profession.
METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The major purpose of this study was to ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty members toward themselves, their jobs, and life in general.

This chapter contains a statement of the objectives of the study, descriptions of the sample and measures used, and delineation of the procedures employed to collect and analyze the data.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Describe home economics college faculty on selected biographical variables.

2. Ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward
   2.1 their jobs
   2.2 their life in general
   2.3 themselves.

3. Investigate the relationships between selected biographical variables and the level of
   3.1 job satisfaction of home economics college faculty
   3.2 life satisfaction of home economics college faculty
   3.3 self-concept of home economics college faculty.

4. Investigate the relationships among job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept of home economics college faculty.
Population and Sample

Broadly defined the population of the study was home economics college faculty in the United States. Because of the manner in which the institutions and individuals were selected, the actual population was home economics college faculty possessing a doctorate, holding the rank of associate professor or higher, and employed in institutions having an enrollment of 500 or more undergraduate home economics majors.

Institutions were selected to participate in the study in the following manner. Using Harper (1974), a list was made of all institutions having 500 or more undergraduate students enrolled as home economics majors. Thirty-five institutions were randomly selected from this list. Thirty institutions, 13 land-grant colleges and 17 other colleges or universities agreed to participate in the study. No private institutions were represented in the sample.

Packets were sent to the highest ranking home economics administrator at each institution. Each packet contained a letter (Appendix A) requesting the institution's cooperation and instructions for the distribution of the enclosed questionnaires, the questionnaires (Appendix B), and a postcard to be returned with the names of the faculty members to whom the questionnaires had been given.

Administrators were instructed to distribute the questionnaires to individuals on their staff possessing a doctorate and holding the rank of associate professor or higher. They were requested to include both men and women, and individuals from all subject matter areas of home economics. Having distributed the questionnaires, the administrator was asked
to place the names of the individuals to whom questionnaires had been
given on the enclosed postcard and return it to the investigator.

The number of questionnaires sent to an institution was based on the
number of undergraduate home economics majors at the institution. A
breakdown of the number of questionnaires sent to the various institutions
is shown in Table 1. Two administrators requested additional question-
naires so that all eligible faculty members at their institution would
have an opportunity to participate.

Table 1. Distribution of questionnaires by size of institution and number
of institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size\textsuperscript{a} in 1972-73</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 - 749</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 - 999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1249</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 - 1499</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 and over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Size in this case and in all subsequent references refers to the
number of undergraduate home economics majors enrolled in the institution.

Selection and Development of Instruments

To obtain the data necessary to accomplish the objectives of the
study, four instruments were selected or developed for inclusion in the
questionnaire. A description of each instrument follows.
Biographical information

Questions were designed to obtain selected demographic and professional background information from each faculty member.

Items in the biographical information section of the questionnaire (Appendix B) can be classified into four groups: One group of items requested demographic information; a second contained questions regarding the productivity and participation in professional organizations of the respondent; a third group of items dealt with the respondent's current position; and the last group, designed for married faculty only, contained questions about the employment background of the respondent's spouse.

This section of the questionnaire was evaluated in terms of its content validity by three home economics researchers at Iowa State University experienced in questionnaire construction. The items were revised and the instrument was administered to two college faculty members not eligible for participation in the study to assess its usability. Final revisions were made based upon their suggestions.

Job satisfaction

In order to determine the level of job satisfaction of home economics college faculty the job satisfaction instrument used in the Owens-Illinois Company studies conducted by Iowa State University and described in MacKinney (Note 1), was adapted for use with college faculty members. Terminology was revised for 52 of the 61 items to make them applicable to college faculty. Nine items were eliminated because it was believed that they either were not applicable to the college and university setting or they were too similar to existing items. Three additional items were
developed. These items dealt with working relationships with other faculty members, the amount of time spent on committee assignments, and administrative facilitation of faculty development.

The items were stated in group referent rather than individual referent terms. Kavanaugh (1969) found that group referent items tended to be more reliable and represented different kinds of job satisfaction than individual referent items. However, the use of group referent items was questioned by several respondents in the present investigation. Several commented that they could answer for themselves, but not for other faculty members, indicating that individual referent items might have been more appropriate for this particular group.

A 99-point scale was used to record the response to the job satisfaction instrument. Directions for use of the scale instructed the college faculty member to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with each statement. A number between 51-99 was used to indicate the degree to which the faculty member agreed with the statement, and a number between 1-49 was to indicate the degree to which they disagreed. A 50 indicated that the college faculty member neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

The job satisfaction instrument was administered to two college faculty members not eligible for participation in the study to assess its usability. Final revisions were made based upon their recommendations. A copy of the final form of the job satisfaction instrument is found in Appendix B.
Life satisfaction

In order to obtain information on the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward life in general, a life satisfaction instrument was developed. The decision to develop an instrument rather than use an existing one was based on a review of the instruments used to assess life satisfaction.

A review of the literature in the area of life satisfaction (Gurin et al., 1960; Bradburn, 1969; Hall and Gordon, 1973; and Bell, 1974) revealed that the most common method used to measure life satisfaction was to ask the respondent from one to three general questions. Subjects were asked how satisfied or happy they were with their life in general at the present time; with their life now compared to earlier times in their life; and with their life now compared to future expectations. It was believed that these questions alone were not adequate to accomplish the objectives of the present investigation.

The instrument consisted of 30 items; the three general items mentioned above and 27 additional items concerned with the following factors: community, home and family, occupation, social activities, financial situation, and health. A justification for the inclusion of items in each of these areas follows.

The inclusion of items concerned with community was based on the work of Hulin (1969). In a study which investigated the effects of community characteristics on job satisfaction and life satisfaction, Hulin found that relationships existed between selected community variables and satisfaction with one's job and with one's life in general. Items were developed to reflect these variables.
In studies on life satisfaction by Gurin et al. (1960), Wessman (1956), Palmore and Luikart (1972), and Spreitzer and Snyder (1974) home and family life were highly correlated with level of life satisfaction. The items which dealt with home and family life in this instrument were based on the results of these studies.

Satisfaction with one's occupation was also found to be related to life satisfaction by Wessman (1956), Palmore and Luikart (1972), and Spreitzer and Snyder (1974). Although an entire section of the questionnaire was devoted to job satisfaction, job satisfaction and satisfaction with one's occupation are not synonymous. Therefore, an item on satisfaction with one's occupation was included in the life satisfaction instrument.

Included under the heading social life were items which dealt with satisfaction with one's friends, satisfaction with the organizations to which one belongs, and satisfaction with leisure time and activities. A relationship was found between life satisfaction and social life by Wessman (1956) and by Palmore and Luikart (1972). Items were designed to measure satisfaction with the factors discussed in these studies.

Satisfaction with one's financial situation was found to be associated with life satisfaction in the studies conducted by Bradburn and Caplowitz (1965), Hulin (1969), Palmore and Luikart (1972), and Spreitzer and Snyder (1974). Based on these findings, several items concerned with financial situation were developed.

The variable, health, was found to be associated with level of life satisfaction in investigations by Palmore and Luikart (1972) and Spreitzer and Snyder (1974). Although both studies were directly concerned with
life satisfaction of the aging, individuals over 65 and under 55 were included in the samples. Because a relationship was found between health and life satisfaction for individuals under 65, an item on health was included in this instrument.

The "Certainty Method" response format utilized in the job satisfaction instrument was also used for the life satisfaction instrument.

The instrument was reviewed by four teacher educators to assess its face validity and administered to two college faculty members at Iowa State University to assess its usability. Revisions were made as a result of this review.

**Self-concept**

The self-concept instrument was used to assess the self-concept, the ideal self-concept, and the traits required of one on a particular job.

The instrument selected was developed by Donald E. Super at Teachers College, Columbia University. The device consisted of three sections: a personal trait list, an ideal trait list, and a job demands trait list. Each list included the same 50 bipolar traits. Respondents were asked to rate themselves, how they would like to be, and how their job demands them to be on each of the traits using a seven point scale.

The split-half reliability for the self-concept instrument, computed using the Spearman-Brown formula was .89 (Dore, 1970, p. 14).

Congruency scores among the three sections of the instrument were used to assess the self-concept of home economics college faculty. Congruency scores were used because they reflected the respondent's satisfaction with himself, one of the objectives of the present study.
Collection of Data

Data for the study were collected by mailed questionnaires during April, May, and June, 1975.

Packets of materials were sent to the highest ranking home economics administrator at the institutions. Included in the packets were a letter (Appendix A) which requested the institution's participation in the study and instructions on the distribution of the questionnaires, copies of the questionnaires (Appendix B), and self-addressed postcard to be returned with the names of the faculty members to whom questionnaires had been given.

Materials distributed to each faculty member included a cover letter, a questionnaire, and an addressed, postage-paid envelope. The cover letter (Appendix A) emphasized the importance of each individual's response and assured the respondents that their answers would be confidential. Although responses were to be confidential, respondents were asked to place their name and address on the return envelope so records of respondents could be kept.

Three weeks after the packets were mailed, a follow-up letter (Appendix A) was sent to individuals who had not responded. Included with the follow-up letter was a postcard on which the faculty member was to indicate whether he had responded, and if not, when they could respond. Space was provided for them to request another copy of the questionnaire, if necessary.

In early May a letter (Appendix A) was sent to the administrators at institutions who had not yet returned the postcard with the names of the
faculty members to whom they had given the questionnaires. This letter emphasized the importance of this information to the investigation. A letter (Appendix A) was also sent to those institutions from whom no response had been received to determine if the institution was participating in the study.

The total number of questionnaires sent to participating and non-participating institutions was 382. Information received from administrators indicated that 314 questionnaires had been distributed to faculty members. Of these, 245 were returned; this was a response rate of 78.1 percent. Seven questionnaires were unusable so the data producing sample consisted of 238 home economics faculty members from 30 institutions. The distribution of the sample in terms of size of institution and type of institution is found in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of sample by size and type of institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size in 1972-73</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 749</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 - 999</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1249</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 - 1499</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 and over</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Data

As indicated by the objectives of this study, the major purposes were to describe home economics college faculty on selected biographical characteristics; to ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward their jobs, their life in general, and themselves; and to analyze the relationships between selected biographical characteristics and level of satisfaction with self, job, and life in general. The fourth major purpose was to analyze the interrelationships among job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept for home economics college faculty. Analysis of the data will be discussed in this order.

Analysis of the instruments

The raw data from the 238 questionnaires completed by home economics college faculty were prepared for keypunching by recording code numbers on each questionnaire and filling in the number 50 in the few instances when data were missing on the job satisfaction and life satisfaction instruments or the number four when data were missing on the self-concept instrument. Frequency counts and percentages were computed for the items in the biographical information section of the questionnaire.

Satisfaction instruments The first step in the analysis of the Job Satisfaction Instrument and the Life Satisfaction Instrument was to transform the data to normal deviates. This was done because intervals between the response values were not believed to be equal, i.e., a person who indicates strong agreement or disagreement with an item does so with more certainty than one who mildly agrees or disagrees. Therefore, the original numerical responses of 1 to 99 were nonlinearly transformed by using these
numbers as cumulative proportions. These "proportions" were referred to the cumulative standard normal curve table and the corresponding number on the abscissa was substituted for the original response. All numbers had 2.33 added to them to eliminate the use of negative numbers. For example, a response of 99 became 4.66, a response of 50 was 2.33 and a response of one became 0 (Wolins and Dickinson, 1973). The rest of the analyses performed were based on these normal deviates and not the original raw data.

Forty-nine within group 85 X 85 correlation matrices based on sex and institution were computed and pooled. The 85 items included the 55 items from the Job Satisfaction Instrument and 30 items from the Life Satisfaction Instrument. The resulting intercorrelation matrix was examined to identify items with large numerical correlations which seemed to be forming clusters; seven were identified. Factors were then extracted and the loadings, which were determined by Joreskog and van Thillo's (1971) least square factor analysis method, were rotated using Varimax procedures. An examination of the factor loadings of items using these procedures revealed many items which did not belong together rationally.

The decision was then made to rotate the loadings using the Procrustes program (Hurley and Cattell, 1962). The Procrustes program is designed to see how well the factor patterns obtainable from a given set of data will fit a previously stated hypothesis or expectation as to what the factor patterns should be. Items included in each factor were determined by examining factor loadings based on the Procrustes rotation and by rationality of fit.

Reliability of each of the factors was calculated using the Spearman-Brown procedure (Nunnally, 1967, p. 193).
Self-concept instrument The self-concept instrument consisted of three trait lists, a personal trait list, an ideal trait list, and a job demands trait list. The personal trait list provided a measure of self-concept, the ideal trait list a measure of ideal self-concept, and the job demands trait list a measure of required self-concept. Each trait list was compared with each of the other two, for a total of three comparisons: self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self.

Discrepancy scores between the three measures of self-concept were computed for each individual by taking the differences between the scores on each item, squaring these differences, and summing the squared differences for all 50 items. In this way, a discrepancy score was obtained for each respondent on the self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self comparisons.

Mean discrepancy scores and standard deviations of the discrepancy scores were computed for each of the three comparisons.

Tests of differences between groups

The analysis of the job and life satisfaction instruments used in the study resulted in factors which, along with the self-concept discrepancy scores, could be used in testing differences between groups of home economics college faculty. The first step in this process was to determine factor scores for each individual.

Factor scores were obtained for each faculty member by summing the scores for the items on the job and life satisfaction instruments which were included in the factor.
To study the effects of sex and the effects of selected other demographic variables on the seven factor scores and three discrepancy scores, the data were analyzed using a two factor analysis of variance. The model on which the analysis was based was:

\[ X_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \alpha\beta_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk} \]

\begin{align*}
    i & = 1, 2 \\
    j & = 1 \ldots b \\
    k & = 1 \ldots n \\
    \alpha & = \text{sex} \\
    \beta & = \text{selected demographic variable} \\
    \alpha\beta & = \text{interaction between sex and selected demographic variable} \\
    \epsilon & = \text{error is normally and independently distributed, with a mean of 0 and a variance of} \sigma_e^2
\end{align*}

The level of significance selected for testing was the .05 level.

The number of faculty on each cell varies. The analysis of variance used was a weighted means analysis which provides an exact test but may be somewhat misleading, especially if sex interacts with one of the selected demographic variables. Significant effects may be found using all between groups degrees of freedom, yet no one source will be significant. Thus, the overall F statistic is presented along with separate tests for the main effects and interaction.

The sex main effect is tested four times and, conceptually, this is the same test each time it occurs. However, the same result does not occur each time for the reason given above.
Interrelationships between factor and discrepancy scores

A 10 X 10 correlation matrix was calculated from the seven factor scores and the three discrepancy scores. Correlations of .12 and .17 were necessary for significance at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The first section of this chapter describes home economics college faculty on selected characteristics. The second section contains the description and composition of the factors formed by responses to the job and life satisfaction instruments. The third section reports the results of the squared difference scores on the three parts of the self-concept instrument, and the fourth section, tests of differences between groups on factor scores and difference scores. The final section includes intercorrelations among the job and life satisfaction factors and the self-concept difference scores.

Characteristics of Home Economics College Faculty

Findings related to the characteristics of home economics college faculty are reported in this section. Included are descriptions of home economics college faculty with respect to current position, productivity and participation in professional organizations, selected demographic characteristics, and employment background of spouse.

Current position

Of the 238 home economics college faculty for whom usable data were available, 83 held the rank of associate professor and 94 the rank of professor. As shown in Table 3, 51 were currently serving in some type of administrative position. The sample, therefore, was representative of the upper academic ranks. This reflected instructions to home economics administrators to distribute questionnaires to faculty members with a doctorate and holding the rank of associate professor or higher.
Table 3. Current rank or position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrative position</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of time in present rank varied from less than 1 year for 10 percent of the sample to 10 years or over for 19 percent. The modal response category for time in present rank was 4 to 6 years, reported by 28 percent of the respondents.

Time employed at present institution ranged from less than 1 year for 3 percent of the faculty who responded to 10 years or longer for 43 percent. Over 80 percent of the sample had been employed at their present institution 4 years or longer.

Of the 238 home economics college faculty who responded, 233 were employed full time and 5 part-time. Full time was the employment status preferred by 227 home economics faculty, 96 percent of those who responded.
Teaching was the major job activity of 153 respondents. As seen in Table 4, administration was the major job activity of 49 faculty; research, scholarly writing, or artistic production the major activity of 23; and extension the major activity of 11.

Table 4. Major job activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, scholarly writing, artistic production</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary interests of respondents appeared to parallel major job activity. Teaching as a primary interest was reported by 147 faculty, research by 37, administration by 41, and other by 13. A comparison of major activity with primary interest indicates that there were 14 more faculty whose primary interest was research than whose major job activity was research.

The average class load of home economics college faculty who responded varied considerably (see Table 5). The modal response category for average class load per term was 4 to 6 hours, reported by 64 faculty members. Eighty percent of the home economics faculty responding indi-
Table 5. Average class load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter credit hours</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cated that their average class load per term was 4 to 6 quarter hours or more. Only 20 respondents reported that they did not teach any classes.

A majority of the faculty who responded, 77 percent, indicated that they taught both undergraduate and graduate students. Eleven percent reported they worked entirely with undergraduates and 12 percent worked entirely with graduates.

Tenure had been achieved by 86 percent of the faculty who participated in this study. The large percent of tenured faculty appears to be a reflection of the higher academic ranks held by faculty who responded.

The sample of home economics college faculty represented the major areas within Home Economics. As shown in Table 6, 59 respondents were in Child Development or Family Relations, 57 in Foods and Nutrition, 33 in Home Economics Education, and 30 in Textiles and Clothing. The areas of Related Art, Extension, Housing and Equipment, Home Management and Family
### Table 6. Faculty by area of home economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, Family Relations</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods and Nutrition</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Home Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics Education</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Equipment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Management, Family Economics</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Art</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and Clothing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economics, Institution Management, and General Home Economics were also represented.

Almost half the respondents, 114, indicated they served on three or four committees at their institution. Seventy-four reported that they actively served on five or more committees. These findings suggest that committee activities are an important part of the job for most home economics college faculty.
Productivity and participation in professional organizations

Home economics college faculty were found to differ considerably on selected professional background variables: number of research grants obtained, books and articles published, job offers received, and membership in professional organizations. A description of home economics college faculty on these variables follows.

The number of research grants obtained from outside funding sources in the last 5 years varied from zero for 131 faculty to three or more for 35 faculty. Seventy faculty reported that they had obtained either one or two research grants during this period. The large number of home economics faculty who had not obtained any grants roughly corresponds to the number who indicated that their major job activity was teaching.

Approximately 30 percent of the respondents had written or edited one or more books in the last 2 years. The number of faculty publishing one or more articles in the last 5 years was much greater than the number having written or edited books. As shown in Table 7, 20 had published 11 or more articles, 33 had published six to ten articles, 62 had published three to five articles, and 59 had published one or two articles. Sixty-four reported that they had had no articles published in the last 5 years. The finding that approximately three-fourths of the faculty who responded had published at least one article in the last 5 years suggests that publishing is considered part of the job for most home economics college faculty.

Twenty-seven percent of the home economics college faculty participating in the study indicated that they had sought employment at another
Table 7. Articles published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

institution during the last 5 years. On the other hand, 70 percent indicated that they had been offered another job during this same time period. The fact that 70 percent had been offered another job while only 27 percent had sought another position suggests that qualified home economics faculty are actively sought out for jobs, but that a majority appear to be satisfied with their current position.

The number of professional organizations in which home economics college faculty held membership ranged from one or two for 13 respondents to seven or more for 80 respondents. Sixty-eight reported they held membership in three or four professional organizations, and 77 held membership in five or six professional organizations. The fact that 66 percent of the respondents held membership in five or more professional organizations suggests that home economics college faculty tend to regard membership in professional organizations as important.
Demographic characteristics

The description which follows of home economics college faculty on selected demographic characteristics indicates that wide variability exists among respondents on some of these characteristics.

Of the 238 home economics college faculty who responded, 45 were male and 193 were female. Respondents ranged in age from under 30 to 60 or over, with 50-59 being the modal age category. As shown in Table 8, 201 of the respondents were 40 years of age or older. The small number of persons under 40 in the sample may be due to the late entry into the academic ranks because of the time required to obtain the doctorate and the length of time spent in lower ranks before being promoted to associate professor, the minimum rank required for inclusion in the sample.

Table 8. Age of home economics college faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-six percent of the respondents reported their health at the present time was excellent or good. Less than 1 percent felt their present health was poor.
For many home economics college faculty, their professional careers were interwoven with their roles as spouse and parent. As indicated in Table 9, 108 respondents were currently married, 30 were either divorced or widowed, and 100 were single. The findings in the present study show that 42 percent of home economics college faculty had never married, while Centra's (1974) study of men and women with a doctorate across all academic areas found that 39 percent of 1950 and 1960 women graduates and 30 percent of 1968 women graduates had never married.

Table 9. Current marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married (once only)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (remarried)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (divorced)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (widowed)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typically home economics college faculty had one or two children, although 36 of the 107 who were parents had three or four children and six had five or more (see Table 10). Centra (1974) reported that approximately half the men and women with doctorates surveyed in his study had one or two children.
Table 10. Number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of people in the present household of respondents ranged from one for 95 respondents to six or more for 8 respondents. Ninety-two home economics faculty reported that there were two or three people in their present household and 43 reported four or five people in their present household. Although 130 respondents indicated they were not married at the present time, findings indicate that approximately one-third of these individuals did not live alone.

Over 96 percent of the sample were Caucasian, with Blacks and Orientals each accounting for approximately 1 percent of the sample. No American Indians were represented in the sample, and only one Spanish American was included. The remaining 2 percent indicated their race as other with no further explanation as to what their race was.

The salaries of the home economics college faculty sampled were in the upper salary ranges provided, with almost 53 percent of the sample reporting salaries of $20,000 or over. The salaries of home economics college faculty for the 1974-75 academic year are shown in Table 11. Only
Table 11. Salary for 1974-75 academic year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $8,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $11,999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $13,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,000 - $15,999</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000 - $17,999</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 or over</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

five faculty members reported earning less than $10,000 a year, the same number who reported they worked part-time. Centra (1974) found that the median income for men and women doctorates employed full time was $17,200 for women and $21,600 for men during the 1972-73 academic year.

The number of months employed for this salary were 12 months for 107 respondents, 11 months for 9 respondents, 10 months for 30 respondents, and 9 months for 90 respondents. Two faculty indicated that they were employed for some period of time other than 9 to 12 months.

**Spouse's background**

Data obtained on the occupational and educational background of spouses of home economics college faculty indicate that 57 percent of the spouses of the 108 married respondents were employed full time, 11 percent
were employed part-time, and 31 percent were not currently employed. Over 41 percent of the faculty members were married to individuals in an educational setting (see Table 12). Approximately 18 percent of the respondents were married to "other professionals", and 7 percent were married to managers. Five percent were married to individuals employed in white collar, clerical or sales and 2 percent were married to persons in skilled or semi-skilled jobs. Four percent reported their spouses were retired and 22 percent reported spouses were employed in a type of employment other than those listed.

Table 12. Current employment of spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of position</th>
<th>Percentage responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, administration, or research in an educational setting</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar, clerical or sales</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled or semi-skilled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 13, 41 percent of the 108 married home economics college faculty were married to individuals who had a doctorate or a professional degree. Twenty-six percent of the faculty's spouses had
Table 13. Spouse's educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Percentage responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned doctorate or professional degree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

master's degrees and 20 percent had bachelor's degrees. Only 7 percent of the faculty who responded were married to persons with a high school education or less. Centra (1974) reported that 63 percent of the sample of women with doctorates in his sample were also married to men with doctorates or professional degrees.

The extent a spouse's job deterred home economics college faculty from considering a job in another community is reported in Table 14. Thirty-four percent reported their spouse's job was no deterrent in considering another job, while 46 percent indicated their spouse's job had been a deterrent. Of this 46 percent, 27 percent indicated the spouse's job had been a major deterrent and 19 percent a minor deterrent. Centra (1974) found that for the women with doctorates in his study, at least half indicated their spouse's job had been a deterrent in considering another job.
Table 14. Spouse's job as career deterrent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of deterrent</th>
<th>Percentage(^a) responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major deterrent</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor deterrent</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No deterrent</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Percentages do not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Factors Derived from Factor Analysis of Job and Life Satisfaction Instruments

Factors describing the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward their jobs and life in general are reported in this section. Items from the pooled within 85 X 85 correlation matrix were derived by least squares factor analysis, and the factor loadings obtained were rotated by the Procrustes method. Seven factors resulted from this analysis.

Item loading on each factor was determined by inspection of the factor loadings. Items were placed in a factor on the basis of size of factor loading and rationality of fit. The loadings for all factors are included in Appendix C. After an inspection of the items loading on each factor was made, the factors were labeled according to the dimensions they appeared to describe. The seven factors are:
I. Attitudes toward administration
II. Friendship
III. Cost of living
IV. Attitudes toward salary
V. Job pressure
VI. Attitude toward life in general
VII. Home and family

The factors varied in size from 12 to 2 items. Fifty-four items were not included in the seven factors. The 54 items are listed in Appendix D.

The factors and the items in each are reported below. Factor loadings are given in the first column; decimal points are omitted. The number of the item on either the job satisfaction instrument or life satisfaction instrument is given in the second column. Items are reported as they appeared in the instruments.

**Factor I attitudes toward administration**

Items in this factor deal with the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward administration at their institution. High scores indicate positive attitudes toward administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>JS124</td>
<td>Faculty at this institution are satisfied with the appreciation and recognition their administrator gives for a job well done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1In this and all subsequent listings of items, those items prefaced with "JS" were from the job satisfaction instrument and those prefaced with "LS" were from the life satisfaction instrument.
Faculty at this institution are satisfied with the operation of the "open door" policy - their freedom to bring their problems to all levels of administration.

The administration here are fair in dealings with faculty.

The administration here do everything to see that faculty get a fair break on the job.

The administration here get faculty to work together as a team.

The administration here are really interested in the welfare of the faculty.

The administration here facilitate cooperation between departments.

The administration here live up to their promises.

The administration here try to get faculty members' ideas on things.

The administration here have a very good personnel policy.

The administration here have the work well organized.

The administration here facilitate the development of faculty members.

**Factor II friendship**

The satisfaction of home economics college faculty with their friends and the people they feel close to are reflected in this factor. High scores indicate positive attitudes toward relationships with friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>LS20</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the frequency with which I see my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>LS21</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my ability to make friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>LS28</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the number of people I feel close to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor III cost of living

This factor includes items dealing with the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward the cost of living in their community. High scores indicate a positive feeling toward the cost of living in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 470 LS8        | I am satisfied with the cost of housing in this community.  
| 515 LS11       | I am satisfied with the cost of living in this community.  

Factor IV attitudes toward salary

The items selected for inclusion in this factor are related to the satisfaction faculty express with their salaries. High scores indicate that faculty have positive attitudes toward their salaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 754 JS9        | Faculty at this institution are satisfied with their salaries in relation to their job responsibilities.  
| 679 JS11       | Faculty at this institution are satisfied with the present system for granting salary increases.  
| 776 JS19       | Faculty at this institution are satisfied with their salaries in relation to what they think other faculty receive for doing similar work in other institutions.  

Factor V job pressure

Pressure on the job is reflected by the items in this factor. High scores indicate that faculty feel pressure on their jobs. The negative factor loading for item 2 indicates that faculty who feel pressure on their jobs tend not to be satisfied with the amount of input faculty have in determining salary increases.
Factor | Item No. | Item
---|---|---
-315 | JS2 | Faculty at this institution are satisfied with the amount of input they have in determining salary increases.
528 | JS47 | Faculty here feel that there is too much pressure on their jobs.
434 | JS50 | Faculty here often feel worn out and tired on the job.

**Factor VI attitude toward life in general**

Items in this factor are concerned with the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward life in general. A positive attitude toward life is reflected by high scores.

| Factor Loading | Item No. | Item
---|---|---
379 | LS14 | I am satisfied with my life now compared to earlier times in my life.
455 | LS15 | I am satisfied with my present occupation.
461 | LS17 | I am satisfied with my life in general at the present time.

**Factor VII home and family**

This factor includes items which deal with the satisfaction of home economics college faculty with their family or members of their household. High scores reflect positive attitudes toward family.

| Factor Loading | Item No. | Item
---|---|---
790 | LS24 | I am satisfied with my home life at the present time.
759 | LS25 | I am satisfied with my relationships with my family or members of my household.
735 | LS27 | I am satisfied with understanding my family or members of my household have for my feelings and problems.
Reliabilities of the seven factors were calculated using the Spearman-Brown procedure. Reliability for factor V is low because item 2 from the job satisfaction instrument was included in the factor. The correlations of item 2 with items 11 and 19 were low and negative (Table 15).

Table 15. Reliabilities\(^a\) of factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Administration</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Decimal points have been omitted.

Self-Concept Discrepancy Scores

Discrepancy scores between the three measures of self-concept are presented in this section. Means and standard deviations for the three self-concept discrepancy scores, self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self, are shown in Table 16.
Table 16. Means and standard deviations for self-concept discrepancy scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>628.68</td>
<td>177.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>564.13</td>
<td>167.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>577.99</td>
<td>174.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the means in Table 16 indicates that the discrepancy between self-concept and ideal self-concept was greater than the discrepancies between self-concept and required self-concept and between ideal self-concept and required self-concept. These data suggest that home economics college faculty perceived greater differences between the way they are and the way they would like to be than between the way they are and the way the job requires them to be or between the way they would like to be and the way the job requires them to be.

Tests of Differences Between Groups

The results of the analyses of variance, which were made to determine whether significant differences existed between groups of home economics faculty on job and life satisfaction factor scores and self-concept discrepancy scores, are discussed in this section.
Two factor analyses of variance, using sex with other selected demographic variables, were made for each of the seven job and life satisfaction factor scores and the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Some of the variables are reported because they have been found to be related to self-concept, job satisfaction, or life satisfaction in the literature and others because they are of particular interest to this investigator.

Variables selected were sex, primary job interest, number of articles published, present health, and parental status. Sex was included because studies by Aebi (1973) and Farley (1974) found differences in the job satisfaction of men and women faculty members. Differences between men and women in degree of life satisfaction expressed were found in studies by Gurin et al. (1960) and by Bradburn (1969).

Primary job interest was reported because it was of interest to this investigator and because Centra (1974) found differences between men and women in their primary job interests. Number of articles published was selected for the same reasons as primary job interests.

Present health was included because previous studies on life satisfaction (Palmore and Luikart, 1972; Spreitzer and Snyder, 1974) found self-rated health to be the variable most strongly related to life satisfaction.

The final demographic variable reported is parental status. Parental status was selected over marital status for two reasons. First, studies by Buxton (1971) and Aebi (1973) found no significant differences between married and unmarried college faculty in degree of job satisfaction. Second, an examination of the F values for marital status and parental
status in the present study revealed more significant F values for paren-
tal status than for marital status.

Academic rank, an important variable in other job satisfaction
studies on college faculty, was not included because the lower academic
ranks were not represented in the present sample. Salary was not selected
because the data on salary revealed a narrow salary range for the home
economics faculty who responded.

Sex with primary job interest

The results of the analyses of variance for the seven factor scores
and the three discrepancy scores by primary job interest and sex are given
in Table 17. Sex was a significant source of variance for factor III,
cost of living. Inspection of the mean scores for factor III by primary
job interest and sex, shown in Table 18, indicates that women faculty were
more satisfied than men faculty with cost of living in their community.

Job interest was found to be a significant source of variance for
factor I, attitudes toward administration; factor III, attitudes toward
salary; and the three self-concept discrepancy scores. The mean scores
for factor I, attitudes toward administration, show that home economics
faculty whose primary job interest was administration were most satisfied
with administration, followed by faculty whose primary job interest was
research. Faculty who listed their primary job interest as something
other than research, teaching, or administration were least satisfied with
administration. The mean scores for factor IV indicate that faculty whose
primary job interest was research expressed the most positive attitudes
toward salary.
Table 17. F ratios for sex and primary job interest as sources of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Sex X interest</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.14*</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>12.03**</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.90*</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aDegrees of freedom for F are 1, 230. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

^bDegrees of freedom for F are 3, 230. Table values for F are 2.64 at 5 percent and 3.87 at 1 percent.

^cDegrees of freedom for F are 3, 230. Table values for F are 2.64 at 5 percent and 3.87 at 1 percent.

^dDegrees of freedom for F are 7, 230. Table values for F are 2.05 at 5 percent and 2.72 at 1 percent.

*Significant at P<0.05.

**Significant at P<0.01.
Table 18. Means of factor scores and discrepancy scores by primary job interest by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>36.12</td>
<td>37.41</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>601.89</td>
<td>650.14</td>
<td>535.43</td>
<td>630.14</td>
<td>664.50</td>
<td>692.97</td>
<td>527.00</td>
<td>584.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>564.67</td>
<td>581.46</td>
<td>464.70</td>
<td>566.12</td>
<td>614.00</td>
<td>620.81</td>
<td>465.67</td>
<td>523.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>583.67</td>
<td>592.18</td>
<td>484.39</td>
<td>577.26</td>
<td>626.70</td>
<td>643.00</td>
<td>526.00</td>
<td>522.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of the mean self-concept discrepancy scores by primary job interest and sex given in Table 18 shows that home economics faculty whose primary job interest was administration reported greater differences between the way they see themselves and the way they would like to be, their self-ideal self discrepancy scores. This same group of faculty also had higher self-required self and ideal self-required self than faculty whose primary job interest was research or teaching.

**Sex with number of articles published**

An examination of the F ratios in Table 19 shows that sex was a significant source of variation for factor III, cost of living; factor V, job pressure; the self-ideal self discrepancy score; and the self-required self discrepancy score. Number of articles published was found to be a significant source of variance for factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and for factor VII, home and family.

Means of the seven factor scores and three discrepancy scores by number of articles published and sex are presented in Table 20. The pattern of mean scores for factor III, cost of living, is similar to that found for primary job interest and sex. Women faculty members were more satisfied with cost of living than men faculty members. Women home economics faculty also indicated that they felt there was more pressure on their jobs than men, as shown by the means for factor V, job pressure. An inspection of the means for men and women for the self-ideal self concept discrepancy score and the self-required self-concept discrepancy score indicates that women reported more differences than men between the way they are and the way they would like to be, and between the way they are and the way their job requires them to be.
Table 19. F ratios for sex and number of articles published as sources of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sex^</th>
<th>Articles^</th>
<th>Sex X interest^</th>
<th>Overall^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00**</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.82*</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.47*</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.60*</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.87*</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 230. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

b Degrees of freedom for F are 4, 230. Table values for F are 2.41 at 5 percent and 3.40 at 1 percent.

c Degrees of freedom for F are 4, 230. Table values for F are 2.41 at 5 percent and 3.40 at 1 percent.

d Degrees of freedom for F are 9, 228. Table values for F are 1.92 at 5 percent and 2.49 at 1 percent.

** Significant at P<0.01.

* Significant at P<0.01.
Table 20. Means of factor scores and discrepancy scores by number of articles published by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td>Men Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td>35.43 30.92</td>
<td>34.56 33.05</td>
<td>31.84 31.95</td>
<td>30.47 33.00</td>
<td>36.40 27.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>3.88 5.49</td>
<td>4.00 5.17</td>
<td>5.37 5.95</td>
<td>4.64 6.53</td>
<td>5.41 6.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>5.64 6.47</td>
<td>6.36 7.04</td>
<td>6.95 7.10</td>
<td>6.91 7.95</td>
<td>7.35 5.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>2.85 4.30</td>
<td>2.43 3.32</td>
<td>3.28 3.77</td>
<td>3.34 4.05</td>
<td>2.55 3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>10.02 10.46</td>
<td>10.72 10.44</td>
<td>11.63 11.25</td>
<td>9.55 10.01</td>
<td>11.15 11.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>536.50 617.07</td>
<td>510.71 650.65</td>
<td>578.88 664.91</td>
<td>604.36 591.47</td>
<td>607.20 690.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>483.67 549.24</td>
<td>440.86 587.96</td>
<td>516.25 598.44</td>
<td>540.36 524.53</td>
<td>562.40 624.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>505.17 564.72</td>
<td>461.00 591.62</td>
<td>522.38 622.31</td>
<td>594.57 526.74</td>
<td>547.80 619.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6 58</td>
<td>7 52</td>
<td>8 54</td>
<td>14 19</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean scores for factor VI and factor VII, reported in Table 20, have a similar pattern. Home economics faculty who had published from three to five articles or 11 or more articles were more satisfied with life in general and with home and family than home economics faculty who had published no articles, one to two articles, or six to ten articles.

**Sex with present health**

The F ratios for the factor scores and discrepancy scores by present health and sex are shown in Table 21. Inspection of the F values indicates that sex was a significant source of variance for the three self-concept discrepancy scores and present health was a significant source of variance for factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and for the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Overall F values were significant for factor I, attitude toward administration, factor III, cost of living, and factor II, job pressure.

Home economics college faculty who perceived their present health as excellent reported higher mean scores for factor VI, attitude toward life in general, than faculty who perceived their present health as either good, fair, or poor (see Table 22). This finding is consistent with findings by Palmore and Luikart (1972) and Spreitzer and Snyder (1974).

An inspection of the means for the three self-concept discrepancy scores by present health and sex shown in Table 22 shows that the means for women were higher than the means for men on all three discrepancy scores, self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self. These means also show that home economics faculty who perceived their
Table 21. F ratios for sex and present health as sources of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Sex X health</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.56*</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.23*</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.62*</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 232. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

Significant at P<0.05.

**Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 232. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

Significant at P<0.01.
Table 22. Means of factor scores and discrepancy scores by present health by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>32.64</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>31.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>598.31</td>
<td>658.35</td>
<td>437.33</td>
<td>599.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652.00</td>
<td>896.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>536.92</td>
<td>587.76</td>
<td>394.50</td>
<td>545.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>572.50</td>
<td>818.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>562.46</td>
<td>599.87</td>
<td>383.83</td>
<td>557.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>587.50</td>
<td>840.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex with parental status

Table 23 presents the F ratios for parental status and sex as sources of variance. Sex was found to be a significant source of variance for factor V, job pressure, and for the three self-concept discrepancy scores, while parental status was found to be a significant source of variance for factor I, attitudes toward administration.

The mean factor and discrepancy scores by parental status and sex are given in Table 24. Inspection of the means by sex for factor V, job pressure, indicates that home economics college faculty who were women and parents felt the most job pressure and that faculty who were men and parents the least job pressure. The pattern of mean self-concept discrepancy scores by parental status and sex is similar to the pattern of mean scores by present health and sex. Women reported greater discrepancies than men between self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self.

The mean scores for factor I, attitudes toward administration, found in Table 24 show that home economics faculty who were not parents held more positive attitudes toward administration than faculty who were parents.

Relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction

Intercorrelations between ten variables, the seven factor scores from the job and life satisfaction instruments and the three self-concept discrepancy scores, are shown in Table 25. Significant positive correlations were found between factor I, attitudes toward administration, and factor II, friendship; factor III, cost of living; factor IV, attitudes toward salary; and factor VI, attitude toward life in general. These
Table 23. F ratios for sex and parental status as sources of variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Sex X parent</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 233. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

^Degrees of freedom for F are 2, 233. Table values for F are 3.04 at 5 percent and 4.70 at 1 percent.

^Degrees of freedom for F are 1, 233. Table values for F are 3.88 at 5 percent and 6.75 at 1 percent.

^Degrees of freedom for F are 4, 233. Table values for F are 2.41 at 5 percent and 3.40 at 1 percent.

*Significant at P<0.05.

**Significant at P<0.01.
Table 24. Means of factor scores and discrepancy scores by parental status by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Not parent</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Not parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor I Administration</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Friendship</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Cost of living</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Salary</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Job pressure</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Life in general</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Home and family</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ideal self</td>
<td>573.33</td>
<td>689.44</td>
<td>599.67</td>
<td>612.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-required self</td>
<td>519.72</td>
<td>611.56</td>
<td>506.33</td>
<td>552.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-required self</td>
<td>538.69</td>
<td>629.91</td>
<td>538.33</td>
<td>561.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

findings indicate that faculty who expressed positive attitudes toward administration tended to express positive attitudes toward friends, cost of living, salary, and life in general. Factor I was found to be negatively correlated with factor V, job pressure. Respondents who indicated faculty felt too much pressure on their jobs appeared to report negative attitudes toward administration. No significant correlations were found between factor I and factor VII, home and family, or between factor I and the three self-concept discrepancy scores.
### Table 25. Intercorrelations of job and life satisfaction factor scores and self-concept discrepancy scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>17**</td>
<td>30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>55**</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-39**</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>-34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>36**</td>
<td>41**</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55**</td>
<td>21**</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>25**</td>
<td>94**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>29**</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>36**</td>
<td>28**</td>
<td>93**</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aDecimal points have been omitted.

^bVariables I-VII are the seven factors derived from the job and life satisfaction instruments and variables VIII-X are the discrepancy scores between self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self respectively.

*Significant at P<0.05.

**Significant at P<0.01.
Factor II, friendship, was significantly correlated with all the other variables except factor V, job pressure. Although significant positive correlations were found between factor II and factor III, cost of living; factor IV, attitudes toward salary; the self-ideal self discrepancy; the self-required self discrepancy; and the ideal self-required self discrepancy; factor II was more highly correlated with factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and factor VII, home and family. These data suggest that friendship, a life satisfaction factor, tends to be more related to other life satisfaction factors, home and family and attitude toward life in general, than it does to the job satisfaction factors and to the self-concept discrepancy scores.

As indicated in Table 25, significant correlations were found between factor III, cost of living, and factor IV, attitudes toward salary; factor V, job pressure; factor VI, attitude toward life in general; and factor VII, home and family life. The correlations between III and IV, III and VI, and III and VII were positive, while the correlation between III and V was negative. Although the correlations between factor III and factors IV-VII were statistically significant, the common variance ($r^2$) between factor III and each of these other factors was 5.4 percent or less. No significant correlations were found between factor III and the three self-concept discrepancy scores.

A significant negative correlation was found between factor IV, attitudes toward salary, and factor II, job pressure. Persons who reported that faculty felt pressure on their jobs also reported negative attitudes toward salary. A small, but significant, positive correlation
was found between attitudes toward salary, factor IV, and attitude toward life in general, factor VI. No significant correlations were found between factor IV and factor VII, home and family, or between factor IV and the self-concept discrepancy scores.

Factor V, job pressure, was positively correlated with factor VI, attitude toward life in general, but not significantly correlated with factor VII, home and family, or the three self-concept discrepancy scores. The correlation between factors V and VI accounted for only 4.2 percent of their common variance.

Attitude toward life in general, factor VI, was significantly correlated with factor VII, home and family, and with the three self-concept discrepancy scores, self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self. The correlation between factors VI and VII, \( r = .50 \), accounted for 25 percent of their common variance.

The data in Table 25 show that factor VII, home and family, was significantly correlated with the discrepancy between self-ideal self, the discrepancy between self-required self, and the discrepancy between ideal self-required self. These correlations account for only a small percentage, 7.8 percent or less, of the common variance between factor VII and the three self-concept discrepancy scores.

The highest correlations were found between the three self-concept discrepancy scores, as shown in Table 25. The findings indicate that when the discrepancy between self-ideal self was small, the discrepancy between self-required self and the discrepancy between ideal self-required self was also small. The reverse also would be true, if the self-ideal
self discrepancy was large, the self-required self and ideal self-required self discrepancies were also large.

Summary

The findings of this study were reported in five sections: a) characteristics of home economics college faculty; b) factors derived from factor analysis of job and life satisfaction instruments; c) self-concept discrepancy scores; d) tests of differences between groups; and e) relationships among self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction.

Descriptions of home economics college faculty with respect to current position, productivity and participation in professional organizations, selected demographic characteristics, and employment background of spouse were reported. The sample consisted of faculty in the upper academic ranks and salary ranges. Most respondents were employed full time and teaching was the major job activity for over 60 percent of the subjects. Wide variability was found among faculty with respect to number of publications and the educational and occupational background of faculty members' spouses. Over 80 percent of the respondents were 40 years of age or older, approximately 20 percent were men, and 45 percent were currently married.

A factor analysis of the items in the job and life satisfaction instruments yielded seven factors: attitudes toward administration, friendship, cost of living, attitudes toward salary, job pressure, attitude toward life in general, and home and family.

Discrepancy scores between the measures of self-concept, ideal self-concept, and required self-concept were computed. The largest discrepancy
found for home economics faculty was the discrepancy between self-concept and ideal self-concept.

Two factor analyses of variance, using sex along with primary job interest, number of articles published, present health, and parental status, were made for the seven factor scores and three discrepancy scores. Significant differences were found between groups on a number of factor and discrepancy scores.

Intercorrelations between the seven factor scores and the three discrepancy scores indicated that a number of these variables were significantly related. The highest correlations were found between the three self-concept discrepancy scores. A number of significant correlations were found between selected job and life satisfaction factor scores, between selected job satisfaction factor scores and the self-concept discrepancy scores, and between selected life satisfaction factor scores and the self-concept discrepancy scores.
SUMMARY

Recruitment, motivation, productivity, and retention of competent faculty are important concerns of college and university administrators. The undersupply of doctoral graduates in home economics to fill the positions available intensifies these concerns for home economics college administrators.

The productivity and creativity of individuals on the job is related to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job, or selected aspects of the job. An individual's performance on the job is also influenced by self-concept and by satisfaction with life in general.

Since performance on the job is related to satisfaction with the job, satisfaction with life in general, and the concept the individual has of self, home economics administrators need to know more about the relationships among job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept for home economics college faculty to effectively recruit, motivate, and retain competent faculty.

The major focus of this study was to ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Specific objectives of the study were to describe home economics college faculty on selected characteristics; to ascertain the attitudes of home economics faculty toward themselves, their jobs, and life in general; to investigate the relationships between selected characteristics of home economics college faculty and their level of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept; and to investigate the relationships among
self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction for home economics college faculty.

Subjects were 238 home economics college faculty members in 30 randomly selected institutions having an undergraduate home economics enrollment of at least 500 students. Subjects possessed a doctorate and held the rank of associate professor or higher.

The questionnaire used to collect the data in the present study contained four instruments: a biographical information instrument, a job satisfaction instrument, a life satisfaction instrument, and a self-concept instrument. Questions on the biographical information instrument were designed to obtain information on selected demographic characteristics of home economics college faculty. An existing job satisfaction instrument was modified to obtain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward their jobs. A 30 item life satisfaction instrument was developed to ascertain the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward life in general. The self-concept instrument used was developed by Donald E. Super and provided measures of self-concept, ideal self-concept, and required self-concept.

Data were collected during April, May, and June, 1975. Packets of materials were sent to the highest ranking home economics administrators at randomly selected institutions. Included in the packet were a letter requesting the institution's participation in the study and instructions on the distribution of the questionnaires, copies of the questionnaires, and a postcard to be returned with the names of faculty to whom questionnaires were given. Questionnaires were distributed to faculty at the
institutions by these administrators. Three weeks later a follow-up letter was sent to individuals who had not responded. Of the 314 questionnaires distributed, 245 were returned. Seven questionnaires contained incomplete data, as a result 238 were used in the analysis.

A descriptive analysis of the demographic data for home economics college faculty indicated that they varied widely on many of the characteristics assessed. Respondents represented the upper academic and salary ranks, a number of subject matter areas in home economics, and usually were employed full time. Approximately half the respondents were married or had been married, and 107 of the 238 were parents. Considerable differences were found among respondents in the number of research grants obtained, number of books written or edited, and number of articles published. Differences were also found in the educational and occupational background of the spouses of faculty members.

Data from the job and life satisfaction instruments were transformed from the original 1-99 response pattern to normal deviates and factor analyzed using least squares factor analysis. Factor loadings obtained were rotated by the Procrustes method. The seven factors which resulted from this analysis were:

I. Attitudes toward administration
II. Friendship
III. Cost of living
IV. Attitudes toward salary
V. Job pressure
VI. Attitude toward life in general
VII. Home and family
Responses to the self-concept instrument provided measures of self-concept, ideal self-concept, and required self-concept. Discrepancy scores were computed between self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self for each faculty member. Means and standard deviations for the three discrepancy scores were calculated. The mean discrepancy score between self-ideal self was greater than the mean discrepancy scores between self-required self and between ideal self-required self.

The next step in the analysis was to test for differences between groups of home economics college faculty in level of job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept. Factor scores were computed for each faculty member by summing the scores of items on the job and life satisfaction instruments included in a factor.

Two factor analyses of variance, using sex with selected other demographic variables, were made for each factor score and each discrepancy score. The demographic variables selected were primary job interest, number of articles published, present health, and parental status. These variables were selected because they were found to be related to self-concept, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction in the literature or because they were of interest to the investigator.

The results of the analyses of variance by primary job interest and sex found that sex was a significant source of variance for factor III, cost of living, and that primary job interest was a significant source of variance for factor I, attitudes toward administration; factor IV, attitudes toward salary; and the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Women were more satisfied than men with cost of living in their community.
Faculty whose primary job interest was administration expressed the most positive attitudes toward administration, and faculty whose primary interest was research expressed the highest level of satisfaction with salary. The greatest discrepancy scores for all three self-concept comparisons, self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self, were found for faculty whose primary job interest was administration.

Sex was found to be a significant source of variation for factor III, cost of living; factor V, job pressure; the self-ideal self discrepancy score; and the self-required self discrepancy score when the data were analyzed by number of articles published and sex. Number of articles published was a significant source of variance for factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and for factor VII, home and family. As above, women were more satisfied with cost of living than men. Women reported that they felt more job pressure than men and higher discrepancy scores between self-ideal self and self-required self were found for women faculty. Home economics faculty who had published three to five articles or 11 or more articles were more satisfied with life in general and home and family than faculty who had published no articles, one to two articles, or six to ten articles.

The analyses of variance by present health and sex indicated that sex was a significant source of variance for the three self-concept discrepancy scores and present health was a significant source of variance for factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and for the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Faculty who perceived their present health as excellent reported the most positive attitudes toward life in general. Mean
scores on all three self-concept discrepancy scores were higher for women and for faculty who perceived their present health as poor.

The F ratios for parental status and sex show that sex was a significant source of variance for factor V, job pressure, and for the three self-concept discrepancy scores, while parental status was a significant source of variance for factor I, attitudes toward administration. As with present health and sex, women reported greater discrepancies than men between self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self. The findings for job pressure were similar to those when the factor was analyzed by number of articles and sex. Women reported they felt more pressure on the job. Faculty who were parents reported less positive attitudes toward administration than faculty who were not parents.

A number of significant intercorrelations were found between the seven factor scores and the three discrepancy scores. The highest correlations were found between the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Correlations between .50 and .55 were found between factor I, attitudes toward administration, and factor IV, attitudes toward salary; between factor II, friendship, and factor VII, home and family; and between factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and factor VII, home and family. Positive correlations between .30 and .49 were found between factor I, attitudes toward salary, and factor VI, attitude toward life in general; between factor II, friendship, and factors III and IV, cost of living and attitudes toward salary; and between factor VI, attitude toward life in general, and the three self-concept discrepancy scores. Negative correlations between .30 and .49 were found between factor I, attitudes toward
administration, and factor V, job pressure, and between factor IV, attitudes toward salary, and factor V, job pressure.

In summary, a description of home economics college faculty on selected characteristics indicated that they represented the upper academic ranks, salary ranges, and most subject matter areas in home economics. Considerable differences were found between respondents on the number of research grants obtained, books and articles published, and the educational and occupational background of spouses of faculty members. Seven factors were derived from the job and life satisfaction instruments: attitudes toward administration, friendship, cost of living, attitudes toward salary, job pressure, attitude toward life in general, and home and family. The greatest discrepancy score was found between self-ideal self for home economics college faculty. Faculty were grouped on the basis of sex and primary job interest, number of articles published, present health, and parental status. Significant differences were found between groups for a number of factor scores and self-concept discrepancy scores. Significant relationships were found between the job and life satisfaction factor scores and the self-concept discrepancy scores.

Several conclusions were made based upon the results of this study. First, home economics college faculty generally were satisfied with themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Second, men and women faculty differed in their attitudes toward cost of living, perceived job pressure, and self-concept discrepancy scores. Third, the satisfaction expressed by home economics college faculty with selected aspects of their jobs and their self-concept discrepancy scores were influenced by their primary job interest. Fourth, faculty who published more articles were more satisfied with life in general and with home and family. Fifth, faculty who were
parents were less satisfied with administration than faculty who were not parents. Finally, relationships among job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept were found to exist for the home economics college faculty surveyed.

Because home economics administrators are concerned with the recruitment, motivation, and retention of competent and productive faculty and because there is a shortage of doctoral graduates in home economics to fill the available positions (Evans, 1972), this investigator recommends that home economics administrators examine the results reported in this study for the information they provide about the job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept of home economics college faculty and the interrelationships among these constructs for this group.

Of particular concern are the factors on their jobs with which faculty expressed either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. These factors provide clues to home economics administrators on how to better motivate their faculty. On the basis of this study, it would seem that home economics administrators need to be aware of the influences administrators, salary, and job pressure have on the attitudes of home economics college faculty toward their jobs.

Home economics administrators also need to be made aware of the factors related to the life satisfaction of home economics college faculty: cost of living, home and family, friendship, and attitude toward life in general. These factors provide information about home economics faculty which can be useful in recruiting, motivating, and retaining competent faculty.
The discrepancies which exist between self-ideal self, self-required self, and ideal self-required self also provide valuable information to administrators in understanding the attitudes of faculty toward their jobs and life in general.

The significant relationships among job satisfaction factors, life satisfaction factors, and self-concept discrepancy scores for the home economics college faculty surveyed suggest that home economics administrators need to be concerned with more than just the work environment if they are to successfully motivate, recruit, and retain competent, productive faculty.
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APPENDIX A: CORRESPONDENCE
This letter is to urge you to complete the attached questionnaire. Its purpose is to explore the attitudes of home economics faculty members at colleges and universities about themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Several recent studies have explored some of these factors in other fields or for faculty in general. We think it is important to look at home economics and to look at this particular combination of factors. We do hope you will help provide these data.

To save you time, questions have been arranged so that all you have to do to answer them is make a check or a rating. Select the response that comes closest to representing your current feelings or status (even if it does not do so exactly). The questionnaire is arranged so that there is room for comments at the end of each section; feel free to comment in specific areas or at the end of the total questionnaire.

Please place your return address on the enclosed envelope when returning the questionnaire. We are requesting this information so that we will have a record of individuals who do not respond in order to contact them later. Should you prefer not to identify yourself on the envelope, we would still appreciate your response. Of course, your administrator will not see your responses to this questionnaire. ALL OF YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE HELD IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

Realizing that many of you are pressed for time, this questionnaire should take approximately 40 minutes to complete. It is not necessary to complete the entire questionnaire in one sitting.

Your effort to answer and return this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. We ask that you return the questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope before May 1 or within 10 days after receiving it.

If you have any questions please call Mrs. Schultz at 515-294-4757 on Tuesday or Thursday.

If you would be interested in receiving a summary of the results of this study, please let us know this too. They should be available in November, 1975.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Research Assistant
An important concern of home economics administrators in colleges and universities is the recruitment and retention of competent and motivated faculty. An individual's dissatisfaction with his/her job or life in general may result in lowered productivity and creativity on the job.

In order to deal more effectively in the areas of recruitment, motivation, and retention of competent, motivated faculty it is necessary to learn more about the relationships between job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self concept.

For these reasons the Home Economics Education Department at Iowa State University is conducting a study to determine the attitudes of home economics faculty about themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Your cooperation in this study would be greatly appreciated and we hope that you will take a little of your time to help us get the needed information.

We are enclosing questionnaires and would like you to give these to faculty members who hold the rank of associate professor or professor at your institution. We are looking for individuals who have an earned doctorate degree. We would like both men and women, as well as faculty members from all areas of home economics to be represented in the study. Please include home economics personnel in home economics areas housed in other units; e.g. home economics education in a college of education.

After you have identified faculty members from your institution who meet these qualifications and distributed the questionnaires to them, would you please place their names on the enclosed postcard and return it to us? We need the names of these individuals for follow-up purposes.
The respondent is asked to indicate on the questionnaire the name of the institution by which he/she is employed. We are sure you realize that institutions which participate in the study will be assigned a code number and referred to by this number (not by name) when the results of the study are reported. If you do not want your institution to participate in this study, please let us know as soon as possible. If you have any questions please call Mrs. Schultz at 515-294-4757 on Tuesday or Thursday.

If you would be interested in receiving a summary of the results of this study, please let us know this too. They should be available in November, 1975.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Research Assistant
May 19, 1975

Dear Professor:

Recently we asked for your cooperation in a study on the attitudes of home economics faculty about themselves, their jobs, and life in general. To date we have no record of your response. Possibly your response is now in the mail or it is one of a few that have come back without a name on the envelope.

We realize how busy you are at this time of year, but would you please fill out the enclosed postcard and return it to us immediately so we can complete our records? If you have not filled out the questionnaire, please do that too, so that the results of the study will adequately represent the attitudes of home economics faculty nationwide. If the questionnaire has been misplaced, or you did not receive it, please let us know and we will be happy to send an additional copy.

We thank you for your time and effort and appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Research Assistant
Recently we asked for your cooperation in a study on the attitudes of home economics faculty about themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Accompanying the request were questionnaires for you to distribute to faculty members at your institution, and a postcard to be completed by you. As yet, we have received no information from you indicating if your institution is participating in this study.

We know how busy your schedule must be and realize how easy it is to misplace or overlook materials. If possible, would you please take a few minutes during the next day or two to distribute the questionnaires and return the postcard? If the materials have been misplaced or you did not receive them, please notify us and we will be happy to send additional materials.

Responses are needed from faculty at all institutions in the sample if the study is to be an adequate representation of the attitudes of home economics faculty nationwide. If for some reason your institution is unable to participate in this study would you please let us know?

We appreciate your time and effort in helping.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Research Assistant
Recently we asked for your cooperation in a study on the attitudes of home economics faculty about themselves, their jobs, and life in general. Accompanying this request were questionnaires to be distributed by you to faculty members at your institution, and a postcard to be completed by you. We have received responses from your faculty but, as yet, have not received the postcard from you.

We know how busy your schedule must be and realize how easy it is to overlook or misplace a postcard. If possible, would you please take a few minutes during the next day or two to send us the names of the individuals to whom the questionnaires were given. We need this information for follow-up purposes. If you prefer not to send us the names of the individuals would you please indicate the number of questionnaires you distributed to your faculty? We need this information for our records.

We appreciate your time and effort in helping with this study.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Hughes
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Research Assistant
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Instructions

Check the answers which most adequately describe you or your situation at the present time. Please respond to all of the questions.

1. What is your rank or position?
   1. Associate professor
   2. Professor
   3. Department head
   4. Dean
   5. Other administrative position
   6. Other

2. How long have you held your present rank?
   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1 to 3 years
   3. 4 to 6 years
   4. 7 to 9 years
   5. 10 years or over

3. How long have you been employed at your present institution (exclusive of years as a student)?
   1. Less than 1 year
   2. 1 to 3 years
   3. 4 to 6 years
   4. 7 to 9 years
   5. 10 years or over

4. What is your current employment status?
   1. Full time
   2. Over half-time but less than full time
   3. Half-time
   4. Less than half-time

5. Which employment status do you prefer?
   1. Full time
   2. Part-time
   3. Unemployed

6. From the list below select your current major job activity.
   1. Teaching
   2. Research, scholarly writing, artistic production
   3. Administration
   4. Extension
   5. Other

7. Do your interests lie primarily in teaching, research or administration?
   1. Primarily in research
   2. Primarily in teaching
   3. Primarily administration
   4. Other

8. What is your average class load per term this year?
   1. None
   2. 3 quarter credit hours or less
   3. 4-6 quarter credit hours
   4. 7-9 quarter credit hours
   5. 10-12 quarter credit hours
   6. 13 quarter credit hours or more

(Note: Convert semester hours to quarter hours by multiplying semester hours by 1.5)
9. What are your teaching responsibilities this year?
   1. ___ Entirely undergraduates
   2. ___ Some undergraduates, some graduates
   3. ___ Entirely graduates

10. Have you achieved tenure?
    1. ___ Yes
    2. ___ No

11. Which area(s) do you hold appointment(s) in? Check all that are appropriate.
    1. ___ Related Art
    2. ___ Business
    3. ___ Child Development
    4. ___ Family Relations
    5. ___ Journalism
    6. ___ Extension
    7. ___ Foods-Nutrition
    8. ___ General Home Economics
    9. ___ Home Economics Education
   10. ___ Housing, Equipment
   11. ___ Institution Management
   12. ___ Textiles-Clothing
   13. ___ Other

12. What is your approximate basic salary for the 1974-75 school year? Please do not include income from extension teaching, consultation, teaching at other universities, royalties, etc.
    1. ___ Less than $8,000
    2. ___ $8,000-$9,999
    3. ___ $10,000-$11,999
    4. ___ $12,000-$13,999
    5. ___ $14,000-$15,999
    6. ___ $16,000-$17,999
    7. ___ $18,000-$19,999
    8. ___ $20,000 or over

13. Indicate the number of months employed for this salary.
    1. ___ 12 months
    2. ___ 11 months
    3. ___ 10 months
    4. ___ 9 months
    5. ___ Other

14. How many research grants have you obtained in the last 5 years from funding sources outside your institution?
    1. ___ None
    2. ___ 1-2
    3. ___ 3 or more

15. How many books have you written or edited in the last 10 years?
    1. ___ None
    2. ___ 1-2
    3. ___ 3 or more

16. How many articles have you published in the last 5 years?
    1. ___ None
    2. ___ 1-2
    3. ___ 3-5
    4. ___ 6-10
    5. ___ 11 or more

17. Have you sought employment at another institution in the past 5 years?
    1. ___ Yes
    2. ___ No

18. Have you been offered another job in the last 5 years?
    1. ___ Yes
    2. ___ No

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
19. In how many professional organizations do you hold membership?
   1. None
   2. 1 or 2
   3. 3 or 4
   4. 5 or 6
   5. 7 or more

20. On how many committees at this institution are you actively serving?
   1. None
   2. 1 or 2
   3. 3 or 4
   4. 5 or more

21. In how many social organizations are you active?
   1. None
   2. 1 or 2
   3. 3 or 4
   4. 5 or more

22. What is your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

23. What is your age group?
   1. Under 30
   2. 30-39
   3. 40-49
   4. 50-59
   5. 60 or over

24. How would you describe your health at the present time?
   1. Excellent
   2. Good
   3. Fair
   4. Poor

25. What is your current marital status?
   1. Married (once only)
   2. Married (remarried)
   3. Separated
   4. Single (never married)
   5. Single (divorced)
   6. Single (widowed)

26. Are you a parent?
   1. Yes
   2. No

27. How many children do you have?
   1. None
   2. 1 or 2
   3. 3 or 4
   4. 5 or more

28. How many people are there in your present household?
   1. 1
   2. 2 or 3
   3. 4 or 5
   4. 6 or more

29. What is your race?
   1. White
   2. Black
   3. Oriental
   4. American Indian
   5. Spanish American
   6. Other

30. What part does religion play in your life?
   1. Very important
   2. Somewhat important
   3. Of little importance
   4. Not applicable
31. What institution are you currently employed by?

________________________________________

The remaining questions ask about your present spouse. If you are not currently married, proceed to the next section on page 6.

32. What is your spouse's educational attainment level?

1. __ High school or less
2. __ Some college
3. __ Bachelor's degree
4. __ Master's degree
5. __ Earned doctorate or professional degree

33. Which one of the following describes your spouse's employment during your marriage?

1. __ Employed full time all of the time
2. __ Employed full time some of the time
3. __ Employed part-time all of the time
4. __ Employed part-time some of the time
5. __ Very little or no employment

34. Is your spouse currently employed?

1. __ Yes, full time
2. __ Yes, part-time
3. __ No

35. Which one of the following describes your spouse's current employment?

1. __ Teaching, administrative, or research in an educational setting
2. __ Other professional
3. __ Managerial
4. __ White collar, clerical or sales
5. __ Skilled or semi-skilled
6. __ Retired
7. __ Other

36. To what extent has your spouse's job deterred you from considering a job that would require a move to another community?

1. __ Major deterrent
2. __ Minor deterrent
3. __ No deterrent
4. __ Not applicable

COMMENTS:

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE AND READ INSTRUCTIONS
JOB SATISFACTION

Instructions

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire is to provide a way for you to describe how you believe faculty at your institution feel about their jobs. You are asked to respond to each statement below in terms of your agreement with each statement. Please respond to each of the statements in the following manner:

If you agree with the statement completely, write 99 in the space near the statement.

If you disagree completely with the statement, write 1 in the space near the statement.

If you neither agree nor disagree with the statement, write 50 in the space near the statement.

A score from 1-49 indicates the degree to which you disagree with the statement.

A score from 51-99 indicates the degree to which you agree with the statement.

Feel free to use any number from 1-99 that best reflects your opinion. Please respond to every statement. The general scale is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disagree completely</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>agree completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty at this institution are satisfied with...

1. ___ the outlook of other faculty toward their work.
2. ___ the amount of input they have in determining salary increases.
3. ___ the amount of help given them in developing their competencies.
4. ___ the basis on which their performance is evaluated.
5. ___ the degree to which they can determine their faculty load.
6. ___ the amount of time they spend on purely administrative activities.
7. ___ the extent to which they receive the authority to accomplish assigned responsibilities.
the number of individuals they normally supervise. __8.
their salaries in relation to their job responsibilities. __9.
grievance procedures. __10.
the present system for granting salary increases. __11.
the amount of authority they have in carrying out student disciplinary actions. __12.
their salaries in relation to what they think others get for doing similar work in this institution. __13.
the amount of input they have in the selection of new faculty. __14.
their opportunities to influence expenditures for equipment, materials, etc. __15.
working relationships with other faculty members. __16.
amount of time necessary for committee assignments. __17.
the fairness and lack of favoritism shown by administration in dealing with faculty and staff. __18.
their salaries in relation to what they think faculty receive for doing similar work in other institutions. __19.
opportunities for promotion. __20.
the willingness of administration to discuss salary matters with faculty. __21.
the administrator's willingness to discuss problems of faculty. __22.
the extent to which promotions are made on the basis of capabilities and merit. __23.
the appreciation and recognition their administrator gives for a job well done. __24.
the cooperation among faculty members in their department. __25.
the importance of their department to the institution. __26.
the amount of information they are given about matters affecting the department. __27.
the operation of the "open door" policy - their freedom to bring their problems to all levels of administration. __28.
the job security provided by the institution. __29.
the extent to which they receive information through official sources rather than through the grapevine.

the channels by which they can communicate to higher administration.

The administrators here...

are fair in dealings with faculty.

expect too much work from faculty.

do everything to see that faculty get a fair break on the job.

keep putting things off.

are more interested in their own success than the needs of faculty.

get faculty to work together as a team.

are really interested in the welfare of the faculty.

facilitate cooperation between departments.

live up to their promises.

try to get faculty members' ideas on things.

have a very good personnel policy.

have the work well organized.

facilitate the development of faculty members.

Faculty here...

feel that they are a part of this institution.

believe office and classroom space at this institution are O.K.

feel that there is too much pressure on their jobs.

are paid enough to live comfortably.

have opportunities for learning in their present positions.

often feel worn out and tired on the job.

are proud to work for this institution.

are doing something worthwhile in their jobs.
This institution...

should do a better job of handling salary concerns.  
operates efficiently and smoothly.  
provides an acceptable employee benefit program.

COMMENTS:
**LIFE SATISFACTION**

Instructions

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire is to provide a way for you to describe how you feel about your life in general. You are asked to respond to each statement below in terms of your agreement with each statement. Please respond to each of the statements in the following manner:

- If you agree with the statement completely, write 99 in the space near the statement.
- If you disagree completely with the statement, write 1 in the space near the statement.
- If you neither agree nor disagree with the statement, write 50 in the space near the statement.

A score from 1-49 indicates the degree to which you disagree with the statement.

A score from 51-99 indicates the degree to which you agree with the statement.

Feel free to use any number from 1-99 that best reflects your opinion. Please respond to every statement. The general scale is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>disagree completely</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>agree completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am satisfied with...

1. ___ the local organizations to which I could belong.
2. ___ medical facilities available in this community.
3. ___ housing available in this community.
4. ___ the local weather.
5. ___ recreational facilities available for adults in this community.
6. ___ cultural activities available in this community.
7. ___ schools in this community.
8. ___ cost of housing in this community.
shopping facilities available locally. ___________ 9.
recreational facilities available for children in this community. ___________ 10.
cost of living in this community. ___________ 11.
my present financial situation. ___________ 12.
religious institutions available in this area. ___________ 13.
my life now compared to earlier times in my life. ___________ 14.
my present occupation. ___________ 15.
my health at the present time. ___________ 16.
my life in general at the present time. ___________ 17.
my present sex life. ___________ 18.
my relationships with friends. ___________ 19.
the frequency with which I see my friends. ___________ 20.
my ability to make friends. ___________ 21.
my present living conditions. ___________ 22.
the amount of time I have available for leisure activities. ___________ 23.
my home life at the present time. ___________ 24.
my relationships with my family or members of my household. ___________ 25.
the amount of time available to spend with my family or members of my household. ___________ 26.
understanding my family or members of my household have for my feelings and problems. ___________ 27.
the number of people I feel close to. ___________ 28.
my life now compared to expectations for my life in the future. ___________ 29.
my activities as a member of organizations. ___________ 30.

COMMENTS:

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE AND READ INSTRUCTIONS
PERSONAL TRAIT LIST*

Instructions

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire is to provide a way for you to rate yourself on each of the 50 traits listed below. An X on the line under 1, opposite "absent-minded" would mean that you are very absent-minded, while an X under the 7 on the first line would mean that you are not at all absent-minded but extremely alert. Put one X on each line, to show how much of each of these 50 traits you possess.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Absent-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aimless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cautious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Confused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used by permission of Donald E. Super, Teachers' College, Columbia University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Curious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Despised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Foolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Impatient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Listless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Narrow-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Persevering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Precise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Realistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Rigid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Solitary</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Stable</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Successful</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tactful</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Tactless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Uneducated</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Unimportant</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Useful</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Wasteful</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Thrifty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Weak</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Wealthy</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE AND READ INSTRUCTIONS
**IDEAL TRAIT LIST**

**Instructions**

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire is to provide a way for you to describe yourself as you would like to be, your ideal self, on each of the 50 traits listed below. An X on the line under 1, opposite "absent-minded" would mean that you would like to be very absent-minded, while an X under the 7 on the first line would mean that you would not like to be absent-minded but would like to be extremely alert. Put one X on each line, to show how much of each of these 50 traits you would like to possess.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would like to be</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Absent-minded.</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active.........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aimless.........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Purposeful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ambitious.......</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Plodding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assertive.......</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bored...........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Busy............</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cautious.........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Reckless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clever...........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Comfortable.....</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Confident.......</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Confused.........</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Clear-thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conservative...</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contented.......</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Conventional....</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_ Unconventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used by permission of Donald E. Super, Teachers' College, Columbia University*
16. Creative...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Ordinary
17. Curious...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Indifferent
18. Depressed...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Cheerful
19. Despised...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Respected
20. Efficient...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Inefficient
21. Exciting...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Dull
22. Foolish........ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Wise
23. Helpful........ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Self-centered
24. Honest........ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Dishonest
25. Hostile........ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Friendly
26. Imaginative.... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Unimaginative
27. Impatient...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Patient
28. Incompetent.... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Capable
29. Independent.... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Dependent
30. Listless....... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Enthusiastic
31. Motivated...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Apathetic
32. Narrow-minded.. |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Broad-minded
33. Persevering..... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Quitting
34. Practical....... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Theoretical
35. Precise......... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Inaccurate
36. Productive..... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Non-productive
37. Realistic...... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Idealistic
38. Reliable....... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Undependable
39. Rigid........... |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Adaptable
40. Slow............ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ |  __ | Fast
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Solitary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Uneducated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Wasteful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Wealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Sociable
Changeable
Unsuccessful
Tactless
Educated
Important
Useless
Thrifty
Strong
Poor
JOB DEMANDS TRAIT LIST*

Instructions

The purpose of this section of the questionnaire is to provide a way for you to rate your job (your position) demands on each of the 50 traits listed below. An X on the line under 1, opposite "absent-minded", would mean that your job requires that you act very absent-minded, while an X under the 7 on the first line would mean that it requires that you act not at all absent-minded, but extremely alert. Put one X on each line, to show how much of each of these 50 traits your job requires you to display.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My job demands</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Absent-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aimless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purposeful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plodding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cautious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reckless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Confused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear-thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unconventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Used by permission of Donald E. Super, Teachers' College, Columbia University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Creative........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Curious........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Depressed........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Despised.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Efficient.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Exciting.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Foolish..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Helpful..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Honest...........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Hostile..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Imaginative......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Impatient.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Incompetent.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Independent......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Listless.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Motivated........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Narrow-minded....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Persevering......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Practical........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Precise..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Productive.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Realistic.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Reliable..........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Rigid............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Slow..............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON TO NEXT PAGE
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Solitary</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Stable</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Successful</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tactful</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Uneducated</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Unimportant</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Useful</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Wasteful</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Weak</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Wealthy</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE. IT IS TRULY APPRECIATED.

Please remember to place your name and address on the return envelope so that we may have a record of people who have responded.
APPENDIX C: FACTOR LOADINGS OF ITEMS FOR THE ROTATED FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Factor loadings of items on factor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>(600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>(637)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Items 1-55 correspond to items 1-55 on the job satisfaction instrument and items 56-85 correspond to items 1-30 on the life satisfaction instrument.

\[b\] Decimal points have been omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>-209</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td>-173</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>-482</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-003</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>054</td>
<td>-264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>(610)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-077</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-092</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>(595)</td>
<td>-043</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>-001</td>
<td>-027</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>(614)</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>-022</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>(586)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-079</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>-045</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>(672)</td>
<td>-071</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>-119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>(523)</td>
<td>-032</td>
<td>-066</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>-143</td>
<td>-028</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>(614)</td>
<td>-038</td>
<td>-015</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-218</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-032</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>010</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>-046</td>
<td>-011</td>
<td>-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>006</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-099</td>
<td>-146</td>
<td>(528)</td>
<td>-083</td>
<td>-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>013</td>
<td>-209</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>067</td>
<td>-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>-017</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-027</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>-119</td>
<td>(434)</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>378</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>-147</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-068</td>
<td>-039</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>-087</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>-321</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-018</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>-187</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-255</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-047</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-099</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-188</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-071</td>
<td>046</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-124</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>-037</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>-013</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>-168</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>(470)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>-020</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>-260</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>(515)</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>-064</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>-101</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-052</td>
<td>-064</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>098</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>-092</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>(379)</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>-237</td>
<td>(455)</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>075</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>-181</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>039</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-050</td>
<td>-369</td>
<td>(461)</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>078</td>
<td>-030</td>
<td>-047</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>-077</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>026</td>
<td>-088</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>-170</td>
<td>(471)</td>
<td>054</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>-004</td>
<td>(485)</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-093</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number</td>
<td>Factor loadings of items on factor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-022</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>-035</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>059</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>-040</td>
<td>-075</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-034</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>-030</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>(759)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>-048</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-065</td>
<td>036</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>-008</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>034</td>
<td>-011</td>
<td>-050</td>
<td>-021</td>
<td>030</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>(735)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>-024</td>
<td>(441)</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>-026</td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>-014</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>-040</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>-088</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>-023</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: ITEMS NOT USED IN FACTORS

Items from Job Satisfaction Instrument

Faculty at this institution are satisfied with ...

1. ____ the outlook of other faculty toward their work.
2. ____ the amount of help given them in developing their competencies.
3. ____ the basis on which their performance is evaluated.
4. ____ the degree to which they can determine their faculty load.
5. ____ the amount of time they spend on purely administrative activities.
6. ____ the extent to which they receive the authority to accomplish assigned responsibilities.
7. ____ the number of individuals they normally supervise.
8. ____ grievance procedures.
9. ____ the amount of authority they have in carrying out student disciplinary actions.
10. ____ their salaries in relation to what they think others get for doing similar work in this institution.
11. ____ the amount of input they have in the selection of new faculty.
12. ____ their opportunities to influence expenditures for equipment, materials, etc.
13. ____ working relationships with other faculty members.
14. ____ amount of time necessary for committee assignments.
15. ____ the fairness and lack of favoritism shown by administration in dealing with faculty and staff.
16. ____ opportunities for promotion.
17. ____ the willingness of administration to discuss salary matters with faculty.
18. ____ the administrator's willingness to discuss problems of faculty.
23. ____ the extent to which promotions are made on the basis of capabilities and merit.

25. ____ the cooperation among faculty members in their department.

26. ____ the importance of their department to the institution.

27. ____ the amount of information they are given about matters affecting the department.

29. ____ the job security provided by the institution.

30. ____ the extent to which they receive information through official sources rather than through the grapevine.

31. ____ the channels by which they can communicate to higher administration.

The administrators here ...

33. ____ expect too much work from faculty.

35. ____ keep putting things off.

36. ____ are more interested in their own success than the needs of faculty.

Faculty here ...

45. ____ feel that they are a part of this institution.

46. ____ believe office and classroom space at this institution are O.K.

48. ____ are paid enough to live comfortably.

49. ____ have opportunities for learning in their present positions.

51. ____ are proud to work for this institution.

52. ____ are doing something worthwhile in their jobs.

This institution ...

53. ____ should do a better job of handling salary concerns.

54. ____ operates efficiently and smoothly.

55. ____ provides an acceptable employee benefit program.
Items from Life Satisfaction Instrument

I am satisfied with ...

1. the local organizations to which I could belong.
2. medical facilities available in this community.
3. housing available in this community.
4. the local weather.
5. recreational facilities available for adults in this community.
6. cultural activities available in this community.
7. schools in this community.
8. shopping facilities available locally.
9. recreational facilities available for children in this community.
10. my present financial situation.
11. religious institutions available in this area.
12. my health at the present time.
13. my present sex life.
14. my relationships with friends.
15. my present living conditions.
16. the amount of time I have available for leisure activities.
17. the amount of time available to spend with my family or members of my household.
18. my life now compared to expectations for my life in the future.
19. my activities as a member of organizations.