WORK VALUES OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN SELECTED SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

By

WILLIAM JACK SKAGGS

Bachelor of Business Administration
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas
1960

Master of Business Administration
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1987

WORK VALUES OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN SELECTED

SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Thomas C. Pearson

Thesis Adviser

Ann E. Austin

John D. Hardiman

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

The job satisfaction of faculty members at the small college level has been of increasing concern to administrators. As enrollments have decreased and budget constraints have become a reality, it has become more important that available resources be used in a manner that maximizes the potential for motivating faculty and improving the quality of faculty work life. This can be enhanced by knowing what different faculty members value in work.

Differences in work value orientations were found which should aid academic policy makers in tailoring faculty reward systems to enhance faculty satisfaction and morale.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the faculty and staff of the Educational Administration and Higher Education Department of the College of Education at Oklahoma State University for their assistance. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Ann Austin for her guidance and to my major adviser, Dr. Thomas Karman, for his encouragement.

I am also grateful for the assistance provided by the other committee members, Dr. John Gardiner and Dr. Wayne Minehart. Their comments were pertinent and helpful.

My colleagues at Oklahoma Christian College, Dr. Bill Goad and Jim Carter, have provided invaluable assistance throughout this project by offering suggestions and other support when it was needed.

This entire project would not have been possible without the encouragement and understanding of my wife, Winona, and my two daughters, Cathy and Cheryl. They deserve and have my sincere appreciation and love.

My mother and father, Royce and Estaline Skaggs, have encouraged and supported me in everything I have undertaken. Although they are in their twilight years, they have closely followed my progress in this project, and have eagerly anticipated its completion. My effort is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Status of Faculty Job Satisfaction

The morale and satisfaction of faculty members in higher education is of increasing concern in the academic community. In visits to thirty-eight campuses across the nation, Bowen and Shuster (1986) found that faculty morale varied considerably. While morale on twelve of the campuses was rated as good, it was rated as fair to very poor at twenty-five of the schools. Their assessment was that, overall, "faculty were frustrated and dispirited" (p.146).

Approximately twenty-five percent of the 3,200 colleges and universities in the United States have unionized faculties. On many campuses throughout the nation, faculty unionism has replaced the collegial government system with one based on collective bargaining for determining wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Bigoness (1978) found that a significant relationship existed between job dissatisfaction with respect to work, pay, supervision, promotional opportunity, and felt need for collective bargaining. Many factors have contributed to the decline in faculty job satisfaction. In the 1970's college and university administrations started assuming more and more responsibility for decision-making. This occurred because of the

financial squeeze which resulted from decreasing enrollments and recessionary economic conditions. The traditional "community of scholars", with its influential role in decisions concerning teaching responsibility, salary, promotion, tenure criteria, and other working conditions, eroded because of the tight budgets and the resulting administrative centralization.

This tightening of control is particularly difficult for the large faculty cohort that joined the professorial ranks in the 1960's. They were socialized into the profession during a time of improving conditions, high mobility, and rapid advancement (Altbach, 1981). Increased egalitarianism in higher education has resulted in many students being enrolled in college although they are less prepared for academic life. They are lacking in basic skills for written and oral communications (Ladd and Lipset, 1979). For the faculty member whose primary job is teaching undergraduates, this often leads to a decrease in a major source of satisfaction: students with intellectual curiosity (Freedman and Associates, 1979). This could partially explain the results of a recent study that found that the largest share of dissatisfied faculty are in liberal arts colleges (Change, 1985b, p. 33).

The faculty has become increasingly specialized by disciplines, and this has created problems and feelings of inequity between the pure and applied disciplines. The applied discipline faculty member has been more attuned to the vocationally oriented student and has enjoyed a feeling of increased mobility because of the ability to enter business and industry (Gomez-Mejia and Balkin, 1984).

What is Job Satisfaction?

The Role of Work Values

Because of the deterioration of faculty job satisfaction and the problems inherent in requiring the faculty to assume a somewhat different role, it seems appropriate to examine closely the components of job satisfaction. Locke (1969, p. 316) stated that "job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing." Locke (1976, p. 8) defined job satisfaction as "resulting from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs." Value attainment has repeatedly been shown to be associated with job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Lofquist and Davis, 1969; Schaffer, 1953; Vroom, 1964; Blood, 1965; Evans, 1969; Pritchard, Dunnette and Jorgenson, 1972; Wanous and Lawler, 1972). Before a manager or college administrator can provide the environment that offers the greatest opportunities for faculty value fulfillment, he or she must first know what the various faculty members value. In discussing the implications of the Expectancy Theory, Hitt, Middlemist and Mathis (1986, p. 328) stated that "managers must investigate the desirability of the rewards given for performance. The rewards must be based on what employees value, not what the managers value." After a review of the literature, Katzell (1964) found a consistent positive association between job satisfaction and agreement between personal values and job conditions. It follows then that what faculty members

value in work is determined by a basic value system. Mankoff (1974) stated that

> Many psychological researchers conclude that it is the basic value system to which a person subscribes that ultimately determines who he is, what he is, where he is, and how he relates to himself, his family, other people, his job, his boss - indeed, the whole world around him (p. 24).

In order to understand the issues involved in faculty job satisfaction better, more knowledge is needed concerning the basic work value orientation of faculty members.

Diversity in Higher Education

The diversity in higher education has fostered an equally diverse academic community. The Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum (Levine, 1978) lists nine different types of institutions ranging from "the most research-oriented universities" to "community and junior colleges." The same source stated that faculty at these institutions "vary widely with respect to size, research credentials, research interest, concern with undergraduate academic problems and quality of teaching performance" (p. xxv). Faculty members at the major research institutions are relatively more cosmopolitan than their counterparts at liberal arts colleges and more like their colleagues at other research universities (Clark, 1985). They belong to a network that is built around a distinct academic discipline. They conduct research, attend professional meetings, and normally enjoy close professional relationships beyond their own institutions.

Faculty in the smaller institutions, on the other hand, come from a variety of backgrounds and often spend the majority of their time

teaching both in their own field and beyond. It is often difficult for them to specialize and to do research in one discipline, and they typically lack the network offered by the discipline. While the diversity between the university and small college faculty is fairly evident, the many different types of small colleges would suggest a diversity of faculty at these institutions. There are elite liberal arts colleges and those which have meager academic standards; some are predominantly supported by a particular church and others are not; and some are pure liberal arts while others have compromised the liberal arts concept because of the necessity for more vocationally oriented programs (Clark, 1985). Pace (1975) has divided liberal arts colleges into three categories: selective liberal arts colleges which are normally nonsectarian with a strong intellectual emphasis; strongly denominational liberal arts colleges; and general liberal arts colleges which do not clearly fall into either of the other two categories.

These different types of institutions have faculty with differing needs and goals, and this would suggest a diversity of work value orientations. Research has shown that work values can be affected by the job experience (Hinrichs, 1972; Weiss, 1978), and that individuals tend to join organizations that will provide those things which they value; therefore one would expect work values of faculty to vary from one type of institution to another. In addition, Clark (1985, p. 238) stated that, "The value systems of the faculty particularly cluster around the individual disciplines and hence at one level of analysis there are as many value systems as there are departments." Studies in industry support this multiplicity of value systems by showing that "assembly-line workers, scientists, and persons in various professional

occupations are characterized by particular, if not unique, value orientations" (Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, 1986, p. 73). This would suggest that faculty work values could vary from institution to institution and from discipline to discipline.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to examine work values of faculty at selected small liberal arts colleges. Faculty members were grouped according to type of college, teaching discipline, age, and years as a faculty member. Knowledge about the work value orientation of faculty will assist administrators in their efforts to provide an environment and reward systems that increase the likelihood of fulfilled values for faculty which, in turn, can lead to increased job satisfaction.

Objectives

Specifically, this study proposed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the work value orientations of faculty members at the small liberal arts college?
2. How do faculty work value orientations differ between faculty at church-related colleges and faculty at independent colleges?
3. How do faculty work value orientations differ between teaching disciplines in small colleges?
4. How do faculty work value orientations vary with age and number of years as a college faculty member?

The answers to these research questions will provide insight as to the source of variance in work values between faculty in liberal arts colleges. The Council of Independent Colleges is presently conducting research to learn more about the faculty at its member colleges and the answers to these questions will provide information concerning important differences between faculty members. If it is found that faculty member work values do differ along the dimensions suggested, increased flexibility and variation in reward systems and faculty development programs would seem to be appropriate.

Hypotheses

This study examined fifteen different work values. Some findings were descriptive and exploratory in nature while others dealt with specific hypotheses. The hypotheses were stated as null hypotheses.

Hypothesis Number One:

The criterion of church-relatedness was selected for this study because it is one of the major differentiating factors among small liberal arts colleges and one that provided the potential for difference in faculty work values. The previous discussion on diversity between various small liberal arts colleges (Clark, 1985; Pace, 1975) would suggest the following null hypothesis:

> There is no significant difference in work value orientations between faculty in church-related liberal arts colleges and those in independent liberal arts colleges.

Hypothesis Number Two:

Biglan (1973b) found that university faculty members in different disciplines differ on commitment to teaching, research, service, scholarly output, and social interactions. While small colleges have traditionally devoted themselves to the mission of teaching rather than research (Michalak and Friedrich, 1981), Biglan's finding would appear to have implications for the small college faculty. The second null hypothesis was that:

> There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations in different teaching disciplines at liberal arts colleges.

Hypothesis Number Three:

Taylor and Thompson (1976) found that younger workers value relations with co-workers more than older workers and place less value on comfort. No difference was found between younger and older workers on emphasis on challenge, financial rewards, and the availability of resources. The third null hypothesis was that:

> There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when age is used as the independent variable.

Hypothesis Number Four:

Finkelstein (1984) noted that over the course of an academic career, faculty tend to turn more to institutional and professional service and somewhat away from teaching and research. He offered the suggestion that there is possibly a decline in intellectual curiosity.

The fourth null hypothesis was that:

> There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when "number of years as a faculty member" is used as the independent variable.

Expected Findings

In addition to the hypotheses above, a search of the literature would suggest more specific findings for some of the work values.

Differences Between Types Of Institutions

Some sources view academic freedom as a major problem in the Christian institution. Ramm (1963, p. 122) stated that "some tension between academic freedom and Christian commitment would appear to be inevitable." Clark (1985, p. 1317), in contrasting the teaching orientation of faculty at church-related schools to leading secular liberal arts colleges, stated that the proper role is one that "stresses containment within the perspectives of faith rather than the questioning-of-everything and deciding-for-one's self form of liberation." Therefore we could expect faculty at church-related colleges to attach less importance to the work value of Independence than do their counterparts at independent colleges. In addition, the faculty member at the church-related school has traditionally been thought to view teaching as a ministry. Ringenberg (1979, p. 28) quoted a faculty member who said that "all of us (faculty) are considered ministers for the church, and we consider ourselves as servants of God -- not merely employees." This attitude reflects a value that is similar to Altruism and would suggest that faculty at church-related

colleges attach more importance to the work value of Altruism than do their counterparts at independent colleges.

Differences Between Teaching Disciplines

Biglan reported that teachers in areas that have a paradigm (Hard) report greater collaboration with peers than those in areas that do not have a paradigm (Soft). In addition he found that scholars in areas that have application to practical problems (Applied) prefer to work with more people on teaching and research projects than those in areas that do not have application to practical problems (Pure) and scholars in areas that are concerned with life systems (Life) preferred to work with people more than those in areas that were in areas not concerned with life systems (Nonlife). If we apply these findings to work values, we could expect to find that faculty in Hard, Applied, and Life systems areas value the work value of Associates more than faculty members in Soft, Pure, and Nonlife systems areas.

Faculty members in the Applied areas in small colleges often enter teaching after having worked in industry. While these individuals would be expected to value Economic Returns less than their counterparts remaining in industry, they could be expected to value Economic Returns more than the Pure area faculty.

Differences in Age and Number of Years as a Faculty Member

Because of what has already been said concerning age and tenure, we could expect to find that younger faculty members value Associates less than older faculty members and that faculty members who have been

teaching longer value Intellectual Stimulation less than newer faculty.

Limitations

The colleges were selected from institutions belonging to the Council of Independent Colleges and they are not representative of all liberal arts colleges. Care should be exercised when applying the results of this study to colleges beyond those chosen. The sample was not randomly selected from all small four-year colleges.

The study was limited to those work values identified by Super and possibly does not represent all work values of faculty members.

Assumptions

Since the study relied on self-reported data, it was assumed that respondents provided an accurate assessment of what they value in work. In addition, this study assumed that the Likert scale is interval in nature and used analysis procedures that are based on this assumption.

Definition of Terms

Values — The qualities people desire and seek in the activities in which they engage and in the situations where they live (Super, 1970).

Value System — An organized prioritization pattern of values in which individual values are interrelated so as to reinforce a coherent whole. A value system provides a framework for the analysis of social norms, ideals,

beliefs, and behavior (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969).

Work Values — Values which are extrinsic to as well as those which are intrinsic in work; the satisfaction which men and women seek in work and the satisfactions which may be the concomitants or outcomes of work (Super, 1970).

Work Value Orientation — For the purposes of this study, work value orientation will refer to the relative importance individuals assign to values that people normally consider important in work.

Value fulfillment — The degree to which a valued outcome is perceived to be present in the job (Butler, 1983).

Job Satisfaction — That which results "from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs" (Locke, 1976 p. 1307).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature provides a clearer understanding of the role of work values in the motivation and satisfaction of individuals in the work force. The theories of Vroom, Adams, and Porter and Lawler are used as illustrations of the moderating effects of values. Certain inconsistencies in the research concerning value importance are discussed. The last section examines the literature on faculty differences with emphasis on the Biglan Model as a framework for categorizing faculty according to teaching discipline.

Work Values: Definition and Domain

Locke (1976, p. 1307) defined job satisfaction as resulting "from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs." He further stated that (p. 1304) "needs are innate while values are acquired" and that "all men have the same basic needs while men differ in what they value." Some researchers have viewed work values as being those values which reflect the Protestant Work Ethic (Hazer and Alvares, 1981; Kidron, 1978; Blood, 1969). Wollack, Goodale, and Wyting (1971) have developed the Survey of Work Values which is based on a number of dimensions of a secularized Protestant Ethic. They define work values as "referring to general

attitudes regarding the meaning that an individual attaches to his work role" (p. 331). The instrument is designed to be an index of "a person's attitudes toward work in general, rather than his feelings about a specific job" (p. 331). It is important that this concept of work values be emphasized since it differentiates work values from job satisfaction which is defined as an attitude toward a specific job. It should be noted that work values are more basic, stabilized, and deep-rooted than job attitudes (Hazer and Alvares, 1981). Elizur (1984) offers an empirically based definition of a work values item. His findings support the claim that "an item belongs to the universe of work value items if its domain asks for an assessment of the importance of a goal in the work context and the range is ordered from 'very important' to 'very unimportant'" (p. 379). Super (1970, p. 4) has defined work values as those "values which are extrinsic to as well as those which are intrinsic in work; the satisfaction which men and women seek in work and the satisfactions which may be the concomitant or outcomes of work."

Work Values and Motivation Theory

Valued outcomes have been components in most attempts to explain motivation and satisfaction. Taylor (1970) referred to a mental attitude that would supposedly lead to greater worker compensation and therefore to greater satisfaction and production. He obviously viewed man as an economic being and felt that if a worker could be shown how to increase his pay, he would be satisfied. Herzberg and associates (1959) studied 200 engineers and accountants to determine sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The respondents were asked to describe a time when they felt especially satisfied and a time when they

felt especially dissatisfied with their job. Herzberg argues that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different things. When the respondents talked about the satisfied times, they spoke of the work itself, achievement, promotion, recognition, and responsibility. When they spoke of the dissatisfying times, they talked about supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, company policies, and salary. Herzberg's two factor theory has received criticism and although the two unipolar continua concept "seems indefensible" (Locke 1976, p. 1318), the theory has had a definite impact on job satisfaction thought and research and has provided information on what individuals value in work.

Process theories have been used to explain satisfaction and, by relating satisfaction to work outcomes, offer a more thorough explanation as to why individuals differ in their desire for various job outcomes or rewards. The Equity Theory deals primarily with inequity which exists "for (a person) whenever he perceives that the relation of his outcomes to inputs and the relation of other's outcomes to other's inputs are unequal" (Adams ,1965, p. 424). Adams postulates that this inequity in a person will "create tension in him." Pritchard (1969) later refers to this tension as being dissatisfaction. Equity and satisfaction exist whenever the ratio of a person's outcomes (pay, for example) to inputs equals the perceived ratio of outcomes to inputs for others. Inequity and dissatisfaction exist when the outcomes to inputs ratios are not perceived as equal. This theory stresses that an individual has valued outcomes that he/she is evaluating as being distributed equitably.

Expectancy theory has also been used to explain individual

differences in job satisfaction. The theory, in essence, concerns choice behavior (Wabba and House, 1974) and postulates that the force acting on an individual to work at a specific level of effort is a function of the algebraic sum of the products of the desirabilities (valences) of the outcomes and the perceived probabilities, or expectancies, that those outcomes will follow from working at that level (Behling and Starke, 1973). Vroom (1964, p. 15) defined valence as "the affective orientation toward particular outcomes." While expectancy theories can become very complex, it serves our purpose to recognize that individuals differ in the value they attach to different outcomes. The expectancy framework has provided an explanation for the different motivation levels of individuals in an organization and would argue for individualized reward systems.

Porter and Lawler (1968) have developed an integrated model to explain satisfaction. Their theory combines the Equity Theory and Expectancy Theory to postulate that reward preference, expectancy of receiving the reward, motivational intensity, abilities, needs, and traits and role perceptions combine to produce performance which, if properly and equitably rewarded, will result in satisfaction.

In examining the managerial implications for expectancy theory, Steers (1984) emphasized that, since different employees often place different valence on different rewards, "managers can improve motivational levels by offering a variety of rewards for employees" (p. 182). Cafeteria-style fringe benefit compensation plans are attempts to operationalize the theories. Lawler (1976) stated that since individuals value different benefits, one way to improve employee satisfaction is to allow them to allocate their benefit pay package as

they see fit. The Systems Division of the TRW Corporation and the Educational Testing Service are mentioned as two organizations which have implemented such a plan.

All of this would suggest that higher education administrators should attempt to determine which rewards are valued and disburse their limited resources where they will be most effective.

Value Importance, Value Fulfillment, and Job Satisfaction

The relationship among value importance, value fulfillment, and job satisfaction has been the subject of a great deal of research (Scarpello and Campbell, 1983; Butler, 1983; Greenhaus, Seidel, and Marinis, 1983; Mobley and Locke, 1970; Super, 1970; Stone, 1976; Blood, 1969, 1971; Locke, 1969, 1976). Mobley and Locke (1970, p. 464) argued that "every emotional response reflects a dual value judgment: the discrepancy between what the individual wants (including how much he wants) and what he perceives himself as getting, and the importance of what is wanted (or that amount of what is wanted) to the individual." While strong correlations have been found between value fulfillment and job satisfaction (Blood, 1969; Wanous and Lawler, 1972; Greenhaus, et al., 1983), research on the relationship between the importance of a value and job satisfaction is less consistent (Butler, 1983). Blood (1971) and Wanous and Lawler (1972) found no improvement in predicting overall satisfaction due to importance weighing of satisfaction facets (Butler, 1983). Mobley and Locke (1970) conducted five studies to explore the relationship between the importance of a job value to an individual and his/her degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the value. Four

of the studies tested the hypotheses that value attainment and value frustration would produce more satisfaction and dissatisfaction when the value was more important than when it was less important. The fifth study tested the hypothesis that "the overall variability in satisfaction with a job aspect would be proportional to the importance of that aspect" (p. 463). All hypotheses were supported. It was suggested that the inconsistency in the results of the various studies was due to the instrument used to measure satisfaction. Butler (1983) pointed out that three of the studies that failed to support importance weighing effects used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Mobley and Locke (1970) suggested that the JDI may not reflect attitude intensity as well as an instrument that uses a Likert scale. The JDI asks a person to describe his/her job rather than to rate the degree of satisfaction with the aspect.

More recently, Butler (1983) used the short forms of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970) to determine if there was a fulfillment-importance interaction. He sampled three different organizations and found that the interaction was not present in one, inconsistent in another, and strong in the third. The third group was comprised of three classes of cadets in training at the Air Officer Candidate School of the U.S. Navy. As a result of his research, Butler proposed that "control over value fulfillment and anticipated impact of fulfillment on future outcomes might be joint moderators, along with value importance, of the fulfillment-satisfaction relationship" (p. 420).

Scarpello and Campbell (1983 p. 315) noted that "a number of conceptualizations of job satisfaction are based on the notion that a

match between the individual's needs, goals, and/or values and the rewards provided by the work environment determine, in a large part, the job satisfaction expressed by an individual." They note, however, that in research associated with the Minnesota Work Adjustments Project, many situations were identified in which individuals had high job satisfaction but a bad match between needs and rewards; conversely, there were others with low job satisfaction although there was a good match between needs and rewards provided by the work environment. They also suggest that this could possibly be explained because "career perceptions 'lock' some people into dissonant work situations and thus contribute to our inability to predict overall job satisfaction from knowledge of the need/reward match" (p. 316). Their hypothesis was supported and results indicated that "individual differences in aspiration level and different views of career progression help explain current job satisfaction over and above the match of needs and rewards" (p. 315). They also suggest that vocationally relevant variables be measured when attempting to assess job satisfaction.

Greenhaus, Seidel, and Marinis (1983) examined the effects of realistic expectations and value attainment on job facet satisfaction and discovered that value attainment accounted for considerably more variance in facet satisfaction than did realistic expectations.

In summary, it would appear that there are moderating variables between the value importance-fulfillment-satisfaction relationship. Butler (1983) suggested that some type of locus of control variable may moderate the relationship. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) tended to find a similar moderating variable when looking at the need/reward satisfaction relationship. This would seem to relate to Kanter's (1979)

"stuck" and "moving" categories of people mentioned earlier.

Although the exact relationships are still being investigated, the literature is clearly supportive of the fact that one's work values play a major role in job satisfaction and that importance is a widely accepted aspect of values (Butler, 1983).

Values Conducive to Job Satisfaction

What are the qualities people desire and seek in work? After a thorough review of the literature, Locke (1976, p. 1328) stated that among the most important values or conditions conducive to job satisfaction are:

1. Mentally challenging work with which the individual can cope successfully.
2. Personal interest in the work itself.
3. Work which is not too physically tiring.
4. Rewards for performance which are just, informative, and in line with the individual's personal aspirations.
5. Working conditions which are compatible with the individual's physical needs and which facilitate the accomplishment of his work goals.
6. High self-esteem on the part of the employee.
7. Agents in the workplace who help the employee to attain job values such as interesting work, pay, and promotions, whose basic values are similar to his own, and who minimize role conflict and ambiguity.

Wollack, Gooddale, Wijting, and Smith (1971) have used the Protestant Work Ethic as the source to develop seven dimensions that

cover the intrinsic, extrinsic, mixed aspects of work. They are:

1. Pride in work.
2. Job involvement
3. Activity preference
4. Attitude toward earnings
5. Social status of job
6. Upward striving
7. Responsibility to work

They have used these job aspects to develop the Survey of Work Values and found that they discriminated among occupational groups.

Elizur (1984) analyzed the literature on work values and determined that there were two basic facets: modality of outcome and the relation to task performance. He pointed out that some outcomes are of a material nature such as pay, benefits, hours of work, and work conditions. Those that are not of a material nature are relations with people and other social relations. There are also psychological outcomes that are cognitive in nature. The second facet classifies the outcomes according to whether they come before or after the task. Some system rewards are earned merely because of membership in the organization while others follow the task and are the result of task accomplishment. The hypotheses were supported by the use of a twenty-one item questionnaire that was analyzed by the Smallest Space Analysis, a variety of nonmetric multidimensional scaling analysis techniques.

After a thorough review of the literature on work values, Zytowski (1970, p. 183) stated that "there is substantial agreement on 12 to 15 value categories," and this number of values seems adequate to describe

the spectrum although factor analysis normally provides three to six values. Super (1970) has developed the Work Values Inventory which measures the relative importance to an individual of each of fifteen work values (Carruthers, 1968). They are:

- way of life
- security
- prestige
- economic returns
- surroundings
- associates
- supervisory relations
- variety
- altruism
- creativity
- independence
- intellectual
- stimulation
- aesthetic
- management

These values resulted from values and job satisfaction research. Various studies (Super, 1962; O'Connor and Kinnane, 1961) have used factor analysis to reduce the number of values to six factors. The Work Values Inventory was used to gather data in this study.

It can be seen that what the literature identifies as work values are essentially the same items that the job satisfaction literature identifies as factors influencing job satisfaction. As an example, Locke (1976) lists eight causal factors in job satisfaction. They are:

Work -

- opportunity to use ones valued skills and abilities
- opportunity for new learning
- creativity
- variety
- difficulty
- amount of work

. responsibility

. no-arbitrary pressure for performance

. control over work methods and work pace (autonomy)

. job enrichment (increasing responsibility and control)

. complexity

Pay

Promotion

Verbal recognition

Working condition

Self

Supervisors, co-workers and subordinates

Company and management.

The key to differentiating between work values and factors influencing job satisfaction, as previously mentioned, is that work values are a person's attitudes toward work in general, rather than his feelings about a specific job (Wollack, et al,1971). Zytowski (1970) supported this characteristic of work values when he stated that "within one or a few work values, the individual has the orientation to explore many specific occupations" (p. 176). An individual's work value of altruism, for example, could be realized on a college campus or in a fire department.

Status of Faculty Value Fulfillment in Higher Education

Those items normally considered to be an individual's possible work values have been reviewed. The literature which addresses the current

status of certain of these items among faculty will now be examined. Since fulfilled work values are directly related to job satisfaction, it is important to examine the extent to which work values are being fulfilled. It should be pointed out that this portion of the review is not intended to depict the relative importance of each item to the faculty member but is intended to summarize the status of items that are commonly considered to be work values.

Economic Return

Historically, there has been a concept of professional poverty in American higher education (Rudolph, 1962). The 1869 inaugural address of President Eliot of Harvard made it clear that scholars should not value economic return. He said:

> The poverty of scholars is of inestimable worth in this money-getting nation. It maintains the true standards of virtue and honor. The poor friars, not the bishops, saved the Church. The poor scholars and preachers of duty defend the modern community against its own material prosperity. Luxury and learning are ill bed-fellows (Hofstadter and Smith, 1961, p. 611).

Although Eliot was referring to student scholars, his comments reflect the mood of the times. The New York Times in 1883 contained the statement, "No professor worth his salt ever devoted himself to learning for any other reason than that he loved learning" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 196).

Faculty economic return continues to be a source of concern. Faculty satisfaction with pay has been examined in numerous studies and has been a prime dissatisfier leading to faculty unionization (Allen and Keaveny, 1981; Bigoness, 1978; Gomez-Mejia and Balkin, 1984). Shuster

and Bowen (1985, p. 14) reported that "between 1970 and 1983, the faculty experienced a sharp decline in real earnings. After adjusting for inflation, the decline amounted to a whopping 20 percent." This was the sharpest decline of any major non-agricultural occupational group; therefore the dissatisfaction would seem to be justified. Gomez-Mejia and Balin (1984) examined satisfaction with pay at both unionized and nonunionized institutions and found that the presence of a faculty union was positively correlated with pay satisfaction and that women were more satisfied than males. This is probably explained by the feeling of increased equity which resulted from unionization. As Finkelstein (1978) pointed out after reviewing the literature, pay is a major source of dissatisfaction, but very little is said about it being a satisfier. Numerous studies have confirmed this (Fedler and Courts, 1982; Locke, 1983; Diener, 1984). It is interesting to note that some respondents to the 1984 Carnegie Foundation Survey of College Faculty rated annual compensation as excellent. In two-year colleges, forty-two percent rated annual compensation as good to excellent versus thirty-eight percent in four-year colleges. The cause for concern is generated by the fifty-eight percent in two-year colleges and the sixty-one percent in four-year colleges who only rated compensation either "fair" or "poor."

Promotion Opportunity

Perceived promotion opportunity has traditionally been found to be a source of job satisfaction and could fulfill the work values of Security, Achievement, and possibly Management. At best, faculty positions offer only opportunities for advancement from instructor to

assistant professor to associate and then to full professor (Novell and Spear, 1983). The obtaining of tenure offers another sense of promotion, and some institutions offer an advanced rank such as distinguished professor or chaired position. In the present environment, as mobility prospects for more senior faculty are low, the junior faculty's upward mobility prospects are even dimmer (Finkelstein, 1978). Kanter (1979) referred to this as the "pyramid squeeze" and cautions that the "stuck" individual will tend to lower aspirations and suffer low self-esteem. This can lead to disengagement in the form of leaving the job or retiring on the job. While Herzberg (1959) classified opportunity for advancement as a satisfier, it appears that it might be the source of dissatisfaction in an organization experiencing pyramid squeeze. Bigoness (1978) reported a significant negative relationship between perceived need for collective bargaining and promotional opportunities. Many faculty members are, in fact, feeling "stuck" (Hunter,et al., 1980; Rice, 1985).

Organizational Policies, Procedures and Structure

Organizational policies, procedures and structure influence job satisfaction and could have an impact on the values of Way of Life, Supervisory Relations, and Independence. Herzberg (1959) discussed two kinds of over-all company policy and administration. One involved level of adequacy of organization and management while the other involved the harmfulness or beneficial effects of the policies. When this definition was applied to the literature on faculty, it became evident that, as Herzberg pointed out, it is a dissatisfier. Winkler (1982) found that

university structure, reward system, and lack of support were major sources of dissatisfaction. Diener (1984) found "high amount of bureaucracy" to be a dissatisfier. Many policies that determine the governance styles, the criteria used in the reward system, evaluation systems, and other things affecting faculty would seem to come under Herzberg's definition. Finkelstein (1978) reported that the key to the relationships between administrative influence and job satisfaction is not the amount of influence but "how that influence is exercised" (p. 146). His final analysis is that administrative leadership style and organizational structure offer only modest explanatory power of the level of job satisfaction. One possible explanation may be found in the difference between satisfaction and morale. In an exploratory study, Austin (1985) found that while faculty at small colleges expressed personal satisfaction, they characterized the overall faculty morale at their school as being low because of "changes in administration, decisions made by administration, lack of administrative leadership, autocratic leadership, and lack of faculty trust in administration" (p. 2). It is clear that as budgets tighten, organizations tend to become more centralized. This centralization and the accompanying policies are particularly dissatisfying for a profession that has viewed itself as a community of scholars rather than employees (Maukich, 1985).

Supervisory Relations

The style of the supervisor as an influencing factor in faculty job satisfaction is unique due to the "leadership among peers" relationship which exists in many academic departments (Tucker, 1984). Higher levels of job satisfaction have been reported when supervisors were above the

median on "initiating structure" and "consideration" as defined by the Ohio State Studies of 1948. Faculty members also responded more positively to expert and referent power than to reward and coercive power (Finkelstein, 1978).

Participation in Decision-Making

The faculty's participation in decision-making has been a key issue in faculty unionization where faculty unionism replaces the collegial governance system (Lee, 1978). Austin and Gamson (1983, p. 42) concluded that "lack of power and opportunities for participation in decision-making may have quite negative effects on faculty members' satisfaction." Nelson (1982) noted that although faculty governance of academic institutions is an old principle, most knowledgeable faculty members know that the final decision on most issues are made by chief administrative officers and boards of trustees. At best, most faculties have broad recommendation rights. After reviewing the literature on faculty, Austin and Gamson (1983, p. 35) stated that "it is not yet known the extent to which faculty members want to participate in decision-making." Finkelstein (1978, p. 131) stated that it is as members of various decision-making bodies "that the dynamics of academic politics most clearly intrude into the work life of the professor."

Associates

Co-worker relationships in any organization are important. Since the Hawthorne experiments, it has been recognized that the social aspect of the workplace is important. The academic faculty member has co-workers within his/her department and institution and at other

institutions within his/her profession. Winkler (1982) found that "narrow, dogmatic, pompous colleagues" was an item that contributed most to job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, Fedler and Courts (1982) found that among Journalism and Mass Communications faculty, satisfaction with colleagues was high. Diener (1984) found that colleague apathy was a direct source of dissatisfaction. From these findings it can be concluded that co-workers can be a source of satisfaction if we view them positively or a definite dissatisfier if viewed negatively. Schuster and Bowen (1985) report that some members in the faculty may feel threatened by other members. The mid-career member may feel threatened by the junior member who is well-trained and is performing at unparalleled levels. The senior faculty member may view the reward system as being skewed toward the "new breed of self centered young faculty" (p. 19). These observations are likely the result of the tightening economic situation and the increasing lack of resources. Newell and Spear (1983, p. 111) pointed out that although professors choose academe because of a desire for colleagueship, "discussion at professional meetings is sometimes savage, as paper respondents indulge in the 'rhetoric of rudeness' to devalue a rival's contribution." Altbach (1985) noted that as faculties have become larger and more specialized it has become more difficult to achieve a sense of community. These observations would suggest that the co-worker is important to faculty satisfaction and that the relationship is being threatened by environmental factors.

Surroundings

Faculty working conditions include physical surroundings such as

adequate office space and teaching facilities, adequate equipment, and acceptable levels of environmental quality (Steers, 1984). Austin (1985) found that a sample of small college faculty was generally satisfied with physical facilities. Diener (1984) found that among faculty he surveyed, poor facilities and equipment were sources of dissatisfaction. Steers noted that working conditions become a factor in job attitudes only when they are present or absent in the extreme or when there is a clear standard for comparison. This would explain the lack of information on physical facilities in the literature.

The average work week for faculty could be considered under the heading of working conditions. Yaker (1984) reported that in universities throughout the nation, some faculty members work fewer than 30 hours a week while others work more than 70. He found that all other differences (institution, rank, sex) were insignificant compared to individual differences in hours worked.

Job Content

Job Content factors could satisfy the desire for variety, prestige, and independence. Job content includes job scope and role clarity and conflict. Job scope includes variety, autonomy, responsibility, and feedback provided by the job. Increased job scope leads to increased satisfaction (Stone, 1978). It would seem that faculty members would have good job variety, but as Austin and Gamson (1983) pointed out, the faculty member often finds him/herself doing the same thing over and over again.

Faculty members have traditionally enjoyed a great deal of autonomy or independence. Even though decision-making has become more

centralized, faculty members still have a great deal of freedom in decisions concerning teaching and research. Faculty often mention autonomy as a major source of satisfaction (Winkler, 1982; Diener, 1984). As the budget tightens, demands for accountability threaten faculty autonomy (Newell and Spear, 1983). It would seem that this very important source of satisfaction is being threatened.

Feedback from work is necessary for a variety of reasons and can be in the form of feedback from the job itself or from co-workers, subordinates, or superiors. Herzberg found feedback to be an ingredient of an enriched job (Herzberg, 1959), and Hackman and Oldham (1976) listed it as one of the five core dimensions of a job. The literature includes information on faculty perception concerning feedback. Hill (1983) surveyed over 900 faculty members in Pennsylvania and found recognition/support to be a major source of job satisfaction. Although student growth can be a chief source of satisfaction for faculty (Diener, 1984), it is particularly difficult for a faculty member primarily interested in teaching to receive adequate feedback. It is difficult to make a connection between "pedagogical outcomes and particular faculty student encounters" (Bess, 1985, p. 168). The research-oriented faculty member receives feedback from peers, although as previous mentioned, this is often "savage." Most institutions have various evaluation systems for faculty including evaluation by students, peers, or/and chair-persons (Centra, 1985). These evaluation processes are seldom mentioned as strong satisfiers, however.

The strongest satisfaction seems to come from the intrinsic characteristics of feedback from the work itself. If, as Schneider and Zalesny (1982) suggest, faculty are high on the need for self

actualization, growth, and achievement, promotion and increases in salary could be strong feedback elements. As previously discussed, the economic squeeze has greatly reduced the opportunities for promotion and salary increases, thereby limiting their use as sources of satisfaction.

The subject of role clarity and conflict has been thoroughly discussed in the literature. The subject usually centers around the research/teaching dilemma. Ph.D. faculty, in particular, are socialized as researchers but normally find that their primary task is teaching. The same dilemma is encountered by the faculty member who is dedicated to teaching but discovers that the system rewards research (Austin and Gamson, 1983; Finkelstein, 1978; Newel and Spear, 1983; Schuster and Bowen, 1985). Finkelstein (1978) lists the placing of "incongruent demands on faculty" as one of two forms of organization stress in academic work.

The current literature depicts a fairly bleak and pessimistic picture of faculty value fulfillment. It is because of this concern that, now more than ever, administrators should be sensitive to the aspects of work that faculty members value.

The Discriminating Ability of Work Values

The literature supports the discriminating capabilities of work values. Henrichs (1972, p. 563) found that new chemistry PhDs who initially took industrial jobs "differed significantly in profession-oriented values from chemists who entered and remained in academic positions." In addition, different work values orientations have been found to exist between occupational groups. Super's Work Values Inventory (1968) has been found to discriminate between occupational

groups (Normile, 1967; Reichel, Neumann, and Pizam, 1981; Carruthers, 1968). Pennings (1970) found that blue collar workers and low status white collar workers differ from high status white collar workers in their work values orientation. Blue collar and low status white collar workers attribute great importance to extrinsic values while the high status white collar work value system is predominantly intrinsic. Dicken (1984) studied work values among faculty members in three Southern Baptist colleges in Kentucky and found significant differences between faculty when they were segmented according to academic rank, teaching area, faculty age, sex, and academic degree.

Differences Among Faculty

As early as 1959, C.P. Snow wrote about the cultural differences between literary and scientific scholars (Creswell and Bean, 1981). There are many other dimensions along which we can classify faculty. The importance of studying faculty differentiation is shown by a statement made by Clark during a focused dialogue concerning research on faculty issues at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education: "We now need more attention to differences among faculty according to institutional type, discipline, and professional field" (p. 1). Finkelstein stated that

> Though professors are a diverse group, research has particularly focused on research university faculty, especially in Arts and Sciences. Attention should be given to differences by institutional type, academic discipline, gender, and generation (p. 2).

Faculty differ according to institutional type. A very thorough discussion of these differences is found in Freedman and Associates

(1985). They studied a Midwestern State University, a private Liberal Arts College, and a large, prestigious Research University. Of importance to this study are the findings concerning the liberal arts college faculty. When asked about job satisfaction, "almost all mentioned autonomy and the freedom to pursue their own interests" (p. 90). They derived a great deal of satisfaction from teaching and opposed the pressure to make their subject matter "relevant" (p. 91). The university faculty tends to be more research-oriented but also student-oriented. They particularly want to share with the serious graduate student. Clark (1985) also emphasized the diversity in American colleges and universities. He said:

> Some are single-minded, others are all-embracing; some transmit a faith, others are secular; some serve only a narrowly specified constituency, others are wide open to all. The role of the college is perhaps the prime determinant of its array of faculty perspectives, and the distribution of faculty values among campuses is largely determined by the differing commitments of the colleges (p. 135).

He pointed out the complexity of the four year college. They vary in quality from elite liberal arts colleges to second-class colleges which have compromised liberal arts commitment with applied curricula. Clark differentiated faculty along three dimensions: local-cosmopolitan, pure-applied, and humanistic-scientific and labeled faculty as "The Teacher," "The Scholar Researcher," "The Demonstrator," and the "Consultant." He pointed out that different faculty types would be appropriate at different types of institutions.

There are 450 to 600 Protestant colleges in the United States (Pace, 1975) and 350 colleges and universities connected with the Roman Catholic Church (Greeley, 1975). Pace (1975) classified Protestant

colleges according to their degree of connection to the Church; they range from those with only historical links to those that are presently associated with evangelical, fundamentalist, and interdenominational Christian churches. He found that there were "striking differences between the different groups of Protestant colleges" (p. 82). The evangelical and fundamental groups were found to have campuses characterized by politeness, consideration, and a feeling of group cohesiveness. Faculty at these institutions generally view their teaching as a ministry (Holmes, 1975), and faculty member influence in organizational decisions is not as great as it is at the public university and nondenominational institution (Kenen and Kenen, 1978). The colleges that maintained only historical links with the Protestant religion were found to be like other liberal arts colleges of the same size. In a paper examining the small, private, less selective liberal arts college (Carnegie's Liberal Arts Colleges II), Jonsen (1978) found that the quality of faculty varies greatly in these institutions. Because of the low salaries paid by many of these colleges, they have difficulty competing for good faculty although some, "because of the attractiveness of the atmosphere, religious affiliation, or other factors, recruit and retain remarkably talented and dedicated faculty" (p. 14).

When these differences are considered in light of Clark's comments, it becomes evident that it is inappropriate to generalize concerning work values and job satisfaction. It is much too simplistic to group all four-year colleges together or even to group according to Liberal Arts I and Liberal Arts II. The work values of the faculty at the different institutions should differ either because of the orientation

that initially made this type of institution attractive or because of the influence of the environment on the work values of the faculty.

Differences in Teaching Discipline: The Biglan Model

Biglan (1973, p. 195) noted that "there has not been a systematic analysis of subject matter characteristics that would serve as a framework for research." Consequently, he set about to group academic disciplines according to a variety of dimensions. He surveyed faculty members at the University of Illinois and, by using nonmetric multidimensional scaling, found that thirty-five academic areas could be categorized using three dimensions. The first distinguishes those disciplines which have a paradigm from those which do not. This dimension distinguishes hard sciences, engineering, and agriculture from social science, education, and humanities. The dimension can be labeled Hard-Soft. The second dimension can be labeled Pure-Applied and reflects the way scholars view the academic area according to its application to practical problems. The third dimension is labeled "concern with life systems" and distinguishes biological and social areas (Life) from those that deal with inanimate objects (Nonlife).

Biglan also interviewed faculty at a small liberal arts college and found the same three dimensions plus a fourth that distinguished creative and empirical liberal arts areas. Applications of the Biglan Model use the first three dimensions because they tend to characterize the subject matter of academic areas in most institutions.

The model has been tested at least nine times (Biglan, 1973; Smart and Elton, 1975; Smart and Elton, 1976; Eison, 1976; Smart and

McLaughlin, 1978; Muffo and Langston, 1979; Creswell, Seagren, and Henry, 1980; Smart and Elton, 1982). In each test the validity of the model has been upheld. Three studies utilizing the Biglan Model are of particular relevance to this proposed study. Eison (1976) examined the satisfaction level of faculty using the Job Description Index and identified three groups: the Applied-Soft-Life, the Pure-Soft-Life, and the Pure-Soft-Nonlife. These groups had significantly different feelings about job satisfaction. In another study, Winkler (1982) used the model to examine job satisfaction of 600 faculty from twenty-two universities. He used the JDI and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form and found significant differences in satisfaction level between Hard-Soft/Nonlife-Life interactions but found no significant differences elsewhere. Gmelch, Lovrich and Wilke (1984) used the model to study sources of stress in academe. One thousand twenty faculty were selected from 80 doctoral degree granting institutions. They were stratified by academic rank and by Biglan's model. The model again served as a framework for distinguishing academic areas.

Creswell and Bean (1981) concluded that the model can be generalized to research and doctoral degree granting institutions but stated that the model "should be studied in types of institutions such as the four-year state colleges or the two-year campuses" (p. 87).

Review of the literature does not indicate that the model has been used to study small colleges except for Biglan's initial study, but because of the repeated success of the model, this study used the Biglan dimensions as a classification method to test for significant differences in work value orientations among disciplines. The literature leaves no doubt that there are different sources of

satisfaction for faculty in different teaching disciplines. The previously mentioned research on the discriminating power of work values verifies that work values have been found to differ from discipline to discipline.

Differences in Age and Tenure

The age of the faculty member would seem to be a personal factor that affects work values orientation and job satisfaction. There are a variety of findings that suggest a positive relationship between contentment and age, particularly for the life-long scholar. Publication rate, although it seems to dip in the 30 year range, peaks again in the fifties (Lawrence and Blackburn, 1985). Baldwin and Blackburn (1981) found that older professors identify more with their roles as teachers and as members of particular institutions. This is contrasted to the younger faculty who tend to view themselves as disciplinary scholars. The findings of Winkler (1982) and Hold (1981), however, found no significant difference in satisfaction level and need for fulfillment level, respectively, between age groups. Lawrence and Blackburn (1985, p. 137) found evidence to support the statement that "what appears to be age related differences in productivity or values are actually cohort effects." They did find differences between cohorts based upon the socialization process. This could explain Winkler and Holts' finding. In addition, there appears to be an interaction between gender and years in the occupation. Gomez-Mejia (1983, p. 492) found preliminary support for the hypothesis that "when men and women are subject to the same occupational experiences, they tend to converge on their work related attitudes over time."

Taylor and Thompson (1976) investigated the work values of young workers and found that younger workers valued self-expression through work to a greater extent than did older workers. They particularly valued the opportunity to learn and the chances to make responsible decisions. The more educated workers, regardless of age, showed a strong sense of pride and valued both intrinsic (job based) and extrinsic (economic) rewards (Steers, 1984).

This study examined the work values with age as an independent variable to determine if there was a significant difference that could be attributed to age. Years as a faculty member and years as a faculty member at the present institution were examined for sources of variance in work values.

Summary

The literature on work values is closely related to that on job satisfaction. Zytowski (1970, p. 177) pointed out that "The concept of work values has had extensive use in studies of factors considered important by persons planning to work and of factors associated with job satisfaction." Mankoff (1974) found that values play a crucial role in human motivation. Neumann and Neumann (1983) stated that work values may predict a wide range of attitudes and behaviors and that "one of the promising areas of research in organizations focuses on the role of perceived work values" (p. 41). Administrative decisions are often made as if all individuals valued the same thing, yet the literature makes it clear that work value orientations differ. This study provided knowledge about the work values of faculty members in small colleges and examined the sources of variance. The Biglan Model was used at the small college level. Work values have been shown to have the ability to discriminate between a variety of demographic variables and provide a viable area for investigation.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

This chapter will discuss the sample, the survey instrument, the data gathering methods, and the statistical methods which were used in this study.

The Sample

The subjects selected for this study are faculty members from colleges that are members of the Council of Independent Colleges. This group of colleges was selected because of the current concern shown by the Council for faculty satisfaction and morale in its member colleges and because these schools are representative of the small four year colleges in the United States. These schools differ in a variety of ways, and for this study, the church-related will be compared with the non-church related. For the purpose of this study, the non-church related-colleges will be referred to as "independent." Early in the study, it became apparent that it would be difficult to classify the small college accurately as a church-related college or as an independent. Some of those which were classified as an independent in Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study (1985) actually had chapel and other things normally associated with a church-related school. One school which the Council of Independent Colleges classified as independent was actually related to a church that, because of

organizational structure, did not have control of the school. Approximately ninety-five percent of the students at this institution are members of the related church. Some of those classified as church-related actually had few of the characteristics normally associated with a church-related college.

In an attempt to classify more accurately the colleges in order to test the hypothesis, a questionnaire was sent to the Academic Deans of fifty Council of Independent College members. Peterson's Annual Guide to Undergraduate Study was initially used to classify the schools and to determine the number of faculty and students. Schools with fifty or more faculty members were selected to ensure an adequate sample size from each school. There were 153 church-related colleges and 20 independent colleges after this selection. The 20 independent colleges and 20 randomly selected church-related colleges were selected. The questionnaire (see Appendix B) was constructed by referring to "The Marks of a Christian College" (Ringenberg, 1979) and Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States (Pattillo and MacKenzie, 1966). Thirty-two Deans responded, and after the results were tabulated, two faculty members who teach at a church-related college were asked to select eight schools that, in their opinion, could be unquestionably classified as church-related or as independent. Four colleges were selected from each group. Faculty members' names were obtained from the most recent college catalog, and surveys were sent to all faculty members at each school. A second mailing was sent four weeks after the first to those who had not responded. Questionnaires were mailed to 719 faculty members and 360 responded resulting in a 50% return rate. Of that number, 353 questionnaires were usable: 215 from church-related

colleges and 138 from independent colleges. Of these, 240 of the faculty members were male and 113 were female. Table I provides information about the schools used in the study.

TABLE I

COLLEGES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

College	Geographic Location	Number of Faculty	Number of Responses	% of Faculty	% of Total
Church Related					
A	Midwestern Protestant	106	71	67%	20%
B	Southern Protestant	118	56	48%	16%
C	Southern Protestant	84	60	71%	17%
D	Northeastern Catholic	94	28	30%	8%
Independent					
A	New England	57	26	46%	7%
B	Northeastern	118	52	44%	15%
C	Western	57	26	46%	7%
D	New England	85	34	40%	10%

After the completed questionnaires were edited to determine their useability, the responses were entered into the computer by using predesignated coding for the demographic section and by entering the respondent's rating for each value directly from the instrument.

Survey Instrument

The survey consisted of several parts: an introductory letter, a demographic section, a survey that asked the respondents to rate the importance of various aspects of work, and a survey that asked about the extent to which these aspects of work were present in their current position. Only the survey concerning importance was used in this study.

Super's Work Values Inventory (see Appendix D) was used to determine faculty work values. Neumann and Neumann (1983, p. 43) stated that "This inventory is still the best available instrument for studying work values." While Berdie (1972) and Brown (1978) provided unfavorable assessments of the reliability and validity of the instrument, Tiedeman (1972) points out that the test-retest reliability data over a two-week interval ranged from .74 to .88, with a median of .83. This reliability data resulted from giving the instrument to 99 tenth graders. The instrument has easily understood directions and a vocabulary level that is simple but not offensive to executives or professional men and women. The present instrument resulted from twenty years of development, and scales were developed on the basis of logic derived from theory and research (Super, 1970).

The survey measures fifteen different work values: Creativity, Management, Achievement, Surroundings, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Security, Associates, Esthetics, Prestige, Independence, Variety,

Economic Return, Altruism, and Intellectual Stimulation (See Appendix A for definitions). There are three questions for each value for a total of forty-five. Each question is answered by marking a scale from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (very important). Fifteen scales are constructed by adding the score on each set of three questions so that a value will have a score of 3 to 15.

The demographics section of the questionnaire gathered data regarding years as a faculty member, years at the present institution, rank, teaching discipline, age, degree held, and sex.

The questionnaire was pretested with faculty members at a small church-related college to check for clarity of instructions and to build the necessary computer instructions.

Analysis

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to analyze the data. Responses were entered and grouped into the fifteen values. The faculty responses were classified according to type of institution (church-related or independent), teaching discipline, years as a faculty member, years as a faculty member at the institution, degree held, academic rank, age, and sex. Biglan's Model (1973b) was used to group teaching disciplines into three dimensions: Hard-Soft; Life-Nonlife; and Pure-Applied. In addition, mutually exclusive categories were used to provide eight disciplinary categories: Hard-Nonlife-Pure (HNP); Hard-Life-Pure (HLP); Hard-Nonlife-Applied (HNA); Hard-Life-Applied (HLA); Soft-Nonlife-Pure (SNP); Soft-Life-Pure (SLP); Soft-Nonlife-Applied (SNA); and Soft-Life-Applied (SLA). The disciplines were assigned to the Biglan categories according to the

procedure used by Creswell, Seagren, and Henry (1979). There are teaching disciplines on this list that are not applicable for the colleges in this study but are included to help identify the various categories. In addition to their classification, this study added Bible and English to the Soft-Nonlife-Pure category and added Sociology to the Soft-Life-Pure category. Table II reflects these classifications.

TABLE II

CLASSIFICATION OF DISCIPLINES INTO
BIGLAN'S THREE DIMENSIONS

Pure

Hard		Soft	
Non-Life	Life	Non-Life	Life
Mathematics	Plant Pathology	Music	Psychology
Physics	Entomology	Fine Arts	Anthropology
Chemistry	Biology	Art	Geography
Geology		Modern Languages	Political Science
		Classics	History&Phil ofEducation
		Speech Comm.	Social Work
		Philosophy	
		History	
		Bible	
		English	

Applied

Hard		Soft	
Non-Life	Life	Non-Life	Life
Architecture	Agronomy	Accounting	Educational Psychology
Computer Science	Animal Science	Finance	Elementary Education
Agricultural Engineering	Horticulture	Management	Secondary Education
Civil Engineering	Food Science	Marketing	Adult Education
Electrical Engineering	Periodontics	Textiles & Clothing	Educational Admin.
Mechanical Engineering	Oral Diagnosis	Economics	Health, Phys. Educ.& Rec.
Industrial Engineering	Oral Surgery	Journalism	Education & Family Res.
Construction Management	Pedontics	Law	Ag. Education
Engineering Mechanics	Adult Dental Care		Industrial Arts Educ.
	Oral Dentistry		Community & Regional Planning
	Preventive Dentistry		
	Endodontics		
	Dental Hygiene		
	Forestry		
	Food & Nutrition		
	Veterinary Services		

Descriptive statistics were used to provide the average response levels for faculty in the various classifications and one-way analyses of variance were used to test for significant differences between the various groups. Each work value, one at a time, was examined as the dependent variable. The General Linear Model (GLM) procedure was used to perform the analysis because of its ability to deal with groups consisting of unequal number of subjects.

Linton and Gallo (1975) have said that Analysis of Variance is one of the most powerful and flexible statistical tests of significance. The analysis of variance tests the null hypothesis that two or more groups have been drawn from the same population of scores. The F ratio is computed by dividing the average sum of squares due to group differences (Mean Square Group) by the average sum of squares due to subject differences (Mean Square error). If there is no difference between groups, the F ratio should be about 1.00. When the F ratio becomes large, it is no longer reasonable to believe that the samples came from the same population and the null hypothesis is rejected (Cody and Jeffrey, 1985; Linton and Gallo, 1975). The GLM procedure will give the F ratio and the probability of obtaining a value of F this large or larger by chance alone.

Tukey's procedure (Steele and Torrie, 1980; Linton and Gallo, 1975) was used to make a pairwise comparison of means when there were more than two independent variables. The procedure consists of computing a critical value by using the following equation and applying it to differences between all pairs of means.

Critical value (means) = qk x square route of MSerror/n where:

q = tabulated upper percentage points of the studentized range

n = the number of observations for each mean compared

MSerror = appropriate error term from the ANOVA

Any difference between means that exceeds the critical value is a significant difference. Specific comparisons can be classified according to the probability of making a Type I error (conservative to nonconservative) and the probability of finding a difference when one exists (low power to high power). As the probability of finding a difference when one exists increases, the probability of making a Type I error also increases. While Tukey has relatively low power, it is a conservative comparison and provides a viable trade-off between the two (Linto and Gallo, 1975). All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level.

Null Hypotheses

In this chapter the hypotheses will be stated as null hypotheses, and it should be remembered that the data have been analyzed to determine if there is adequate reason to reject each null hypothesis; otherwise, the hypothesis is not rejected.

Hypothesis Number One:

There is no significant difference in work value orientations between faculty in church-related liberal arts colleges and those in independent liberal arts colleges.

Hypothesis Number Two:

There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations in different teaching disciplines at liberal arts colleges.

Hypothesis Number Three:

There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when age is used as the independent variable.

Hypothesis Number Four:

There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when "number of years as a faculty member" is used as the independent variable.

Restatement of Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study is to examine work values of faculty at selected small liberal arts colleges. Knowledge about the work value orientation of faculty should assist administrators in providing the environment and reward systems to increase the likelihood of fulfilled values for faculty which in turn can lead to increased job satisfaction.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The findings of the study are reported in this chapter. The work values orientation for all colleges combined are presented first, and then the findings used to test each hypothesis are presented. Since the study is partially exploratory in nature, the last section discusses findings that go beyond the specific hypotheses.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used for all statistical tests reported in this chapter. Mean scores were computed for each work value for the various groups, and tests of significance were conducted using PROC GLM. Scores on the individual work values can range from 3 to 15 because of the combining of responses to three questions which the respondent scored as 1 = unimportant to 5 = very important.

General

The mean scores for all respondents are reported in Table III. The scores have been rank ordered to build a hierarchy of work values for the faculty at the selected small liberal arts colleges. Way of Life, a value associated with work that permits one to live the kind of life he or she chooses and to be the type of person he or she wishes to be, received the highest mean score. This was followed by Altruism and Independence. The two work values of Management and Esthetics received the lowest mean scores.

TABLE III

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES
N = 353

Work Value	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Way of Life	13.11	1.74
Altruism	13.05	1.95
Independence	12.57	1.79
Achievement	12.47	1.77
Supervisory Relations	12.41	2.11
Intellectual Stimulation	12.39	1.74
Creativity	11.89	2.24
Economic Returns	11.03	2.37
Variety	10.88	2.24
Surroundings	10.57	2.02
Prestige	10.40	2.16
Security	10.06	2.59
Associates	9.80	1.99
Management	8.46	2.21
Esthetics	8.37	3.06

The next section examines the findings as they pertain to each hypothesis.

Hypothesis Number One

The first hypothesis states that "There is no significant difference in work value orientations between faculty in church-related liberal arts colleges and those in independent liberal arts colleges."

Findings

Table IV presents the mean scores of work values of faculty in church-related colleges and those in independent colleges. There are significant differences between the two groups for the work values of Management, Supervisory Relations, Associates, Independence, and Altruism. Table V presents the analysis of variance summary table for these work values.

The church-related faculty value Associates significantly more than those at the independent colleges. The two groups differ significantly on the importance of the work value Independence ($p= 0.0055$). Those at the independent colleges value it more than those at the church-related colleges. In addition, the independent college faculty value the work value of Management less than those at the church-related college (8.09 vs 8.70, $p= 0.0100$). The work value of Altruism received the highest score for church-related faculty work values and had a p value of 0.0130 in the GLM procedure.

TABLE IV

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

Work Value	Church-Related n = 215	Independent n = 138	F Ratio
Creativity	11.89	11.89	0.00
Management	8.70	8.09	6.71*
Achievement	12.56	12.33	1.38
Surroundings	10.65	10.45	0.79
Supervisory Relations	12.63	12.07	5.79*
Way of Life	13.07	13.18	0.35
Security	10.27	9.74	3.53
Associates	10.17	9.21	20.35**
Esthetics	8.50	8.17	0.90
Prestige	10.41	10.38	0.02
Independence	12.36	12.90	7.80**
Variety	10.88	10.88	0.00
Economic Return	11.00	11.07	0.08
Altruism	13.25	12.73	6.23*
Intellectual Stimulation	12.37	12.44	0.14

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE V

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: CHURCH-RELATED AND INDEPENDENT COLLEGES COMPARED

Dependent variable: Management

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Type of Institution	1	32.31	32.31	6.71	0.0100
Error	351	1689.50	4.81		
TOTAL	352				

Dependent variable: Independence

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Type of Institution	1	24.55	24.55	7.80	0.0055
Error	351	1104.00	3.15		
TOTAL	352	1128.55			

Dependent variable: Altruism

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Type of Institution	1	23.30	23.30	6.23	0.0130
Error	351	1311.97	3.74		
TOTAL	352	1335.27			

TABLE V (Continued)

Dependent variable: Supervisory Relations

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Type of Institution	1	25.56	25.56	5.79	0.0166
Error	349	1539.36	4.41		
TOTAL	350	1564.92			

Dependent variable: Associates

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Type of Institution	1	76.44	76.44	20.35	0.0001
Error	350	1314.83	3.76		
TOTAL	351	1391.27			

Summary

There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and to say that there are differences between the work value orientations of church-related faculty and independent faculty.

Hypothesis Number Two

The second hypothesis states that "There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations in different teaching disciplines at liberal arts colleges."

Findings

Tables VI through VIII present the mean scores for the work values by disciplines classified according to the Biglan Model. This classification places the faculty in one of three separate categories: Hard or Soft; Life or Non-life; or Pure or Applied. Those faculty members who teach in disciplines which have clearly delineated paradigms (Hard) were compared with those who teach in disciplines where the paradigm is less clearly delineated (Table VI). The GLM procedure indicated that there was a significant difference in the mean scores for the work values of Esthetics, Independence, Way of Life, and Prestige.

Table VII presents the results of the GLM procedure when the faculty members are classified as Life or Non-life. Only one work value, Esthetics, was found to be significantly different between the two groups.

Table VIII presents the GLM procedure results for the Pure-Applied groupings. This classification provides the greatest number of significantly different work values. The applied disciplines scored Management, Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Prestige, Variety, and Altruism as significantly more important than did the Pure discipline faculty members.

The individual analysis of variance summary tables are presented in Tables IX through XI for those work values which are significantly different at the $p < 0.05$ level.

TABLE VI

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY TEACHING DISCIPLINE
(HARD VS SOFT)

Work Value n =	Hard 84	Soft 269	F Ratio
Creativity	11.55	12.00	2.58
Management	8.23	8.54	1.28
Achievement	12.36	12.50	0.42
Surroundings	10.70	10.53	0.42
Supervisory Relations	12.27	12.46	0.51
Way of Life	12.67	13.25	7.40**
Security	9.70	10.17	2.13
Associates	10.00	9.73	1.17
Esthetics	7.25	8.73	14.94**
Prestige	9.92	10.55	5.61*
Independence	12.04	12.74	10.04**
Variety	10.75	10.93	0.39
Economic Return	10.93	11.06	0.20
Altruism	12.92	13.09	0.48
Intellectual Stimulation	12.59	12.34	1.37

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE VII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY TEACHING DISCIPLINE
(LIFE VS NON-LIFE)

Discipline n = Work Value	Life 145	Non-Life 208	F Ratio
Creativity	11.99	11.82	0.52
Management	8.72	8.28	3.41
Achievement	12.36	12.54	0.88
Surroundings	10.70	10.62	0.23
Supervisory Relations	12.42	12.40	0.01
Way of Life	13.10	13.13	0.02
Security	10.11	10.02	0.10
Associates	9.74	9.84	0.21
Esthetics	7.70	8.84	11.70**
Prestige	10.42	10.39	0.02
Independence	12.40	12.69	2.21
Variety	11.07	10.76	1.68
Economic Return	11.10	10.98	0.25
Altruism	12.98	13.09	0.28
Intellectual Stimulation	12.23	12.51	2.10

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE VIII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY TEACHING DISCIPLINE
(PURE VS APPLIED)

Discipline n = Work Value	Pure 233	Applied 120	F Ratio
Creativity	11.89	11.88	0.00
Management	8.16	9.05	13.18**
Achievement	12.24	12.90	11.23**
Surroundings	10.55	10.63	0.12
Supervisory Relations	12.25	12.73	4.08*
Way of Life	13.07	13.20	0.46
Security	10.17	9.85	1.21
Associates	9.78	9.83	0.04
Esthetics	8.57	7.99	2.73
Prestige	10.23	10.73	4.36*
Independence	12.60	12.51	0.21
Variety	10.61	11.41	10.26**
Economic Return	11.02	11.04	0.01
Altruism	12.90	13.33	3.78
Intellectual Stimulation	12.33	12.52	0.89

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE IX

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: TEACHING DISCIPLINE OF FACULTY MEMBERS (HARD VS SOFT)

Dependent variable: Independence

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	31.40	31.40	10.04	0.0017
Error	351	1097.15	3.13		
TOTAL	352	1128.55			

Dependent variable: Way of Life

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	22.09	22.09	7.40	0.0068
Error	349	1041.35	2.98		
TOTAL	350	1063.44			

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	134.65	134.65	14.94	0.0001
Error	337	3036.52	9.01		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dependent variable: Prestige

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	25.84	25.84	5.61	0.0184
Error	350	1612.69	4.61		
TOTAL	351	1638.52			

TABLE X

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: TEACHING DISCIPLINE OF FACULTY MEMBERS (LIFE VS NONLIFE)

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	106.98	106.98	11.77	0.0007
Error	337	3064.19	9.09		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

TABLE XI

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: TEACHING DISCIPLINE OF FACULTY MEMBERS (PURE VS APPLIED)

Dependent variable: Management

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	62.31	62.31	13.18	0.0003
Error	351	1659.50	4.73		
TOTAL	352	1721.81			

Dependent variable: Achievement

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	34.15	34.15	11.23	0.0009
Error	349	1061.22	3.04		
TOTAL	350	1095.37			

Dependent variable: Supervisory Relations

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	18.06	18.06	4.08	0.0443
Error	349	1546.86	4.43		
TOTAL	350	1564.92			

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dependent variable: Prestige

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	20.16	20.16	4.36	0.0375
Error	350	1618.36	4.62		
TOTAL	351	1638.52			

Dependent variable: Variety

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Teaching Discipline	1	50.17	50.17	10.26	0.0015
Error	350	1712.06	4.89		
TOTAL	351	1762.22			

As the second step in analyzing the difference between faculty teaching disciplines, faculty members were placed in one of eight categories formed by the three dimensions of Hard-Soft, Life-Nonlife, and Pure-Applied. These categories are Hard-Nonlife-Pure (HNP), Hard-Nonlife-Applied (HNA), Hard-Life-Pure (HLP), Hard-life-Applied (HLA), Soft-Nonlife-Pure (SNP), Soft-Nonlife-Applied (SNA), Soft-Life-Pure (SLP), and Soft-Life-Applied (SLA). The results of the GLM procedure are presented in Table XII. As would be expected, the SNP group is the largest because of the type of colleges in this study. Analysis of

variance summary tables for the work values which were significantly different are presented in Table XIII. Since there were more than two groups being compared, Tukey's specific comparison test was used to determine if there were significant differences between individual groups. There were significant differences found between the groups' scores for the work values of Management ($p= 0.0016$), Achievement ($p= 0.0016$), Surroundings ($p= 0.0033$), Security ($p= 0.0249$), Esthetics ($p= 0.0001$), Prestige ($p= 0.0169$), Independence ($p= 0.0113$), and Altruism ($p= 0.0360$). The results of the Tukey Tests are presented in Tables XIV through XVII for those work values that had significant differences in more than two means. The Tukey Test indicated a significant difference ($p= 0.05$) between the SLP faculty and SLA faculty even though the GLM procedure indicated no significant difference ($p= 0.0607$).

TABLE XII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY TEACHING DISCIPLINE
(EIGHT CATEGORIES)

Discipline n = Work Value	HNP 38	HNA 9	HLP 16	HLA 21	SNP 125	SNA 36	SLP 54	SLA 54	F Ratio
Creativity	11.4	10.3	11.8	12.1	12.1	11.7	11.8	12.2	1.24
Management	7.6	8.2	8.3	9.3	8.4	8.6	7.9	9.4	3.39**
Achievement	12.2	12.3	11.9	12.9	12.6	12.9	11.6	13.0	3.40**
Surroundings	10.6	9.6	11.2	11.0	10.8	10.2	9.7	11.0	3.12**
Supervisory Relations	12.1	12.9	12.2	12.4	12.5	12.3	11.8	13.1	1.95
Way of Life	12.7	12.4	12.6	12.7	13.3	13.2	13.0	13.5	1.46
Security	9.6	9.4	10.2	9.6	10.5	8.9	9.8	10.6	2.33*
Associates	9.9	10.0	10.4	9.8	9.9	9.6	9.3	10.0	1.01
Esthetics	6.8	7.7	7.3	7.8	9.9	7.6	7.1	8.4	8.87***
Prestige	9.5	9.9	10.4	10.4	10.6	10.8	9.9	11.0	2.48*
Independence	12.0	11.2	12.4	12.1	12.9	13.2	12.5	12.4	2.64*
Variety	10.7	10.4	10.3	11.3	10.6	11.5	10.7	11.6	1.84
Economic Return	10.9	10.1	10.9	11.5	11.3	10.4	10.6	11.5	1.49
Altruism	12.7	13.4	13.0	13.0	13.2	13.0	12.3	13.7	2.17*
Intellectual Stimulation	12.8	13.3	11.9	12.5	12.3	12.6	12.1	12.4	1.11

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$
*** $p < 0.001$

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: TEACHING DISCIPLINE OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Dependent variable: Management

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	110.73	15.82	3.39	0.0016
Error	345	1611.08	4.67		
TOTAL	352	1721.81			

Dependent variable: Independence

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	57.41	8.20	2.64	0.0113
Error	345	1071.14	3.11		
TOTAL	352	1128.55			

Dependent variable: Altruism

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	56.40	8.06	2.17	0.0360
Error	345	1278.87	3.71		
TOTAL	352	1335.28			

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Achievement

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	71.04	10.15	3.40	0.0016
Error	343	1024.33	2.99		
TOTAL	350	1095.37			

Dependent variable: Surroundings

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	85.50	12.22	3.12	0.0033
Error	343	1344.39	3.92		
TOTAL	350	1429.90			

Dependent variable: Security

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	106.35	15.19	2.33	0.0249
Error	341	2227.39	6.53		
TOTAL	348	2333.74			

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	501.00	71.57	8.87	0.0001
Error	331	2670.17	8.07		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

Dependent variable: Prestige

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Discipline of Faculty Member	7	78.77	11.25	2.48	0.0169
Error	344	1559.75	4.53		
TOTAL	351	1638.52			

TABLE XIV

MEANS AND MEAN DIFFERENCES
FOR THE WORK VALUE
"MANAGEMENT"

	HNP (7.58)	HNA (8.22)	HLP (8.31)	HLA (9.33)	SNP (8.42)	SNA (8.56)	SLP (7.93)	SLA (9.41)
HNP	-	0.64	0.73	1.75	0.85	0.98	0.35	1.83*
HNA		-	0.09	1.11	0.20	0.33	0.30	1.19
HLP			-	1.02	0.11	0.24	0.39	1.10
HLA				-	0.91	0.78	1.41	0.07
SNP					-	0.13	0.50	0.98
SNA						-	0.63	0.85
SLP							-	1.48*
SLA								-

* $P < .05$

Note: Each value in the body of the table represents the difference between the column and row values.

TABLE XV

MEANS AND MEAN DIFFERENCES
FOR THE WORK VALUE
"ACHIEVEMENT"

	HNP (12.24)	HNA (12.33)	HLP (11.94)	HLA (12.90)	SNP (12.55)	SNA (12.89)	SLP (11.62)	SLA (13.00)
HNP	-	0.10	0.30	0.67	0.31	0.65	0.61	0.76
HNA		-	0.40	0.57	0.22	0.56	0.71	0.67
HLP			-	0.97	0.61	0.95	0.32	1.06
HLA				-	0.36	0.02	1.28	0.10
SNP					-	0.34	0.93*	0.45
SNA						-	1.27*	0.11
SLP							-	1.38*
SLA								-

* $P < .05$

Note: Each value in the body of the table represents the difference between the column and row values.

TABLE XVI

MEANS AND MEAN DIFFERENCES
FOR THE WORK VALUE
"SURROUNDINGS"

	HNP (10.62)	HNA (9.56)	HLP (11.19)	HLA (10.95)	SNP (10.82)	SNA (10.17)	SLP (9.67)	SLA (10.98)
HNP	-	1.07	0.57	0.33	0.20	0.46	0.96	0.36
HNA		-	1.63	1.40	1.27	0.61	0.11	1.43
HLP			-	0.24	0.37	1.02	1.52	0.21
HLA				-	0.13	0.79	1.29	0.03
SNP					-	0.66	1.16*	0.16
SNA						-	0.50	0.82
SLP							-	1.32*
SLA								-

* $P < .05$

Note: Each value in the body of the table represents the difference between the column and row values.

TABLE XVII

MEANS AND MEAN DIFFERENCES
FOR THE WORK VALUE
"ESTHETICS"

	HNP (6.81)	HNA (7.67)	HLP (7.31)	HLA (7.80)	SNP (9.88)	SNA (7.59)	SLP (7.06)	SLA (8.38)
HNP	-	0.86	0.51	0.99	3.08*	0.78	0.25	1.57
HNA		-	0.35	0.13	2.22	0.08	0.61	0.71
HLP			-	0.49	2.57*	0.28	0.25	1.07
HLA				-	2.08	0.21	0.74	0.58
SNP					-	2.30*	2.82*	1.51*
SNA						-	0.53	0.79
SLP							-	1.32
SLA								-

* P $< .05$

Note: Each value in the body of the table represents the difference between the column and row values.

Tables XVIII and XIX show the differences in the work values when the faculty members are sorted by type of institution and then classified by discipline. The small sample sizes in the various Hard areas detract from one's ability to interpret the results, but by examining these results, one can tell which disciplines contribute to the differences found between the two types of institutions.

TABLE XVIII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES CLASSIFIED BY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES
(CHURCH-RELATED AND INDEPENDENT: HARD)

Discipline	HNP		HNA		HLP		HLA	
	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.
n=	18	20	6	3	10	6	10	11
Work Value								
Creativity	10.9	11.9	10.5	10.0	11.5	12.2	13.4	11.0*
Management	7.3	7.9	9.7	5.3	8.2	8.5	10.4	8.7*
Achievement	12.1	12.4	13.2	10.7	12.6	10.8	13.1	12.7
Surroundings	10.9	10.4	9.8	9.0	11.2	11.2	11.6	10.4
Supervisory Relations	12.7	11.6	13.5	11.7	12.6	11.5	13.0	11.8
Way of Life	12.4	13.0	12.5	12.3	12.6	12.7	12.8	12.6
Security	10.1	9.2	10.2	8.0	10.2	10.2	10.4	8.9
Associates	10.6	9.4*	10.5	9.0	10.3	10.7	10.2	9.5
Esthetics	6.6	7.0	8.7	5.7	7.9	6.3	8.2	7.5
Prestige	9.4	9.5	10.5	8.7	10.4	10.3	10.4	10.4
Independence	11.3	12.7*	10.7	12.3	12.6	12.0	12.7	11.6
Variety	10.4	11.0	11.3	8.7	10.2	10.3	12.1	10.6
Economic Return	11.0	10.8	12.0	6.0*	11.2	10.3	11.7	11.3
Altruism	12.9	12.6	13.8	12.7	13.4	12.3	12.9	13.0
Intellectual Stimulation	12.6	13.0	13.3	13.3	11.9	11.8	13.3	11.7*

* $P < 0.05$

TABLE XIX

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES CLASSIFIED BY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES
(CHURCH-RELATED AND INDEPENDENT: SOFT)

Discipline	SNP		SNA		SLP		SLA	
	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.	Ch.	Ind.
n=	77	48	22	14	32	22	40	14
Creativity	11.9	12.4	12.0	11.1	12.1	11.4	12.0	12.7
Management	8.6	8.2	8.8	8.2	8.4	7.2*	9.4	9.5
Achievement	12.5	12.6	13.1	12.5	11.7	11.5	13.0	13.0
Surroundings	10.8	10.8	10.2	10.1	9.8	9.6	10.9	11.2
Supervisory Relations	12.6	12.4	12.0	12.7	11.8	11.7	13.5	12.3
Way of Life	13.1	13.6	13.2	13.3	13.0	13.0	13.7	13.1
Security	10.6	10.4	9.0	8.9	9.8	9.8	10.8	10.1
Associates	10.3	9.3*	9.8	9.2	9.8	8.5*	10.3	9.2
Esthetics	9.8	10.1	7.7	7.4	7.5	6.4	8.3	8.6
Prestige	10.6	10.5	10.4	11.3	10.0	9.6	10.7	11.8
Independence	12.5	13.5*	12.9	13.6	12.8	12.0	12.0	13.5*
Variety	10.4	10.9	11.5	11.6	11.0	10.4	11.4	11.9
Economic Return	11.1	11.5	9.7	11.4	10.4	10.9	11.6	11.3
Altruism	13.0	13.2	13.5	12.4*	12.6	11.9	13.6	13.7
Intellectual Stimulation	12.3	12.4	12.6	12.6	12.3	12.0	12.1	13.1*

* $P < 0.05$

The Soft-Life-Applied faculty (primarily education) score highest on the work value of Management and were significantly different from the Hard-Nonlife-Pure faculty (math, physics,etc) and Soft-Life-Pure (psychology, sociology, etc). The Soft-Life-Pure faculty, in turn, scored the work value of Achievement lower than the other faculty members and significantly lower than Soft-Life-Applied, Soft-Nonlife-Applied (business), and Soft-Nonlife-Pure (fine arts, philosophy,etc). Soft-Life-Pure faculty scored Surroundings significantly less than did the Soft-Nonlife-Pure and the Soft-Life-Applied faculty members. The work value of Security was valued less by the Soft-Nonlife-Applied faculty than by other faculty members and this difference was significant when compared to the Soft-Nonlife-Pure faculty. The Soft-Nonlife-Pure faculty rated Esthetics significantly higher than five of the other groups and produced the greatest differences between disciplines found in the study. The SNA faculty scored Esthetics low in relation to the other work values but still scored it significantly higher than the other faculty members.

Summary

There is sufficient evidence to allow us to reject the hypothesis that there is no difference between faculty work value orientations in different teaching disciplines at liberal arts colleges.

Hypothesis Number Three

The third hypothesis states that "There is no significant difference between work value orientations when age is used as the independent variable."

Findings

Table XX presents the work value scores for faculty members when they are stratified by age. Summary analysis of variance tables are presented where significant differences were found (Table XXI).

TABLE XX

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY FACULTY AGE

Age n = Work Value	< 30 11	30-40 101	41-50 139	51-60 73	> 60 29	F Ratio
Creativity	12.60	11.72	11.77	12.21	11.97	0.91
Management	9.27	8.53	8.41	8.56	7.93	0.87
Achievement	13.27	12.29	12.40	12.73	12.44	1.27
Surroundings	10.63	10.39	10.36	10.95	11.24	2.02
Supervisory Relations	12.73	12.47	12.30	12.39	12.66	0.26
Way of Life	13.55	13.23	12.98	13.01	13.45	0.81
Security	10.36	10.16	9.87	10.21	10.14	0.33
Associates	10.09	10.22	9.50	9.65	10.00	2.18
Esthetics	8.36	8.33	8.00	9.08	8.50	1.48
Prestige	11.27	10.52	10.46	10.36	9.45	2.00
Independence	12.36	12.18	12.74	12.99	12.14	3.04*
Variety	11.36	10.97	11.02	10.71	10.17	1.14
Economic Return	11.00	11.48	11.00	10.90	9.90	2.60*
Altruism	13.82	13.18	12.88	13.15	12.83	0.95
Intellectual Stimulation	12.46	12.48	12.39	12.19	12.62	0.43

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: AGE OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Dependent variable: Independence

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Age	4	38.10	9.53	3.04	0.0175
Error	348	1090.45	3.13		
TOTAL	352	1128.55			

Dependent variable: Economic Return

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Age	4	57.52	14.38	2.60	0.0362
Error	346	1916.20	5.54		
TOTAL	350	1973.72			

The GLM procedure produced only two work values which were significantly different: Independence ($p = 0.0175$) and Economic Return ($p = 0.0362$). The Tukey Test also indicated a significant difference ($p = 0.05$) between the 31-40 year age group and the 41-50 age group for the work value Associates. In addition, the Tukey Test produced a significant difference between the 31-40 year group and the 51-60 year group for the work value Independence and produced a significant

difference between the 31-40 year group and the greater than 60 year group for Economic Return.

Summary

While there is not the magnitude of differences that we have found using other classifications, there are significant differences between faculty that can be attributed to age; therefore we reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when age is used as an independent variable.

Hypothesis Number Four

Hypothesis four states that "There is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when 'number of years as a faculty member' is used as the independent variable."

Findings

The GLM procedure produced only one significant difference between faculty when they were classified in this manner (Table XXII and XXIII). The Tukey Test reflected that faculty members with more than 20 years tenure valued Esthetics significantly more than those in the 16 to 20 year group. Both groups rated this work value either last or next to last along with the work value Management.

If we examine the work values that are significantly different at the 0.10 level, Independence and Variety become significant with the value of Independence increasing with years and Variety decreasing.

TABLE XXII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY YEARS AS FACULTY MEMBER

Years n = Work Value	< 4 35	4-6 54	7-14 83	15-20 80	> 20 101	F Ratio
Creativity	11.51	11.67	12.10	11.95	11.92	0.57
Management	8.89	8.57	8.41	8.41	8.35	0.44
Achievement	12.57	12.19	12.53	12.33	12.65	0.78
Surroundings	10.50	10.22	10.52	10.48	10.90	1.14
Supervisory Relations	12.74	12.15	12.59	12.14	12.51	0.93
Way of Life	13.20	13.13	13.13	13.05	13.10	0.05
Security	10.09	9.33	10.26	10.05	10.30	1.39
Associates	9.97	9.94	9.95	9.53	9.73	0.64
Esthetics	7.86	8.19	8.26	7.74	9.24	3.10*
Prestige	10.77	10.70	10.66	10.13	10.11	1.62
Independence	11.94	12.20	12.63	12.73	12.81	2.30
Variety	10.66	11.35	11.20	10.88	10.47	1.98
Economic Return	11.26	11.17	11.07	11.01	10.85	0.27
Altruism	13.23	13.00	13.14	12.85	13.08	0.34
Intellectual Stimulation	12.00	12.54	12.47	12.40	12.39	0.58

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE XXIII

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: YEARS AS FACULTY MEMBER

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member	4	113.64	28.41	3.10	0.0158
Error	334	3057.53	9.15		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

Summary

There is not sufficient evidence that faculty members differ in work value orientations when years as a faculty member is used as the independent variable; therefore we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

When we examine the work values of the faculty members when they are classified according to number of years as a faculty member at their present institution (Table XXIV and XXV), we find more differences. This is discussed in the next section.

Additional Findings

In addition to the findings that are related to the hypotheses of the study, other findings are worthy of our examination. When faculty members are classified according to the number of years as a faculty member at their present institutions, the work values of Surroundings, Security, Esthetics, and Variety were significantly different.

TABLE XXIV

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY YEARS ON FACULTY
AT PRESENT INSTITUTION

Years n = Work Value	< 4 56	4-6 68	7-14 81	15-20 67	> 20 81	F Ratio
Creativity	11.70	12.13	11.70	11.96	11.95	0.47
Management	8.91	8.74	8.31	8.30	8.22	1.27
Achievement	12.43	12.31	12.38	12.42	12.76	0.74
Surroundings	10.33	10.15	10.58	10.48	11.17	2.84*
Supervisory Relations	12.67	12.28	12.30	12.11	12.70	1.07
Way of Life	13.18	13.03	12.84	13.21	13.33	0.93
Security	10.04	9.27	10.07	10.15	10.65	2.66*
Associates	9.93	9.94	9.69	9.46	9.96	0.83
Esthetics	7.79	7.82	8.08	8.46	9.51	4.02**
Prestige	10.75	10.79	10.38	9.99	10.19	1.76
Independence	12.16	12.46	12.57	12.90	12.68	1.44
Variety	10.82	11.66	10.96	10.87	10.20	4.05**
Economic Return	11.07	11.12	11.04	11.14	10.83	0.21
Altruism	13.07	13.00	13.09	12.78	13.25	0.55
Intellectual Stimulation	12.04	12.85	12.25	12.61	12.22	2.41*

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE XXV

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: YEARS AS FACULTY MEMBER AT PRESENT INSTITUTION

Dependent variable: Surroundings

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member At Present Institution	4	45.41	11.35	2.84	0.0244
Error	346	1384.49	4.00		
TOTAL	350	1429.90			

Dependent variable: Security

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member At Present Institution	4	70.09	17.52	2.66	0.0325
Error	344	2263.65	6.58		
TOTAL	348	2333.74			

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member At Present Institution	4	145.75	36.44	4.02	0.0034
Error	334	3025.42	9.06		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

TABLE XXV (Continued)

Dependent variable: Variety

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member At Present Institution	4	78.68	19.67	4.05	0.0032
Error	347	1683.55	4.85		
TOTAL	351	1762.22			

Dependent variable: Intellectual Stimulation

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Years as a Faculty Member At Present Institution	4	28.73	7.18	2.41	0.0489
Error	347	1033.38	2.98		
TOTAL	351	1062.11			

When the faculty members are classified according to sex, the mean score for nine of the fifteen work values are found to be significantly different. Tables XXVI and XXVII reflects these differences. The female faculty members had higher mean scores for the values Creativity, Management, Achievement, Surroundings, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Variety, Altruism, and Intellectual Stimulation than the male faculty members.

TABLE XXVI

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY SEX OF FACULTY MEMBER

Sex n = Work Value	Male 240	Female 113	F Ratio
Creativity	11.64	12.41	9.38**
Management	8.18	9.08	13.30***
Achievement	12.27	12.88	9.52**
Surroundings	10.32	11.11	12.27***
Supervisory Relations	12.17	12.93	10.14**
Way of Life	12.92	13.52	9.03**
Security	10.03	10.12	0.08
Associates	9.69	10.03	2.25
Esthetics	8.33	8.45	0.11
Prestige	10.33	10.56	0.88
Independence	12.54	12.64	0.24
Variety	10.71	11.26	4.66*
Economic Return	11.05	10.98	0.06
Altruism	12.85	13.45	7.35**
Intellectual Stimulation	12.27	12.66	4.01*

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$
*** $p < 0.001$

TABLE XXVII

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: SEX OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Dependent variable: Management

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	62.87	62.87	13.30	0.0003
Error	351	1658.93	4.73		
TOTAL	352	1721.81			

Dependent variable: Creativity

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	46.06	46.06	9.38	0.0024
Error	351	1722.63	4.91		
TOTAL	352	1768.69			

Dependent variable: Altruism

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	27.40	27.40	7.35	0.0070
Error	351	1307.88	3.73		
TOTAL	352	1335.28			

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Achievement

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	29.08	29.08	9.52	0.0022
Error	349	1066.29	3.06		
TOTAL	350	1095.37			

Dependent variable: Surroundings

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	48.57	48.57	12.27	0.0005
Error	349	1381.32	3.96		
TOTAL	350	1429.90			

Dependent variable: Supervisory Relations

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	44.19	44.19	10.14	0.0016
Error	349	1520.73	4.36		
TOTAL	350	1564.92			

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Way of Life

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	26.83	26.83	9.03	0.0028
Error	349	1036.61	2.97		
TOTAL	350	1063.44			

Dependent variable: Variety

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	23.15	23.15	4.66	0.0316
Error	350	1739.07	4.97		
TOTAL	351	1762.22			

Dependent variable: Intellectual Stimulation

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Sex	1	12.03	12.03	4.01	0.0460
Error	350	1050.08	3.00		
TOTAL	351	1062.11			

Table XXVIII presents the work values of faculty members when they are sorted by type of institution and then classified by sex. The difference between church-related and independent faculty members is actually accounted for entirely by differences among the male faculty.

The church-related faculty values Management, Supervisory Relations, Security, Associates, Independence, and Altruism significantly more, and values Independence less than the independent faculty. The female work value mean scores reflect no significant differences. When the two sexes are compared in each of the two types of colleges (Table XXIX and XXX), it becomes apparent that there are more differences between the independent college sexes than is found at the church-related colleges. In every case where there is a significant difference, the female rates the work value as more important than her male counterpart.

TABLE XXVIII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES CLASSIFIED
BY SEX OF FACULTY MEMBER
(CHURCH AND INDEPENDENT)

	Male		Female	
n =	Ch. 141	Ind. 99	Ch. 74	Ind. 39
Work Value				
Creativity	11.7	11.6	12.3	12.6
Management	8.5	7.7*	9.1	9.0
Achievement	12.4	12.0	12.8	13.1
Surroundings	10.4	10.2	11.1	11.2
Supervisory Relations	12.5	11.8*	13.0	12.9
Way of Life	12.8	13.0	13.5	13.5
Security	10.3	9.6*	10.1	10.1
Associates	10.2	9.0*	10.2	9.8
Esthetics	8.6	8.0	8.3	8.7
Prestige	10.5	10.1	10.3	11.1
Independence	12.3	12.8*	12.5	13.0
Variety	10.7	10.8	11.3	11.2
Economic Return	11.1	11.0	10.8	11.3
Altruism	13.2	12.4*	13.4	13.5
Intellectual Stimulation	12.3	12.2	12.5	13.0

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE XXIX

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES CLASSIFIED
BY SEX OF FACULTY MEMBER
AT INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

Sex n = Work Value	Male 99	Female 39	F Ratio
Creativity	11.6	12.6	5.08*
Management	7.7	9.0	9.04**
Achievement	12.0	13.1	9.55**
Surroundings	10.2	11.2	7.09**
Supervisory Relations	11.8	12.9	7.45**
Way of Life	13.0	13.5	2.37
Security	9.6	10.1	1.02
Associates	9.0	9.8	4.02*
Esthetics	8.0	8.7	1.35
Prestige	10.1	11.1	3.94*
Independence	12.8	13.0	0.19
Variety	10.8	11.2	0.69
Economic Return	11.0	11.3	0.48
Altruism	12.4	13.5	8.39**
Intellectual Stimulation	12.2	13.0	3.95*

** $p < 0.01$
* $p < 0.05$

TABLE XXX

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES CLASSIFIED BY SEX OF FACULTY MEMBER AT CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES

Sex n = Work Value	Male 141	Female 74	F Ratio
Creativity	11.7	12.3	4.57*
Management	8.5	9.1	4.38*
Achievement	12.4	12.8	2.00
Surroundings	10.4	11.1	5.16*
Supervisory Relations	12.5	13.0	2.89
Way of Life	12.8	13.5	6.99**
Security	10.3	10.1	0.35
Associates	10.2	10.2	0.01
Esthetics	8.6	8.3	0.30
Prestige	10.5	10.3	0.43
Independence	12.3	12.5	0.26
Variety	10.7	11.3	4.57*
Economic Return	13.2	13.4	0.77
Altruism	13.2	13.4	0.83
Intellectual Stimulation	12.3	12.5	0.92

** $p < 0.01$
* $p < 0.05$

When the faculty members are categorized according to the degree held (Table XXXI and XXXII), significant differences were found for seven work values: Management, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Esthetics, Variety, Economic Return, and Altruism. The results of the Tukey Test reflect that the differences are primarily between the faculty with masters degrees and those with the PhD. The PhD has significantly less value for the work values of Management, Esthetics, and Altruism.

TABLE XXXI

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES BY DEGREE HELD
BY FACULTY MEMBER

Degree n = Work Value	Bachelors 9	Masters 123	Ed.D. 37	Ph.D. 184	F Ratio
Creativity	11.89	12.06	11.62	11.83	0.47
Management	7.22	8.90	8.73	8.18	3.84**
Achievement	12.56	12.71	12.70	12.25	1.89
Surroundings	10.78	10.73	10.97	10.37	1.36
Supervisory Relations	11.78	12.66	13.08	12.14	3.17*
Way of Life	13.89	13.33	13.49	12.86	3.14*
Security	9.22	10.27	9.81	10.01	0.72
Associates	9.11	9.91	9.76	9.76	0.51
Esthetics	9.00	8.98	8.54	7.89	3.21*
Prestige	9.33	10.55	10.41	10.35	0.95
Independence	13.22	12.66	12.32	12.53	0.76
Variety	10.11	11.15	11.51	10.61	2.87*
Economic Return	8.89	11.43	11.25	10.83	4.24**
Altruism	12.11	13.43	13.49	12.75	4.52**
Intellectual Stimulation	12.33	12.28	12.22	12.51	0.61

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE XXXII

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: DEGREE HELD BY FACULTY MEMBERS

Dependent variable: Manage

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	55.04	18.35	3.84	0.0100
Error	349	1666.76	4.78		
TOTAL	352	1721.81			

Dependent variable: Altruism

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	49.99	16.66	4.52	0.0040
Error	349	1285.29	3.68		
TOTAL	352	1335.28			

Dependent variable: Supervisory Relations

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	41.81	13.94	3.17	0.0243
Error	347	1523.12	4.39		
TOTAL	350	1564.93			

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Way of Life

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	28.12	9.37	3.14	0.0254
Error	347	1035.32	2.98		
TOTAL	350	1063.44			

Dependent variable: Esthetics

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	88.62	29.54	3.21	0.0232
Error	335	3082.54	9.20		
TOTAL	338	3171.17			

Dependent variable: Variety

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	42.57	14.19	2.87	0.0364
Error	348	1719.65	4.94		
TOTAL	351	1762.22			

TABLE XXXII (Continued)

Dependent variable: Economic Return

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Degree Held By Faculty Member	3	69.81	23.27	4.24	0.0058
Error	347	1903.91	5.49		
TOTAL	350	1973.72			

When the faculty members were categorized according to rank (Table XXXIII and XXXIV), there were significant differences for the work values of Management, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Variety, and Economic Return. The Tukey Test only showed a significant difference between associate professor and professor for the work value of Variety.

TABLE XXXIII

WORK VALUE MEAN SCORES
BY FACULTY MEMBER RANK

Rank	Instr.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	F Ratio
n =	31	95	103	109	
Work Value					
Creativity	11.74	11.81	11.94	11.79	1.08
Management	9.03	8.63	8.20	8.13	3.11**
Achievement	12.87	12.43	12.36	12.43	0.63
Surroundings	11.16	10.41	10.48	10.55	1.61
Supervisory Relations	13.19	12.63	12.18	12.10	2.39*
Way of Life	13.42	13.40	12.80	13.06	2.01
Security	10.61	10.09	9.79	10.07	0.56
Associates	9.81	10.19	9.77	9.46	1.40
Esthetics	8.83	8.20	8.24	8.46	1.47
Prestige	10.68	10.71	10.17	10.25	1.55
Independence	12.19	12.17	12.75	12.84	1.76
Variety	11.03	10.86	11.29	10.32	2.32*
Economic Return	11.48	11.28	10.83	10.82	2.12*
Altruism	13.58	13.17	13.17	12.65	1.72
Intellectual Stimulation	12.16	12.35	12.57	12.31	0.68

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

TABLE XXXIV

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE: RANK OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Dependent variable: Management

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Rank of Faculty Member	7	102.21	14.60	3.11	0.0034
Error	345	1619.60	4.69		
TOTAL	352	1721.81			

Dependent variable: Supervisory Relations

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Rank of Faculty Member	7	72.90	10.41	2.39	0.0211
Error	343	1492.03	4.35		
TOTAL	350	1564.92			

Dependent variable: Variety

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Rank of Faculty Member	7	79.51	11.36	2.32	0.0251
Error	344	1682.71	4.89		
TOTAL	351	1762.22			

TABLE XXXIV (Continued)

Dependent variable: Economic Return

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	p > F
Rank of Faculty Member	7	81.72	11.67	2.12	0.0414
Error	343	1892.00	5.52		
TOTAL	350	1973.72			

Summary

As a result of this study, it was found that:

1. There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the work value orientations of church-related faculty and independent faculty.
2. There is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between faculty work value orientations in different teaching disciplines at liberal arts colleges.
3. While there is not the magnitude of differences that we have found using other classifications, there are significant differences between faculty that can be attributed to age; therefore we reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between faculty work value orientations when age is used as an independent variable.
4. There is not sufficient evidence that faculty members differ in work value orientations when years as a faculty member is used as

the independent variable; therefore we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

In addition, there were significant differences in the work value orientations of faculty members at small liberal arts colleges when considering different degrees, rank, and sex.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter we will review the purpose of the study and discuss the findings. Conclusions that can be drawn from the study will be addressed. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for college administrators as a result of this study and recommendations for further research.

Discussion

The job satisfaction and morale of the faculty member at the small college is of concern to administrators. Decreasing enrollments, tight budgets, and changing student interests have contributed to the findings that the largest share of dissatisfied faculty are in liberal arts colleges (Change, 1985b, p. 33). Vroom, Porter and Lawler, and others stress that the level of motivation and satisfaction is contingent on the value the employee places on the rewards offered by the organization. It is therefore necessary that the college administrator determine what faculty members value in their work.

The primary purpose of this study was to examine work values of faculty at selected small liberal arts colleges. Specifically, this study proposed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the work value orientations of faculty members at selected small liberal arts colleges?

2. How do faculty work value orientations differ between faculty at church-related colleges and faculty at independent colleges?

3. How do faculty work value orientations differ between teaching disciplines at the selected small liberal arts colleges?

4. How do faculty work value orientations vary with age and number of years as a college faculty member?

Earlier research has supported the discriminating abilities of work values (Normile, 1967; Reichel, Neumann, and Pizam, 1981; Carruthers, 1968). Dicken (1984) conducted research similar to the present study in three Southern Baptist colleges and found significant differences between faculty when they were segmented according to academic rank, teaching area, faculty age, sex, and academic degree. This study sought to make a comparative analysis.

Colleges were selected from the Council of Independent Colleges, and Super's Work Values Inventory was mailed to 713 faculty members in church-related and independent colleges. A fifty percent response rate provided faculty work value scores with which to test four major hypotheses and check for other expected findings.

General

When the work value mean scores for all of the faculty members in the study are combined to produce a work values hierarchy (Table III), the results closely parallel those of Dicken (1984) who found that "Across all variables, the work values held to be consistently important are Supervisory Relations, Achievement, Way of Life, Altruism, and Intellectual Stimulation (p. 55)." This study would add Independence as well. The faculty members in this study value what Neumann and Neumann (1983) call self-expression values much more than values concerning work conditions. The one exception is the value of Way of Life which is a work conditions value which, by definition, would permit self expression if it were desired.

Differences in Types of Colleges

It was found that faculty members at church-related schools differ from faculty members at independent colleges on certain work values. The most significant differences are found in the value attached to Associates and Independence. The greater desire for association with fellow workers by church-related faculty members could be influenced by the similarity of backgrounds, beliefs, and basic life style. The greater importance attached to Independence by the independent college faculty coincides with the expected findings in this area. Because of the issues of academic freedom (Ramm, 1963) and containment (Clark, 1985) in the church-related college, a faculty member who placed a high importance on Independence would likely find the church-related college too restrictive.

This finding should be of particular interest to an organization such as the Council of Independent Colleges which has member schools from both of these groups. These differences could perhaps influence any Council recommendations concerning faculty enrichment and development. The church-related faculty probably value affiliation type activities much more than those faculty at independent colleges. Administrators could also expect the independent college faculty to react much more strongly against any policy that would threaten their independence.

The greater value attached to Altruism, Supervisory Relations, and Management would suggest that the church-related faculty would be more receptive to demands placed on them by administrators such as increased teaching load and committee membership. In addition, the greater value placed on Altruism would support the expected findings that church-related faculty consider their teaching as a ministry.

The findings also indicate that there are many similarities in the work value orientation of the two groups. Such values are Variety, Creativity, Prestige, Economic Return, and Intellectual Stimulation are given similar weight by both groups.

Differences in Teaching Disciplines

When the faculty is categorized as either Pure or Applied, there are five work values which significantly differ at the p 0.05 level. This categorization of faculty is appropriate for the small liberal arts college which has added business, education, mass communications, and other degree programs in an effort to meet the demands of the student who wants a degree that will lead to a job. Many of these colleges

still attach a great deal of importance to their liberal arts foundations.

The Applied faculty values Management, Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Prestige, and Variety more than the Pure faculty. We had expected the Applied faculty member to value Economic Return more than his/her Pure counterpart because of a frequent connection with industry. While this is not the case, there is a possible connection between what we expected to find and the significant difference between the Soft-Nonlife-Applied (business) and Soft-Nonlife-Pure (fine arts, English, etc) on the mean score for Security. The SNA faculty possibly valued it less because of the demand for this faculty member's discipline outside the academic setting. This increased possibility for mobility could be reflected in this score.

The findings tend to support Biglan's findings that teachers in Hard areas report greater collaboration with peers. The present study shows that teachers in the Hard areas value Independence significantly less than teachers in the Soft areas. It can be argued that those who attach less importance to Independence would possibly be willing to collaborate more.

In light of these findings, it would be inappropriate for an administrator at the small liberal arts college to treat all disciplines alike. The differences in what the faculty value in work could be a source of conflict if the administrator is not aware of them and does not take them into consideration when making decisions which affect the entire faculty. The fact that eight work values are significantly different when the faculty is divided into the eight separate groups of Hard-Nonlife-Pure, Hard-Nonlife-Applied, Hard-Life-Pure, Hard-Life-

Applied, Soft-Nonlife-Pure, Soft-Nonlife-Applied, Soft-Life-Pure, and Soft-Life-Applied supports the diversity found in the larger groupings. Administrators at small liberal arts colleges may feel that their faculty is very homogeneous because of the lack of strong research emphasis in any one field or the lack of strong professional affiliation. These findings would discourage that view.

Differences Due to Age and Years as a Faculty Member

This study found little difference in work value orientations that can be attributed to age or tenure as a faculty member. An analysis of the findings which did produce significant differences suggest that as faculty members grow older, particularly between the ages of 31-40 and 41-50, they value Associates less. This could reflect self-confidence and a tendency toward self-reliance. Somewhat parallel to this is the significant increase in the importance of the work value Independence between the 31-40 and 51-60 year groups. This supports the findings of Taylor and Thompson (1976) concerning relations with co-workers. The significant difference in Economic Returns is not found until the faculty member exceeds 60 years of age, although there is a gradual decrease through the years up to that time. Taylor and Thompson found no difference in desire for economic return that could be attributed to age, and our findings would partially support that up to the age group of over 60 years.

In summary, faculty members tend to value Associates less and Independence more as they grow older but do not seem to value Economic Return significantly less until they are over 60 years of age.

Administrators would be unwise to attempt to motivate older faculty members with additional pay and would be wiser to increase their independence. The literature suggests differences in preference for various combinations of benefits packages for different age groups, but this study does not indicate that. Security would be the work value most likely to differentiate in the area of benefits, but the age groups were very similar in their response to this variable. There are even fewer differences in work value scores when tenure as a faculty member is considered.

Differences Due to Sex

The greatest differences between work value orientations were found when the faculty members were divided by sex. The investigation of this difference was not one of the purposes of this study because it was felt that there would be an insufficient number of female faculty members at the colleges surveyed. This was not the case. There were nine work value scores which were significantly different. The higher scores on the work values of Management, Achievement, and Supervisory Relations would suggest that the female faculty member might be more interested in advancement than the male faculty member. There is also the suggestion of a greater intensity and determination on the part of the female member. Whatever the reason, there are more differences between faculty member work values when they are grouped according to sex than with any other grouping.

It is interesting to note that the greatest differences were between faculty members at the independent colleges. This would seem to indicate that there are basic values and beliefs shared by faculty

members at church-related colleges that transcend the difference in sex.

As more female faculty members join the small college faculties, administrators will need to be more aware and responsive to the differences between the work value orientations of the two sexes.

Differences Due to Faculty Rank

An analysis of the findings relative to faculty rank would indicate that as faculty members progress from instructor to professor, they value Management, Supervisory Relations, and Economic Return less. The value of Way of Life seems to decrease in mid-career at the level of associate professor and then increase later. These findings seem to support the fact that there as a faculty member progresses through the academic ranks, he or she is less motivated by the more extrinsic factors.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn as a result of this study:

1. The importance attached to certain work values by church-related college faculty and independent college faculty differ. As a result, agencies or individuals concerned about faculty morale and satisfaction in these institutions should recognize the need for reward systems which take these differences into consideration. The differences in the importance attached to the work values of Associates, Independence, and Altruism would suggest that there are motivational options available to the administrators of one group which would be inappropriate or ineffective for the other. One can conclude from this study that there is a distinctiveness that can

be attached to the church-related college faculty. The study suggests a greater closeness and sense of mission than is found at the independent college. At the same time, there seems to be a more submissive attitude among faculty at the church-related college.

2. Small college faculty in different teaching disciplines differ in the importance attached to work values. This is particularly true when the faculty is classified as either Pure or Applied. Although these differences would be expected in the more specialized environment of the university, the small college administration often views the faculty as a homogeneous group. The results of this study support the statements of authors who point out that, for a variety of reasons, individuals tend to place different value on various rewards (Clark, 1985; Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, 1986; Steers, 1984; Lawler, 1976). As a result of these findings, attention should be given to these differences when developing reward packages and faculty development programs.
3. The older faculty members in small colleges value monetary rewards less than the younger faculty members but value independence more. This would suggest that the applying of the relatively less expensive intrinsic motivators could increase the morale and satisfaction of the older faculty member and that the greatest benefits of increased monetary rewards would be experienced by the younger faculty members.
4. Male and female faculty members differ significantly in the importance placed on many of the work values investigated, particulary at the independent college. Any attempt to improve

morale and satisfaction will have to take this into account. This study tends to indicate that women value upward mobility and those things normally associated with authority more than their male counterparts.

Overall, the findings in this study support the conclusion that faculty members at the selected small liberal arts colleges differ in the importance attached to various work values.

Recommendations

This section will make recommendations based on this study. Recommendations for college administrators and decision-makers in organizations, such as the Council of Independent Colleges, will be made first. This will be followed by recommendations for future researchers.

Recommendations for Academic Decision-makers

The following recommendations are appropriate for small liberal arts college decision-makers including department chairpersons and administrators.

1. Those individuals who make decisions and recommendations that affect both church-related colleges and independent colleges should understand that there are differences between the basic work values of faculty members at these different institutions. Programs to improve faculty satisfaction and morale that affect both should be implemented locally in order to enhance success and acceptance.
2. College Administrators in institutions that are experiencing the

transition from purely liberal arts to more applied technical programs should understand that the new faculty members in applied fields may be motivated by different rewards than the liberal arts faculty.

3. Chief academic officers and department chairpersons should recognize that as they add female faculty members in increasing numbers, they will need to be sensitive and responsive to a different work value orientation. It is recommended that administrators encourage feedback from the female faculty members to ensure that needs are being met. Other research has shown that work values of the different sexes tend to become similar the longer they work and associate with each other.
4. Administrators at church-related colleges should develop plans to capitalize on the value placed on Associates. This is a work value that would suggest satisfaction with activities, both formal and informal, that bring faculty members together.
5. College administrators should be straight-forward when interviewing prospective faculty members. Care should be taken to communicate the institution's policies and reward systems so that the faculty member can decide if there is congruence between what is offered and expected and his or her basic work values.

Recommendations for Additional Research

1. Research should continue to be done at the small liberal arts college level to gain a better understanding of the diversities in faculty. This study has not addressed causality and future research in this area should attempt to determine the reasons for

the differences. Longitudinal studies should be undertaken to study the socialization process of the small liberal arts college faculty and how this affects the work values of faculty members. The wide diversity of academic preparation of the faculty is a probable cause of differing work value orientations. Those with the Ph.D. have normally been socialized in the research model prevalent at institutions that grant advanced degrees. Others have gotten graduate degrees in part-time programs while working as active faculty members, thereby missing much of the socialization process offered by the graduate institution. Some faculty members at these colleges are in their second career and bring many values from their previous occupations. A study of these diverse backgrounds could possibly explain many of the differences found in this study.

3. There is a possibility that the faculty members in this study were unable to relate totally to the questions used to determine the importance of various work values. It is recommended that a work values questionnaire be developed that more closely relates to the academic situation.
4. The status of work value fulfillment needs to be determined and then compared to the importance attached to certain values. This study has provided information concerning the importance of various work values to faculty members and the additional step of determining if the institution is providing rewards consistent with these values would aid in understanding why faculty member job satisfaction and morale are low.
5. It is recommended that additional research be undertaken to

investigate the differences between male and female faculty members' work values in the small liberal arts colleges. Information concerning career paths and professional aspirations of the female faculty member should help explain many of the findings of this study. The similarities and the differences between the female faculty member in the church-related colleges and her counterpart in the independent college should be investigated. In most church groups, women have not had the opportunities for leadership roles; therefore one would expect this to have an impact on perceived female roles in the church-related college. Additional research concerning female faculty members would provide valuable information for academic decision-makers.

This study has provided an investigation into the work value orientations of faculty members at the selected small liberal arts colleges. Biglan's Model has been used to compare the work values of faculty members in different teaching disciplines at the small college level differ. It was found that the importance attached to various work values differs and therefore the value attached to rewards will vary from faculty member to faculty member. This knowledge should provide administrators the initiative to seek feedback from their faculty members to determine their work values and the degree to which present intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are enhancing the attainment of those work values.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S. "Toward an Understanding of Inequity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67 (1963), 422-436.

Allen, R. E., T. J. Keaveny. "Correlates of University Faculty Interest in Unionization: A Replication and Extension." Journal of Applied Psychology, 5 (1981), 582-588.

Altbach, P. G. "Stark Realities: The Academic Profession in the 1980s." ASHE Reader on Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities. Ed. Martin Finkelstein. Massachusetts: Ginn Press, 1985.

Austin, A. E. "Summary of Responses to CIC Interview Study of Faculty Experience in the Small Liberal Arts College." (Paper presented to Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1985).

Austin, A. E., Z. F. Gamson. Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 10. Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Averill, L. J. A Strategy for the Protestant College. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Berger, C. J., C. A. Olson, J. W. Boudreau. "Effects of Unions on Job Satisfaction: The Role of Work-Related Values and Perceived Rewards." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32 (1983), 289-324.

Biglan, A. "Relationship Between Subject Matter Characteristics and the Structure and Output of University Departments." Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (1973), 204-213.

Biglan, A. "The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas." Journal of Applied Psychology. 57 (1973), 195-203.

Bigoness, W. J. "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining." Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (1978), 228-233.

Blackburn, R. T. Tenure:Aspects of Job Security on the Changing Campus. Research Monograph No. 19. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1972.

Blood, M. R. "The Validity of Importance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (1971), 487-488.

Blood, M. R. "Work Values and Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 53 (1969) 456-459.

Bornheimer, D. G. "Conditions Influencing Faculty Voting in Collective Bargaining Elections." Research in Higher Education, 22 (1985) 291-305.

Brown, M. A. "The Relationship of Values and Job Satisfaction:Do Birds of a Feather Work Well Together?." Personnel, 57 (1980), 66-73.

Brown, M. A. "Values- A Necessary but Neglected Ingredient of Motivation on the Job." Academy of Management Review, 1 (1976), 15-23.

Butler, J. K. "Value Importance as a Moderator of the Value Fulfillment- Job Satisfaction Relationship: Group Differences." Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (1983), 420-428.

Carruthers, T. E. "Work Values and Chosen Careers: Note on a Trial of an American Work Values Inventory With British Subjects." Occupational Psychology, 42 (1968), 111-117.

Clark, B. R. "Faculty Culture." ASHE Reader on Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities. Ed. Martin Finkelstein. Massachusetts: Ginn Press, 1985.

Clark, B. R. "Listening to the Professoriate." Change, (September/October, 1985), pp. 36-43.

Cody, R. P., J. K. Smith. Applied Statistics and the SAS Programming Language. New York: North-Holland, 1985.

Connor, E. P., B. W. Becker. "Values and the Organization: Suggestions for Research." Academy of Management Journal, 18 (1975), 550-561.

Corcoran M., S. M. Clark. "Professional Socialization and Contemporary Career Attitudes of Three Faculty Generations." Research in Higher Education, 20 (1984), 131-153.

Creswell, J. W., A. T. Seagren, T. C. Henry. "Professional Development of Training Needs of Department Chairpersons: A Test of the Biglan Model." Planning and Change, 10 (1979), 224-237.

Creswell, J. W., J. P. Bean. "Research Output, Socialization, and the Biglan Model." Research in Higher Education, 15 (1981), 69-91.

Dicken, B. G. "The Use of Work Values and Developmental Theory in Faculty Career Development Activities." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1984).

Diener, T. "College Faculty and Job Satisfaction." (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orlean, LA, 1984).

Eison, C. L. "The Measurement of Job Satisfaction and Departmental Association at Western Kentucky University: Testing the Holland and Biglan Models." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1976).

Elizur, D. "Facets of Work Values: A Structural Analysis of Work Values." Journal of Applied Psychology, 69 (1984), 379-389.

Fedler, F., T. Counts. "Professors' Satisfaction With Job Related to Academic Ranks." (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, Athens OH, 1982).

Finkelstein, M. J. The American Academic Profession. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984.

Gmelch, W. H., N. P. Lovrich, P. K. Wilke. "Sources of Stress in Academe: A National Perspective." Research in Higher Education, 20 (1984), 477-490.

Freedman, M. "Personal History and Professional Career." ASHE Reader on Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities. Ed. Martin Finkelstein. Massachusetts: Ginn Press, 1985.

Gomez-Mejia L. R., D. B. Balkin. "Faculty Satisfaction with Pay and Other Job Dimensions Under Union and Nonunion Conditions." Academy of Management Journal, 27 (1984), 591-602.

Gonnet, K. A. M. "An Investigation of Eleven Job Satisfaction Variables as They Pertain to Full-Time Community College Faculty." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State University, 1983).

Greeley, A. M. "From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Education." Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Greenhaus, J. H., C. Seidel, M. Marinis. "The Impact of Expectations and Values on Job Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 31 (1983) 394-417.

Hackman, J. R., G. R. Oldman. "Motivation Through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16 (1976), 250-279.

Hazer, J. T., K. M. Alvares. "Police Work Values During Organizational Entry and Assimilation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 66 (1981) 12-16.

Hellriegel, D., J. W. Slocum, R. W. Woodman. Organizational Behavior. 4th. Ed. St. Paul: West, 1986.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, B. B. Snyderman. The Motivation to Work. 2nd Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Hill, M. D. "Some Factors Affecting the Job Satisfaction of Academic Women." (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, 1983.)

Hindrichs, J. R. "Value Adaptation of New Ph.D.'s to Academic and Industrial Environments: A Comparative Longitudinal Study." Personnel Psychology, 25 (1972) 545-565.

Hitt, M. A., R. D. Middlemist, R. L. Mathis. Management: Concepts and Effective Practice. St. Paul: West, 1986.

Hofstadter, R., W. Smith. American Higher Education Documentary History. vol.2, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Holmes, A. F. The Idea of a Christian College. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.

Holt, F. G. "The Relationship of Need Fulfillment to Job Attitudes of Faculty in Higher Education." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, The College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1981.)

Hunter, M., M. L. Crow, J. C. Ventimiglia. "Faculty Morale in Higher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 31,(March-April, 1980), 27-30.

Hunter, M., M. L. Crow, D. M. Beach, J. C. Ventimiglia. "Morale Maladies in American and Foreign Higher Education: The Faculty Flameout Diagnosis." Texas Tech Journal of Education, 10 (1983), 101-113.

Jonsen, R. W. Small Liberal Arts Colleges:Diversity at the Crossroads. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No.4. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

Jurgensen, C. E. "Job Preferences (What Makes a Job Good or Bad?." Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (1978) 267-276.

Kanter, R. M. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." Perspectives in Leadership, Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Kidron, A. "Work Values and Organizational Commitment." Academy of Management Journal, 21 (1978), 239-247.

Lawrence, J. H., R. T. Blackburn. "Faculty Careers: Maturation, Demographic, and Historical Effects." Research in Higher Education, 22 (1985) 135-154.

Levine, A. Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Linton, M., P. S. Gallio, Jr. The Practical Statistician: Simplified Handbook of Statistics. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1975.

Locke, E. A. "Job Satisfaction and Role Clarity Among University and College Faculty." Review of Higher Education, 6 (1983), 343-365.

Locke, E., "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. M. D. Dunrette. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 1297-1350.

Mankoff, A.W. "Values - Not Attitudes - Are the Real Key to Motivation." Management Review, (December 1974), 23-29.

Mobley, W. H., E. A. Locke. "The Relationship of Value Importance to Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5 (1970), 463-483.

Muffo, J. A., I. W. Langston. "Biglan's Dimensions: Are the Perceptions Empirically Based?." Research in Higher Education, 15 (1981), 141-159.

Neumann, L., Neumann, Y. "A Discriminant Analysis of Students' Work Values: Differences Between Engineering and Liberal Arts." Journal of Experimental Education, 52 (1983), 41-46.

Newell, L. J., I. S. Spear. "New Dimensions for Academic Careers: Rediscovering Intrinsic Satisfactions", Liberal Education, 69 (1983), 109-116.

Pace, C. R. "Education and Evangelism: A Profile of Protestant Colleges." Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Pennings, I. M. "Work Values Systems of White Collar Workers." Administrative Science Quarterly, 15 (1970), 397-405.

Reichel, A., Y. Neumann, A. Pizam. "The Work Values and Motivational Profiles of Vocational, Collegiate, Nonconformist, and Academic Students." Research in Higher Education, 14 (1981), 187-199.

Ringenberg, W. C. "The Marks of a Christian College." Christianity Today, (November 2, 1979), pp. 26-29.

Robey, D. "Task Design, Work Values, and Worker Response: An Experimental Test." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12 (1974), 264-273.

Roskens, R. W. "Implications of Biglan Model Research for the Process of Faculty Advancement." Research in Higher Education, 18 (1983), 285-297.

Rudolph, F. The American College and University. New York: Random House, 1962.

Scarpello, V., J. P. Campbell. "Job Satisfaction and the Fit Between Individual Needs and Organizational Rewards." Journal of Occupational Psychology, 56 (1983), 315-328.

Schuster, J. H., H. R. Bowen. "The Faculty at Risk." Change, (September-October 1985), pp. 13-21.

Schuster, J. H., H. R. Bowen. American Professors: A National Resourse Imperiled. New York: Oxford Press, 1986.

Smart, J. C., C. F. Elton. "Validation of the Biglan Model." Research in Higher Education, 17 (1982), 213-229.

Steers, R. M. Introduction to Organizational Behavior. 2nd Ed., Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1984.

Stone, E. F. "The Moderating Effect of Work-Related Values on the Job Scope-Job Satisfaction Relationship." Organizational Behavior and Human Behavior, 15 (1976), 147-167.

Super, D. E. Work Values Manual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

Taylor, F. W. "What is Scientific Management." Classics in Management. Ed. H. F. Merrill. New York: American Management Association, 1970, pp. 67-71.

Taylor, R. N., M. Thompson. "Work Value Systems of Young Workers." Academy of Management Journal, 19 (1976), 522-536.

Vroom, V. "Ego Involvement, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance." Personnel Psychology, 15 (1964), 159-177.

Wanous, J. P., E. E. Lawler. "The Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (95-105), 1972.

Weiss. H. M. "Social Learning of Work Values in Organizations." Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (1978), 711-718.

Winkler, L. D. "Job Satisfaction of University Faculty in the United States." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1982).

Wollack, S., J. G. Goodale, J. P. Wijting, P. C. Smith. "Development of the Survey of Work Values." Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (1971), 331-338.

Yuker, H. E. Faculty Workload: Research, Theory, and Interpretation. Washington, D.C.: Higher Education Research Reports Executive Summary, Report 10,1984.

Zytowski, D. G. "The Concept of Work Values." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, (March 1970), 176-186.

APPENDIX A

WORK VALUE DEFINITIONS

WORK VALUE DEFINITIONS

Creativity	A work value associated with work which permits one to invent new things, design new products, or develop new ideas (Super, 1970). (Items 15, 16, 45)
Management	A work value associated with work which permits one to plan and lay out work for others to do (Super, 1970). (Items 14, 24, 37)
Achievement	A work value associated with work which gives one a feeling of accomplishment in doing a job well (Super, 1970). (Items 13, 17, 44)
Surroundings	A work value associated with work which is carried out under pleasant conditions - not too hot or too cold, noisy, dirty, etc.(Super, 1970). (Items 12, 25, 36)
Supervisory Relations	A work value associated with work which is carried out under a supervisor who is fair and with whom one can get along (Super, 1970). (Items 11, 18, 43)
Way of Life	A work value associated with the kind of work that permits one to live the kind of life he chooses and to be the type of person he wishes to be (Super, 1970). (Items 10, 26, 35)
Security	A work value associated with work which provides one with the certainty of having a job even in hard times (Super, 1970). (Items 9, 19 42)
Associates	A work value characterized by work which brings one into contact with fellow workers whom he likes (Super, 1970). (Items 8, 27, 34)
Esthetics	A work value inherent in work which permits one to make beautiful things and to contribute beauty to the world (Super, 1970). (Items 7, 20, 41)
Prestige	A work value associated with work which gives one standing in the eyes of others and evokes respect (Super, 1970). (Items 6, 28, 33)

Independence	A work value associated with work which permits one to work in his own way, as fast or as slowly as he wishes (Super, 1970). (Items 5, 21, 40)
Variety	A work value associated with work that provides an opportunity to do different types of jobs (Super, 1970). (Items 4, 29, 32)
Economic Return	A work value associated with work which pays well and enables one to have the things he wants (Super, 1970). (Items 3, 22, 39)
Altruism	A work value present in work which enables one to contribute to the welfare of others (Super, 1970). (Items 2, 30, 31)
Intellectual Stimulation	A work value associated with work which provides opportunity for independent thinking and for learning how and why things work (Super, 1970). (Items 1, 23, 38)

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER AND INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111 • (405) 478-1661

Division of Business

September 9, 1986

Chief Academic Office/ Academic Dean
Oklahoma Christian College
Oklahoma City, OK 73111

Dear Dean,

I am a faculty member at Oklahoma Christian College and a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University. My dissertation deals with the work values of faculty members at small liberal arts colleges. One objective of the study is to determine if the work values of faculty at church related colleges differ from those of faculty at colleges that are not church related. Although there are many sources that describe colleges, it is difficult to accurately classify the schools as church related.

The completion of the enclosed questionnaire will help to more accurately classify your institution and will provide information that will improve my ability to group small colleges for this study.

Thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedule.

Sincerely,

W. Jack Skaggs

Institutional Questionnaire

Please mark the appropriate response to each question. These questions are designed to determine the nature of your institution's affiliation, if any, to a church body. The word "church" is used here for convenience. It is intended to embrace all religious groups, including branches of Judaism. If you wish to expand your response to any of the questions, or if you wish to make additional comments on your relationship to a church body, please use the reverse side of this sheet. Disregard items that are not applicable to your institution.

1. Is your institution affiliated with a sponsoring church or religious constituency?
   Yes _____ No _____

2. If not presently affiliated with a sponsoring church or religious constituency, has the institution ever been affiliated with a sponsoring church or religious constituency?
   Yes _____ No _____

3. Does the statement of your educational purposes in catalogs and other publications make it clear that yours is a religiously oriented institution?
   Yes _____ No _____

4. Are faculty members required to be members of the sponsoring church or religious constituency?
   Yes _____ No _____

5. If "No" to 4 above, is preference given to members of the church in the selection process?
   Yes _____ No _____

6. What percentage of your student body comes from the sponsoring church or religious constituency?
   0-20% _____ 21-40% _____ 41-60% _____
   61-80% _____ 81-100% _____ N/A _____

7. Are your students required to take a given number of hours of bible related courses?
   Yes _____ No _____

8. Does your institution have chapel services?
   Yes _____ No _____
   If so, how frequently? daily _____ weekly _____ other _____
   Is it compulsory _____ Voluntary _____ for students?
   Is it compulsory _____ Voluntary _____ for faculty?

APPENDIX C

PUBLISHER'S PERMISSION TO USE

SUPER'S WORK VALUES INVENTORY

received
6-19-86

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111 • (405) 478-1661

Division of Business

June 17, 1986

Mr. Fredrick L. Finch, Vice President
Editor in Chief, Test Division
The Riverside Publishing Company
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Chicago, IL 60631

Dear Mr. Finch,

Last April I talked to you about my request to reproduce Donald Super's Work Values Inventory for use in research for my dissertation. At that time you requested that I provide you with more information.

I will be sending a mail survey to approximately 600 faculty members of small four year colleges. My objective is to compare the work values of faculty members at church-related colleges with those of faculty at independent colleges.

I would like to change the word "employees" in question 27 and the word "workers" in question 34 to read "faculty members" and change "company" in question 42 to read "institution." This wording makes the inventory more compatible to a study of this nature.

Your April 2, 1986 letter suggested that I purchase the inventory but it appears to me that the instruction portion of the inventory would be inappropriate for faculty members. I propose to use the survey after a brief demographics section. I would also like to use the same questions to ask faculty members to describe their present positions.

I have enclosed a copy of the instrument I would like to use. I would appreciate your permission to use the Work Values Inventory in this manner.

Sincerely,

W. Jack Skaggs

W. Jack Skaggs
Assistant Professor
of Management

wn

Enclosure

The Riverside Publishing Company
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue · Chicago, Illinois 60631 · 1-800/323-9540 · 312/693-0040

June 25, 1986

W. Jack Skaggs
Assistant Professor
of Management
Oklahoma Christian College
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111

Dear Professor Skaggs:

Your permission request of June 17, 1986 concerning the **Work Value Inventory** has been received.

Permission is granted to reproduce the materials referenced in your letter. This is a one-time permission granted to you for this study only. No additional copies may be made.

Please use the following acknowledgment:

> This publication is based in part on the **Work Value Inventory** Copyright © 1970. Reprinted by **Oklahoma Christian College** with permission of the Publisher, THE RIVERSIDE PUBLISHING COMPANY, 8420 W. Bryn Mawr Avenue, Chicago, IL 60631.

Sincerely,

Fredrick L. Finch, Vice President
Editor in Chief, Test Division

FLF:mkk

cc: A. Brennan

APPENDIX D

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111 • (405) 478-1661

Division of Business

October 1, 1986

Dear Faculty Member,

As a part of my dissertation to complete the requirements for the doctorate, I am conducting research on the work values of faculty in small four year colleges. The small four year college maintains a unique place in American higher education and although a great deal of research has focused on the large university, not nearly as much attention has been given to the smaller, more diverse four year college. As a result, there has recently been a call from those interested in higher education research for increased attention on liberal arts colleges. You can help in this effort by responding to the enclosed questionnaire.

I, too, am a faculty member and know that the first part of the semester is a busy time of year for you but your responses are needed in order to have all disciplines represented in the colleges selected for this study.

The questionnaire number will enable me to determine who responds to the questionnaire for the purpose of follow-up mailings. No individual responses will be singled out in the study but will be aggregated to insure confidentiality.

The questionnaire takes approximately twenty minutes to complete. Please take a moment and fill it out the and return it in the self-addressed envelope provided. It would be helpful if I could have the questionnaire back by October 15th. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

W. Jack Skaggs

W. Jack Skaggs
Assistant Professor
Division of Business

wn

Enclosures
Questionnaire
Return Envelope

WORK VALUES OF FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE SMALL COLLEGE LEVEL

Faculty Questionnaire

Introduction:

Work values have been defined as the qualities people desire and seek in the activities in which they engage and in the situation where they live. Knowledge of faculty work values will provide administrators with valuable information that can be used in making decisions concerning rewards systems and faculty development programs. We are interested in knowing how work values differ among faculty, therefore a brief demographic section will precede the work values inventory.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

I. Demographic Data

1. How many years have you been a faculty member in higher education? (do not include time spent as a teaching assistant)(please check appropriate space)

___less than 5 years ___16-20 years
___5-10 years ___more than 20 years
___11-15 years

2. How many years have you been a faculty member at your present instituion? (please check appropriate space)

___less than 5 years ___16-20 years
___5-10 years ___more than 20 years
___11-15 years

3. What is your academic rank?

___Lecturer ___Professor
___Instructor ___Distinguished/Named
___Assistant Professor Chair Professor
___Associate Professor ___Emeritus Professor
___Other:_____

4. Are you full time or part time?

___full time ___part time

5. What is your primary teaching discipline?

_____

6. Please indicate by checking your most advanced degree, and for that degree, write in the field of study, and the year of graduation.

Degree	Field of Study	Year of Graduation
___Bachelors	_____	_____
___Masters	_____	_____
___Ed. D.	_____	_____
___Ph. D.	_____	_____

7. Your Age:

___below 30 years ___51-60 years
___31-40 years ___60+ years
___41-50 years

8. Your Sex:

___Male ___Female

II. The statements below represent values which people consider important in their work. These are satisfactions which people often seek in their jobs or as a result of their jobs. They are not all considered equally important; some are "very important" to some people but of "little importance" to others. Please read each statement carefully and indicate how important it is or would be for you.

Unimportant	of little importance	moderately important	important	very important
1	2	3	4	5

Work in which you....

___ 1. have to keep solving new problems.
___ 2. help others.
___ 3. can get a raise.
___ 4. look forward to changes in your job.
___ 5. have freedom in your own area.
___ 6. gain prestige in your field.
___ 7. need to have artistic ability.
___ 8. are one of the gang.
___ 9. know your job will last.
___10. can be the kind of person you would like to be.
___11. have a boss who gives you a square deal.
___12. like the setting in which your job is done.
___13. get the feeling of having done a good day's work.
___14. have authority over others.
___15. try out new ideas and suggestions.
___16. create something new.
___17. know by the results when you've done a good job.
___18. have a boss who is reasonable.
___19. are sure of always having a job.
___20. add beauty to the world.
___21. make your own decisions.
___22. have pay increases that keep up with the cost of living.
___23. are mentally challenged.
___24. use leadership abilities.
___25. have adequate lounge, toilet, and other facilities.
___26. have a way of life, while not on the job, that you like.
___27. form friendships with your fellow employees.
___28. know that others consider your work important.
___29. do not do the same thing all the time.
___30. feel you have helped another person.
___31. add to the well-being of other people.
___32. do many different things.
___33. are looked up to by others.
___34. have good contacts with fellow workers.

___35. lead the kind of life you most enjoy.
___36. have a good place in which to work (good lighting, quiet, clean, enough space, etc)
___37. plan and organize the work of others.
___38. need to be mentally alert.
___39. are paid enough to live right.
___40. are your own boss.
___41. make attractive products.
___42. are sure of another job in the company if your present job ends.
___43. have a supervisor who is considerate.
___44. see the results of your efforts.
___45. contribute new ideas.

III. Please indicate the extent to which the following statements describe your present position.

Not at all	To a very little extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
1	2	3	4	5

Work in which you....

___ 1. have to keep solving new problems.
___ 2. help others.
___ 3. can get a raise.
___ 4. look forward to changes in your job.
___ 5. have freedom in your own area.
___ 6. gain prestige in your field.
___ 7. need to have artistic ability.
___ 8. are one of the gang.
___ 9. know your job will last.
___10. can be the kind of person you would like to be.
___11. have a boss who gives you a square deal.
___12. like the setting in which your job is done.
___13. get the feeling of having done a good day's work.
___14. have authority over others.
___15. try out new ideas and suggestions.
___16. create something new.
___17. know by the results when you've done a good job.
___18. have a boss who is reasonable.
___19. are sure of always having a job.
___20. add beauty to the world.
___21. make your own decisions.
___22. have pay increases that keep up with the cost of living.
___23. are mentally challenged.
___24. use leadership abilities.
___25. have adequate lounge, toilet, and other facilities.

___26. have a way of life, while not on the job, that you like.
___27. form friendships with your fellow employees.
___28. know that others consider your work important.
___29. do not do the same thing all the time.
___30. feel you have helped another person.
___31. add to the well-being of other people.
___32. do many different things.
___33. are looked up to by others.
___34. have good contacts with fellow workers.
___35. lead the kind of life you most enjoy.
___36. have a good place in which to work (good lighting, quiet, clean, enough space, etc)
___37. plan and organize the work of others.
___38. need to be mentally alert.
___39. are paid enough to live right.
___40. are your own boss.
___41. make attractive products.
___42. are sure of another job in the company if your present job ends.
___43. have a supervisor who is considerate.
___44. see the results of your efforts.
___45. contribute new ideas.

OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111 • (405) 478-1661

Division of Business

November 7, 1986

Dear Faculty Member,

Recently you received a questionnaire concerning the work values of faculty members at the small college level. Many have completed the survey and returned it. At the time of this mailing we have not received your response. If you have responded, thank you. If you have not, we would appreciate it very much if you would take the time to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

W. Jack Skaggs

W Jack Skaggs
Assistant Professor
Division of Business

wn

Enclosures
Questionnaire
Return Envelope

VITA

William Jack Skaggs

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: WORK VALUES OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN SELECTED SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Thorp Springs, Texas, November 26, 1936, the son of Royce J. and Estaline Skaggs. Married to Winona L. Atkinson on December 19, 1959.

Education: Graduated from Pasadena High School, Pasadena, Texas, in May, 1955; received Bachelor of Business Administration from Texas A and M University in January, 1960; received Master of Business Administration from Southern Methodist University in August, 1974; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1987.

Professional Experience: Assistant Professor, Division of Business, Oklahoma Christian College, January, 1981 to present. Member Academy of Management, Organizational Behavior Teaching Society, Association for the Study of Higher Education, and Oklahoma City Personnel Association.