DISTANCE EDUCATION:

A MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION OF FULL-TIME BUSINESS FACULTY IN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE BUSINESS SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS AT ACCREDITED COLLEGES OF BUSINESS

by

Marie Gould

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Capella University

May 2007

DISTANCE EDUCATION:

A MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION OF FULL-TIME BUSINESS FACULTY

IN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE BUSINESS SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS AT

ACCREDITED COLLEGES OF BUSINESS

by

Marie Gould

has been approved

May 2007

APPROVED:

JOHN KLOCINSKI, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor and Chair

SAMUEL NATALE, D.Phil (Oxon.), Committee Member

MICHAEL K. BENTIL, D.B.A., Committee Member

ACCEPTED AND SIGNED:

_____

JOHN KLOCINSKI, Ph.D.

_____

Kurt Linberg, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Business & Technology

Abstract

This study had two purposes (a) to determine if there is a difference in the level of job satisfaction from teaching in a traditional classroom versus teaching an asynchronous distance education course, and (b) to determine whether job satisfaction among full-time faculty members in ACBSP-accredited colleges of business who teach asynchronous distance courses differs depending on certain characteristics. Data was collected via the Internet using the Job Descriptive Index, then compared to determine any significant difference in any of the categories. The paired sample test was used to complete this analysis. Descriptive statistics, independent *t* tests, and ANOVA were used to determine if there were significant differences among faculty members in different characteristic categories.

Dedication

To God and my parents. If it were not for the fact that I truly believe God called me to complete this project, I would have given up a long time ago. Faith and perseverance have allowed me to remain steadfast in spite of the obstacles during the last 6 years. I am fortunate to have parents who value education and wisdom. Mom and Dad, thank you for your prayers and for being my foundation. In honor of you, I completed my final draft on your 50th anniversary.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my mentor, Dr. John Klocinski, for his guidance and professionalism in helping me complete this project. I also want to thank Dr. Samuel Natale and Dr. Michael K. Bentil for their patience, support, and participation on my committee. I am eternally grateful for everything you have done for me.

Special thanks to those who have traveled with me on this journey—my friend, Mr. Keith Harper; my sister, Ms. Andrea Gould; my "covering" of friends, Dr. Brenda Ingram-Wallace, Mrs. Charlene Webb, and Mrs. Joyce Henderson; my mentees, Ms. Camille Pierre, Ms. Monique Outerbridge and Ms. Ursala Garnett; and the "best" editor I could ever ask for, Ms. Brooke Smith.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the faculty and staff at Capella University and Peirce College. Without you, this would not have been possible. I thank you for your support and guidance through this entire process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

As the popularity of the Internet exploded in the 1990s, so did the demand for technological knowledge, especially as many organizations now expect college graduates to have technology skills as well as knowledge in their field of study. To adapt, colleges and universities have had to change their way of teaching, and according to Fox (2000), pressures on higher education from internal and external sources to incorporate online technologies are likely to continue to grow. These online technologies can become an integral part of the curriculum, or simply be another way to convey, retrieve, and manipulate information.

However, in the Internet, colleges and universities also found a new potential source of revenue and means of delivery. Distance learning provided a new teaching and learning environment that enhanced traditional correspondence courses by adding technology and interactivity. "More than 350,000 students were enrolled in fully online distance learning programs in 2001-2003, a figure growing more than 40 percent annually" (Newman, Callahan & Gallagher, 2002, para. 1). Thus distance education is a high priority of educators, students, administrators, and corporate leaders (Shachar & Neumann, 2003)—one that is changing how these institutions market their product: education.

Accordingly, academic and training communities have been assessing the effectiveness of distance education methods. Enrollment in higher education is expected to increase at a rate of 16% over the next decade (Jones, 2003). Many of the new students will be nontraditional ones requiring flexibility in course offerings. These students have the opportunity to design a

schedule that incorporates their academic pursuits with their professional and personal responsibilities by learning in the comfort of their homes. Thus with the increase of nontraditional learners with competing priorities, these new delivery systems for distance education are a perfect fit for the new majority.

However, given the strides that academia is making in this area, business and professional organizations have also entered the market, with the Internet breeding for-profit corporations which may pose a threat to traditional institutions as competition for online students increases. If institutions do not accept the paradigm shift to online delivery systems, they may become obsolete in a few years.

Online education represents a new technoculture that reflects the larger changes in politics, the economy, and society. Although computers are used in teaching and learning, the focus should not be on the tool; instead, institutions should concentrate on the broader changes occurring in our global society and higher education. According to Shachar and Neumann (2003), "the Internet has cast a worldwide Web of almost instantaneously active, fiber optic strands that bind together the practical worlds of business and commerce, and facilitates the exchange of views in the various academic and non-academic disciplines" (para. 1). As a result, educational systems have become open to using different methods of delivery systems.

Two distinct formats exist within the distance education model, as the two main delivery systems in distance education are *synchronous* and *asynchronous* delivery. When using a synchronous delivery system, the learning process occurs in real time, while an asynchronous system gives learners the ability to retrieve information later. Thus unlike a traditional classroom with set schedules and attendance, the learning process occurs over a period of time in which the participants do not have to be engaged simultaneously.

When designing a distance education course, the instructional designer should take into consideration both types of delivery, as selection of delivery systems depends on the needs of the students and the type of subject matter. Some instructors may rely on only one delivery system; however, this practice is not the norm. Both systems have advantages and disadvantages, but a combination of the two provides an interactive learning environment, which is why many organizations are moving to the hybrid (blended learning) approach. This study will focus on the asynchronous model because it is the format most ACBSP institutions use when teaching distance education courses.

Distance learning is expected to open the doors to education and training throughout the world by reducing costs and increasing flexibility of delivery. In this context, the fundamental technologies of distance learning have less to do with particular forms of hardware and software than with the technologies of human organization, such as specialization and division of labor. There is a risk the quality and impact of distance learning will suffer if the platform is absorbed into traditional patterns of academic work.

In essence, the faculty must develop courses based on the specifications of the delivery system, as designing each platform in the same way would not be feasible. For example, class participation is usually a requirement for most courses. In the traditional classroom, the instructor is able to have real-time conversations to evaluate participation, and the instructor and students can also provide immediate feedback to each other. Although participation may be a key assessment for the course in an asynchronous environment, real-time participation and immediate feedback is almost impossible. Thus to evaluate participation, the instructor may instead create discussion threads and give students the opportunity to respond within an established time frame. The instructor may need to include a summary of the discussion to

ascertain that everyone comprehends the key points, as in many cases; there will not be an opportunity to provide immediate feedback.

Background of the Study

The primary mode of traditional academic teaching involved the instructor lecturing and the student listening. The instructor was seen as the expert whose responsibility was to impart knowledge to student minds. Students were expected to take notes and ask questions for clarification. This type of learning interaction has been referred to as sage on the stage (O'Malley & McCraw, 1999). Although this method is appropriate for individuals with specific learning styles, it may not be conducive for nontraditional students with practical experience or those interested in pursuing a "pure" online degree program, as these students will have a desire to share in the learning process and communicate with each other rather than listen to a talking head.

The distance education model provides a learning environment in which the instructor and students are separated by location (Gallagher & McCormick, 1999) or there is an instructional arrangement where the instructor and student agree on how to communicate at a distance to fulfill an educational requirement (Keegan, 1986; Perraton, 1988). These courses are delivered via synchronous or asynchronous instruction by methods such as written correspondence, videotape, CD-ROM, Web-based or Web-enhanced learning, audio and video-conferencing, interactive TV, e-mail, and facsimile.

Distance learning does not preclude the use of the traditional classroom. However, as the use of the Internet has increased, there has been a shift towards Web-based learning as opposed to other forms of distance education. These learning methods are being added to various

learning programs (Shachar & Neumann, 2003). Some experts are even predicting that the standard model of having students attend a class at a specific location and certain time will disappear in the future (Blustain, Goldstein, & Lozier, 1999).

Instead of relying on a single delivery system, the American distance education model has integrated various technologies (Levine & Doyle, 1994; Murphy, 1992). Administrators will need to examine the cost benefit analysis of each system to determine which format or combination works best for the institution, as each model has both advantages and disadvantages. Specifically, some of the advantages include lower cost, reduced travel time, greater effectiveness, larger market, better teaching materials, and improved learning environment. Faculty can also cut travel budgets while participating in activities via a technological format. Departments in learning organizations can reduce time out of the office by offering distance education programs. They can sponsor satellite sessions for employees, or accommodate those who work on shifts. Faculty and students will have less travel time because they will be able to participate at their individual locations, giving them more flexibility to deal with busy work schedules. Studies have also shown that students learn as well or better in a distance-learning environment (Wittington, 1987), especially those who tend to be self-directed learners (Conrad, 1999), as these students attempt to correlate their experiences to abstract concepts (Dille & Mezack, 1991) and favor an independent learning environment that allows them to use a conceptual learning style (Gee, 1990).

Another advantage is that institutions will have the opportunity to reach a broader market of people without being confined to one central facility. The additional revenue can help offset start-up costs of distance learning or be used to pay for other initiatives the institution sponsors.

Smaller colleges can view this as a lifeline, as they will be able to attract students in remote areas and those who may not have considered them in the past because of the school's location.

However, distance learning also has some of the disadvantages of distance, including the impersonal feeling of the environment, costs, "up front" time required, and lack of faculty support. Some students and faculty have complained the distance education format is impersonal and does not provide the opportunity to develop relationships. This is especially true in an accelerated environment that occurs when a traditional 14-week course is taught in a 5- or 7-week format in which all of the assignments and readings from the 14-week course must be completed in a shorter time frame.

In addition, some students may have a learning style that requires face-to-face interaction to succeed, as they may need classroom time to get a grasp of the material being taught. Material for distance learning classes has to be completely developed before the start of a class, which may force some instructors to improve its quality; however, it also deprives them of the flexibility of developing the curriculum as they go. It is important the instructor still has the opportunity to be flexible in revising the content of the course once the class has started. Depending on the make-up of the class, assignments may have to be revised to meet the needs and learning styles of its particular students. Some instructors ask students to complete a learning style inventory at the beginning of the class so that they have an idea of the student's preferred learning styles (Dille & Mezack, 1991).

In terms of costs, start-up expenses may be high, but prices are coming down. The high start-up cost can be attributed to faculty members being required to put in much upfront time to develop them, which leads to improved materials but also to the authors asking, "What is in it for

me?" Many organizations are addressing the faculty satisfaction and commitment issue by using both monetary and intrinsic rewards to encourage faculty to participate in distance education.

Overall, for distance education to continue to be a viable delivery system in higher education, faculty members must be satisfied with their jobs (Neyman, 2002). Job satisfaction refers to the feelings and attitudes people have about their jobs, which in turn depends on many work-related factors (i.e., daily tasks, benefits) as well as personal factors (e.g., age, social status, job experience, family and social relationships). A person's motivation and aspirations and how well these needs are being satisfied by the individual's work also affect attitudes toward jobs. Increases in job satisfaction and reduction in turnover have been found to increase organizational productivity (Trevor, 2001).

Institutions must meet the task of making certain their investment (qualified faculty) is secure (satisfied), otherwise they will run the risk of not being able to meet the student demand for distance education courses. Yet only limited research has been conducted in the area of the faculty's role in teaching distance education courses (Nelson, 2000; Schifter, 2000), with only a few studies focusing on job satisfaction among full-time business faculty members who teach distance courses (Neyman, 2002; Preziosi & Gooden, 2003).

Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)

ACBSP is one of the two major business accreditation bodies; it has a strong focus on teaching excellence. As of April 2006, ACBSP had a membership of 403 educational institutions with 297 having received accreditation (Association of College Business Schools and Programs, n.d.). Twelve corporations and 13 emeriti also have membership in the association along with approximately 4,600 individual members.

Although not all accredited institutions offer distance learning, the ACBSP was selected to complement the study conducted by Susan Neyman in 2003 that used the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), as discussed more fully below.

Statement of the Problem

Although the field is growing rapidly, some faculty members are not jumping on the distance learning bandwagon. Instead, they are waiting to see if distance education is more than a trend while watching to see what impact this new model will have on their courses. According to Robinson (1996), professors fall into three categories: innovators, late adopters, and resistors [*sic*]. Innovators are the faculty members who embrace new technology and implement it early in the program, while late adopters want to wait and see what happens. However, if the organization has been successful in implementation and communication, there will be a group of faculty members willing to adopt the technology into their courses. In comparison, resistors are not impressed with the new technology and prefer to use the traditional method of teaching where they are in control of their classrooms. Given these findings, it is imperative for organizations to determine how to satisfy their faculty members by getting them to accept the new wave of technology, as "the trends of institutions offering DE [distance education] courses will continue to expand due to increased consumer demand and cost-efficiencies offered by this type of course delivery" (Cook & Crawford, 2002, p. 5).

The responsibilities of the faculty have changed over the years. Initially faculty members were concerned with issues such as productivity, teaching scholarships, research, and tenure, while today they also have to be prepared to deal with new technology, changing student populations, and customer-oriented approaches. Many are concerned that although their roles

have changed, the reward systems at their institutions have not. Therefore, they do not desire to adopt distance education (DE), but instead want to discuss issues such as faculty incentives, compensation, workload, training and technical support, and intellectual property rights. Wolcott (1997) believes that what an institution values is reflected in its reward system. For example, there have been studies that focused on institutional reward systems that have inflexible promotion criteria and are not consistent with different types of scholarship (Diamond, 1993; Edgerton, 1993). Current reward systems are also seen as being out-of-date.

Researchers have found that DE faculty members were motivated more by intrinsic than extrinsic reasons (Betts, 1998; Taylor & White, 1991; Wolcott, 1997). Wolcott and Betts found that incentives tied to personal and social satisfaction pleased the faculty. Wolcott also found the faculty to be concerned about the equity of rewards for DE, as the members do not believe they are receiving the recognition for individual work and pay increases they deserve for their efforts in supporting institutional goals.

As DE continues to become an integral part of many institutions being able to generate revenue, those institutions will also have the task of making sure they have the resources to produce quality programs. Originally the challenge will be to find a qualified pool of faculty members to teach the courses, but another challenge will be to retain these individuals by making certain they are satisfied with the support and rewards they are receiving from their institutions. If the faculty members are not satisfied with teaching DE courses, they may choose positions and responsibilities that do not include distance instruction, or perform poorly if they are forced to teach using an online format (Neyman, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

Susan Neyman (2002) conducted a study on job satisfaction of full-time business faculty in institutions accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The ACBSP joins the AACSB as the other of the two largest recognized accrediting bodies for business schools. The purpose of this study was to replicate Neyman's research by surveying the full-time business faculty in the ACBSP.

This study focused on two areas. First, the research sought to determine if there was any difference in the level of job satisfaction between teaching a traditional class versus an asynchronous DE course. The research focused on those professors who have taught both traditional classroom courses and at least one DE course within the last 3 years. The study asked participants 144 questions with reference to traditional instruction methods, then the same questions as they applied to DE. Five facets of job satisfaction were measured using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). These dimensions include (a) the work itself, (b) supervision, (c) pay, (d) promotions, and (e) co-workers. Second, the study was designed to find out if there was a correlation between faculty job satisfaction and certain characteristics such as (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) number of years teaching in higher education, (e) type of institution, (f) ACBSP type of institution, (g) tenure status, (h) rank, (i) availability of technical support for faculty, (j) faculty training in using distance education, and (k) student preparation.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following

a. Is there a difference in job satisfaction from teaching a traditional course versus teaching a distance course as experienced by full-time faculty members who have taught both traditional and DE courses at an ACBSP-accredited college of business in the last 3 years?

b. Is there a difference in the job satisfaction level gained from teaching DE as experienced by full-time faculty members in ACBSP-accredited colleges of business who have taught at least one distance course in the past 3 years, based on the following characteristics (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) number of years teaching in higher education, (e) type of institution, (f) ACBSP type of institution, (g) tenure status, (h) rank, (i) availability of technical support for faculty, (j) faculty training in using distance education, and (k) student preparation?

Nature of the Study

The major focus of this study was to look at the job satisfaction of business faculty at ACBSP-accredited institutions. Determination of job satisfaction levels within this group and the way certain characteristics influence this trait were the main issues of this descriptive correlation research, which used survey methodology. As previously described, the study explored five dimensions of job satisfaction through the use of the JDI. Data was collected via a Web-based survey.

Significance of the Study

This study provides information for those individuals responsible for making decisions and implementing policies that affect distance learning programs. The analyses of the data obtained from this study may assist these individuals with making hiring decisions and developing appropriate reward systems. The information may also provide documentation that will help administrators in developing a profile of characteristics for a successful DE faculty. In addition, the information provided feedback on the types of incentives that are important in motivating DE faculty members.

This study sought to gather information on the characteristics of DE faculty members who are content with their jobs. According to Neyman (2003), academic administrators may be able to use this data in selecting DE faculty, creating training and development programs for DE faculty, retaining DE faculty, determining the appropriate workload for DE faculty, and recruiting senior faculty to teach DE courses (p. 15). By highlighting the characteristics of faculty members who are satisfied with teaching DE courses, institutions may be able to implement policies that will aid them in making their DE programs successful.

Definition of Terms

Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). A major accrediting organization for business programs that promotes excellence through teaching and learning (Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, n.d.).

ACBSP champions. Individuals responsible for being the liaison between ACBSP and their institution (Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, n.d.).

Asynchronous instruction – Use of a format in which the student and instructor are in different geographic locations. Instructional material may be accessed from virtually any location at any time through use of the computer (Belanger & Jordan, 2000).

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). A major accrediting organization for business programs to which most research institutions belong (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, n.d.).

Correlational research study. A correlational study compares two or more different characteristics from the same group of people, then explains how the two characteristics vary together and how well one can be predicted from knowledge of the other (Diem, 2002).

Descriptive research study. A descriptive study establishes only the associations between variables (Diem, 2002).

Distance education. Distance education programs typically involve learners removed from the location of instructional delivery (Miller & Husmann, 1996).

Distributive learning. Distance learning environments in which students and instructors are separated by both time and space. Learners progress through instruction at their own pace (Belanger & Jordan, 2000).

Electronic survey. A survey distributed using technology.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) is a unit of the Office of Policy Planning and Innovation; it is contained within the Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education. FIPSE's mandate is to "improve postsecondary educational opportunities" across a broad range of concerns (United States Department of Education, n.d.)

Hybrid instruction. Also referred to as *blended learning instruction*. This method is being used when the learning environment is both online and in the physical classroom.

Job satisfaction. This refers to the feelings and attitudes people have about their jobs. Job satisfaction depends on many work-related factors (i.e., daily tasks, benefits, etc.) as well as personal factors (e.g., age, social status, job experience, family and social relationships, etc.). A person's motivation and aspirations and how well these needs are satisfied by work also affect that person's attitude toward jobs. Increases in job satisfaction and reduction in turnover have been found to increase organizational productivity (Trevor, 2001).

Survey research methodology. The researcher gathers data from a large group of subjects, usually via mail, telephone, or in-person interviews. Because information is gathered at one point in time, survey research is sometimes referred to as a "status" or "normative" study (Diem, 2002).

Synchronous instruction. Method in which learning takes place among the learners at the same time (Belanger & Jordan, 2000).

Web-based distributive learning. A learning environment in which students engage in mediated instruction through a Web-browser at their own pace, while being geographically separated from the learning institution (Belanger & Jordan, 2000).

Assumptions and Limitations

Several assumptions and limitations affect this research study.

Assumptions

There were several major assumptions made about this study (a) the sample represented the population, and the respondents answered truthfully; (b) the JDI had validity and measured

the desired constructs; (c) faculty members checked their e-mail accounts for the survey; (d) faculty members completing the survey were articulate and responded truthfully to questions as to why they were satisfied with their jobs; (e) the faculty were authentic by providing positive and negative feedback; (f) institutions had DE programs; and (g) the full-time faculty had opportunities to teach in DE courses.

Limitations

Time constraints were a legitimate limitation. This study developed a time line that allowed the surveys to be distributed at the appropriate time. The researcher contacted faculty members when the schools were in session. However, it was not possible for the researcher to determine "peak" times when faculty members were busy (i.e., close to the end of a semester, mid-terms) because schedules were different for each institution.

ACBSP has split its membership into eight regions. Seven of the regions cover the continental United States while the eighth consists of international institutions. Based on a recommendation from the committee, the researcher did not solicit participants from the eighth region to avoid skewed results based on cultural motivation.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter 2 provides an examination of the literature which provides its theoretical framework. Some of the topics to be discussed include (a) job satisfaction theory, (b) job satisfaction of faculty members teaching distance courses, (c) instruments used in research regarding job satisfaction of faculty, and (d) accreditation programs for business programs, especially ACBSP.

Chapter 3 provides the justification for the research methodology used in this study, including an explanation of research and sampling design, data collection and analysis process, and measures and procedures, as well as the pilot testing, limitations, and time line of the study. Chapter 4 presents the data collected for the study, with the information being subjected to the selected testing methods explained in chapter 3. Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the data in which the research questions are answered and recommendations for further research are presented.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

One of the most pressing problems facing organizations today is how to motivate employees to work more productively while increasing their feelings of satisfaction, involvement, and commitment. If an employee is dissatisfied with a job, there may be an adverse effect on job performance (Zillmann, 2000). Poor job performance may lead to poor service performance by the company, as many consumers report dissatisfaction with the quality of service they receive. These concerns have been expressed in industries such as manufacturing, retail, and service. Some perceive that employees seem not to care about quality work.

Employees have attitudes or viewpoints about many aspects of their jobs, their careers, and their organizations. Thus increases in job satisfaction and reduction in turnover have been found to increase organizational productivity (Trevor, 2001). Conversely, there can be a decrease in productivity if employees feel disengaged from what is going on in the organization on a daily basis.

Given the changes occurring in higher education, it is possible for employees at educational institutions to have issues with job satisfaction. Institutions are reallocating many of their resources to delivery systems such as distance education (DE). Even institutions that are small or in rural areas will be able to benefit from this new instructional technology (Lynch & Corry, 1998). These efforts are being integrated with the traditional delivery system of face-to-face instruction so that colleges and universities can attract a growing consumer pool of nontraditional students. The combination of these two methods has been described as

"distributed learning" (Oblinger, Barone, & Hawkins, 2001). Colleges and universities will now be able to generate revenue from a broader audience and recruit popular faculty to teach at their institutions without requesting potential candidates to relocate. However, although this area is the thrust of many institutions, there has not been much research exploring how instructional staff and faculty feel about this transition or investigating job satisfaction levels of faculty (Oshagbemi, 2000; Tang, 1999). Furthermore, few studies have examined job satisfaction levels based on a particular academic discipline such as business (Terpstra & Honoree, 2004). This study will seek to explore the level of job satisfaction among business faculty members who teach DE courses at ACBSP-accredited colleges and universities.

This chapter provides an examination of the literature that provides a theoretical framework for this study. Some of the topics to be discussed include (a) job satisfaction theory, (b) job satisfaction of faculty members teaching distance courses, (c) instruments used in research regarding job satisfaction of faculty, (d) the higher education environment, and (e) accreditation bodies for business programs, especially ACBSP.

Theoretical Framework

As the purpose of the study is to determine the level of job satisfaction among business faculty members who are teaching DE courses at ACBSP-accredited institutions, the study is grounded in job satisfaction theory. These theories act as a foundation to comprehend the motivators and inhibitors of the target population. Evaluation of the different types of job satisfaction theory allows the researcher to understand and analyze the satisfiers and dissatisfiers that business faculty members experience when teaching DE courses. A review of the classical literature on job satisfaction identified the following major theories (a) Maslow's hierarchy of

needs, (b) Herzberg's motivation/hygiene theory, (c) Alderfer's ERG theory, and (d) McClelland's need for assessment theory. This literature review establishes a foundation to explain the concept of job satisfaction theory in which the theories mentioned above are introduced and discussed.

Job Satisfaction Theory

Job satisfaction is generally recognized as a multifaceted construct that includes both intrinsic and extrinsic job elements (Howard & Frink, 1996). Both affect (feelings) and cognition (thinking) are important, as according to Saari and Judge (2004), the relationship is reciprocal—people tend to have feelings about what they are thinking, and think about what they are feeling. This concept proves that cognition and affect are linked to a person's psychological and biological makeup. Therefore, when people evaluate their job, their thought processes as well as feelings are involved.

Frederick Taylor, considered to be the "Father of Scientific Management," believed worker motivation was due to salary (Lindsey, 1998); thus in his 1911 research, Taylor proposed that employee satisfaction would increase with the level of salary increase the employee received. Accordingly, productivity and job satisfaction would increase if the workers were given fair wages and favorable working conditions. This school of thought was prevalent until the Hawthorne studies were conducted from 1927-1932, in which workers were interviewed and asked to discuss what they liked and disliked about their jobs. Most people had mixed reactions, as some mentioned social aspects of the job before mentioning economic issues. The researchers in this study concluded that money was not the primary motivator of job satisfaction, as satisfaction could also come from social recognition. As understanding the correlates and

outcomes related to job satisfaction are important to researchers and organizations, theories about the relationships between job satisfaction and important work variables such as life satisfaction, family satisfaction, work-family conflict, performance, withdrawal behaviors, and organizational citizenship have been developed and empirically examined (Frone, Cooper, & Russell, 1994; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Judge & Wantanabe, 1993; Organ & Ryan, 1995). There are two general approaches to motivational theory: *content* and *process* theory. Content theory focuses on what makes a person respond to certain things. These theories suggest that people have certain needs and desires, with content theorists believing that workers' behaviors are driven by their ability to satisfy personal needs. Many of the job satisfaction theories fall under the category of content theories. Another subdivision of this category is *needs* theory, which are content theories in which the job content is the source of motivation. The needs theorists assume that need deficiencies cause behaviors as workers seek to satisfy their needs through the job. A basic assumption of all need theories is that people are motivated to satisfy their desires. If something is missing from their lives, they want to get it. Content theories thus highlight the variables that motivate workers to do so.

The job satisfaction theories discussed in this study use Maslow's hierarchy of needs as their foundation. Maslow's theory suggests that all people are satisfying the same five needs: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. According to the theory, people seek to satisfy their needs in a step progression. Once a need has been satisfied, it is no longer a source of motivation.

Belilos (1997) explains Maslow's hierarchy of needs as applied to workers as follows

1. Physiological Needs – includes the basic physical needs such as the ability to acquire food, shelter, clothing, and other basics to survive

2. Safety Needs – includes a safe and non-threatening work environment, job security, and safe equipment and installations
3. Social Needs – includes contact and friendship with fellow workers, social activities, and opportunities
4. Ego – includes recognition, acknowledgement, and rewards
5. Self-Actualization – includes realizing one's dreams and potential, and reaching the heights of one's gifts and talents. (para. 5)

It is only when these needs are met that workers are morally, emotionally, and physically ready to satisfy the needs of the employer and the customers.

Maslow (1954) concluded that lower level needs had to be fulfilled before the higher level needs could be activated. He believed that people would move to the next level once the majority of their lower level needs were met**.** For example, if an unemployed person started a job in July and became self-sufficient by December, there is a possibility the person would start to focus on career development. Maslow believed that people could be motivated by two or more sets of needs. For example, a person may want to become a CPA, but cannot continue to pursue educational goals because of a need to work overtime to make ends meet. Salary is the dominant need at this point. However, once salary is no longer an issue, this individual may pursue educational goals.

In 1969, Clayton Alderfer wrote an article, "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Need". The purpose of the article was to align Maslow's theory with empirical research. The results produced a revised theory called the ERG Theory. As Alderfer felt there was an overlap of Maslow's five-level hierarchy, he revised Maslow's theory to include three levels, which equate to the acronym *ERG* (Existence, Relatedness, and Growth). *Existence* refers to

basic needs and thus is equivalent to Maslow's physiological and safety needs. *Relatedness* refers to the desire to maintain interpersonal relationships, which is similar to Maslow's social and love needs. *Growth* refers to an intrinsic desire for personal development, which is similar to Maslow's self-esteem and self-actualization levels. Existence needs motivate at a more fundamental level than relatedness needs, which in turn supersede growth needs. Both models are hierarchical and use the pyramid concept.

Unlike Maslow's hierarchy of need theory, ERG theory supports the belief that more than one need may be operative at the same time. Thus ERG theory does not assume a rigid hierarchy where a lower need must be satisfied before moving to the next level. The ERG theory also accounts for culture, as people from different cultures may have different needs; therefore, the ERG theory allows for the order of needs to be at different levels for people from different cultures. People also have different preferences, which are taken into account by the ERG theory. This flexibility allows for a wider range of outcomes in research.

Another difference is the frustration-regression principle. The concept of this principle is that if a person gets frustrated with a higher order need, the person may stay at the lower level need. The satisfaction level of the individual will increase at the lower level need because it appears to be easier than tackling the need at the next level. Maslow's theory did not acknowledge this concept.

Herzberg studied the factors in an employee's work environment that caused satisfaction and dissatisfaction. His findings were included in a book entitled *The Motivation of Work* published in 1959. Hertzberg's theory was structured directly for an organizational or work setting. He interviewed employees to find out what pleased and displeased them about their jobs. He found those factors causing satisfaction were different from those factors causing

dissatisfaction, calling the satisfiers "motivators" and the dissatisfiers "hygiene factors". Motivator factors were those factors within a job which allow for such things as achievement, responsibility, recognition, advancement, and challenge. Thus motivator needs are those associated with the work itself, such as the degree of challenge of the job. Motivator needs are met by jobs with increased levels of responsibility and autonomy. In contrast, hygiene factors are classified as environmental factors such as salary, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, styles of leadership, security working hours, and status. Hertzberg believed that when motivator needs are met, the person experiences job satisfaction. In contrast, the central theme for the dissatisfiers deals with the relationship the employees have with their job content as related to the environment or context of the job. The combination of the two factors can produce four different scenarios such as

1. High hygiene/High motivation. This was considered to be the best work environment. The workers are highly motivated and have minimum complaints about their jobs.
2. High hygiene/Low motivation. In this scenario, the employees view the job as a paycheck. Although there are few complaints about the job, their motivation to do the job is not high.
3. Low hygiene/High motivation. Employees in this scenario may like their jobs, but may have issues about the working conditions (i.e., salary or hours). These employees are highly motivated, but have complaints about their working conditions.
4. Low hygiene/Low motivation. This was considered to be the worst work environment, in which the workers are unmotivated and have many complaints about the job.

These levels differ from Maslow's and Alderfer's theories, as the actual job, responsibility, and advancement were found to be the most important for bringing about lasting changes of attitude. For Herzberg, motivation results from personal growth based on a need to grow. In other words, people find satisfaction in work that is interesting and challenging. An individual is driven to fulfill goals due to the potential of increased growth and incentive opportunities. According to Herzberg, the idea that the work one does is significant leads to satisfaction with the work itself. Employees will be motivated to do work they perceive is significant. From a philosophical perspective, it is Herzberg's position that it is the responsibility of society's dominant institutions to provide for the growth and well-being of people. In American society, one such dominant organization is the business institution. Therefore, it is the responsibility of business and industry to provide the means for growth and self-actualization

McClelland's work furthered Maslow's work by adding learned needs theory. His work identified sets of motivators present to varying degrees in different people, and then proposed that these needs were socially acquired or learned. The level in which these motivators are present varies from person to person, depending on the individual's background.

According to McClelland, regardless of culture or gender, people are driven by three motivators: achievement, affiliation and influence. Achievement is characterized by the desire to take responsibility for finding solutions to problems, mastering complex tasks, setting goals, and getting feedback on the level of success. Affiliation is characterized by the desire to belong, enjoyment of teamwork, concern about interpersonal relationships, and need to reduce uncertainty. The need for power is characterized by a drive to control and influence others, a need to win arguments, and a need to persuade and prevail.

High achievement motivation is the need to achieve excellence through individual efforts. People driven by the achievement motive like to test themselves against their environment in order to attain standards of excellence. High power motivation occurs when an individual obtains satisfaction from the exercise of influence, as these people are concerned about their impact on others. They enjoy persuading someone to take their point of view, empowering others around them, and finding ways to connect and influence powerful people. High affiliation motivation occurs when the leader tends to be nonassertive, submissive, and dependent on others. These people are concerned about the quality of their relationships, including the degree of their harmony and reliability. Thus these individuals are likely to become upset when disruptions to relationships occur, and accordingly are not management material.

In summary, all four of the theorists discussed in this section have made an impact in the field of job satisfaction study. Maslow's work is highly recognized in the work environment. However, research does not validate his theory, as his work has been criticized as to how the data were collected and interpreted. Alderfer's work is seen as a more valid version of Maslow's work, but unfortunately it ignores situational variables that are important in the world of work. Herzberg's findings have supported managers giving employees more input into planning and controlling their work; however, it is not considered a real theory, as the concept assumes a correlation between satisfaction and productivity that was not measured. McClelland's findings validate the fact that high achievers do not necessarily make the best managers, as the achievement aspect is related to the individual's personal aspirations and may not influence how someone leads people. Therefore, an organization may have a great employee, but that does not mean the person should be promoted to a higher level position that may include managerial

responsibilities. Although there is mixed empirical support, this theory is consistent with the research on individual differences among people.

Individual Differences and Job Satisfaction

Individual differences can be defined as the personal attributes that vary from one person to another. These differences range from the most obvious (demographic, such as gender, race, age, etc.) to the least obvious (psychological, such as personality). As diversity becomes a greater issue in organizations, the need for understanding differences will increase. Managers need to understand the individuals with whom they work and be concerned with the issue of job fit, which can be described as the extent to which the contributions made by the individual match the rewards offered by the organization. If the organization can take advantage of the behaviors and abilities of their employees and fulfill their needs, the organization and employees will have the perfect person-job fit. If the fit is successful, the organization will be happy with the person, and the person should be satisfied with the job.

Porter and Steers (1973) argued that the extent of employee job satisfaction reflected the cumulative level of worker expectations met. Employees expect their job to provide a mix of features (i.e., pay, promotion, or autonomy) for which each employee has preferred values. The range and importance of these preferences vary across individuals, but when the accumulation of unmet expectations becomes sufficiently large, there is less job satisfaction and greater probability of withdrawal behaviors (Pearson, 1991) such as absenteeism, low morale, and lack of commitment to job and organization. As these withdrawal behaviors can lead to unfavorable results for the organization, it is imperative that business leaders tap into those policies,

programs, and processes that will increase the potential for greater employee satisfaction and motivation.

Job Satisfaction: Importance to Organizations

The motivation of employees is important to organizations because it is a factor that may affect employee productivity. Employees tend to be more productive when they are happy with the organization and their jobs; thus productivity may increase as the result of a satisfied employee. Greater overall job satisfaction can lead to greater commitment to the organization, fewer withdrawal behaviors (i.e., tardiness, absenteeism, or voluntary turnover), better job performance, and fewer counterproductive behaviors.

According to Jakobson (2005), happy employees have a positive impact on a company's revenues and profits. He reported that a recent study by the Forum for People Performance Management and Measurement based at Northwestern University broke ground by focusing on employees who do not have direct contact with customers. Considering the role that each employee plays in a company's success, businesses need to invest in responding to initiatives that focus on employee motivation. Employees have the power to determine the future of the organization—including whether it fails or succeeds. Therefore organizations need to respond to and satisfy employee concerns the same way they would pursue satisfying their client base.

Predictive Variables of Job Satisfaction

Specific variables can be predictive of job satisfaction. Various reports and research projects exist on this topic, but the results are not always consistent, as some of the findings indicate that white-collar workers, older workers, people with more experience on the job, men,

and members of majority groups like their jobs more than their counterparts.

White-Collar Personnel

White-collar workers tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Wan & Leightley, 2006). Based on traditional human resource management practices, being a faculty member would be considered a white-collar position. Professors have flexible schedules and autonomy on how to control their time; therefore, there is an increased probability for faculty members to be satisfied with their positions.

Older Workers

Oshagbemi (1998) conducted a study on the impact of age on the job satisfaction of university teachers. His literature review showed that most studies that focused on the correlation between age and job satisfaction have concluded there is some association between the two variables. Oshagbemi's study reported the results from a survey given to academics in the United Kingdom in 1994, in which questionnaires were sent to the faculty at 23 universities. The results indicated that age is related to job satisfaction levels in the core aspects of the professor's job. Experience and on-the-job tenure have the same effect as maturity, so the same concepts hold true as those for the older workers.

Mottaz (1987) thought there were four possible explanations as to why there was a correlation between these two variables. The hypotheses were

1. Younger workers are more concerned with intrinsic rewards (i.e., the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers), whereas older workers are more interested in extrinsic rewards (e.g., pay, promotion, supervision). Younger workers have a desire and need for more rewards than the job can provide.

2. Older workers have more seniority so it is easier for them to move into jobs that provide more satisfaction and rewards.
3. Older workers have fewer expectations for their jobs because they believe the intrinsic rewards are impossible to attain.
4. After being at a job for a period, older workers tend to assimilate into the culture and accept things "as is" versus attempting to attain higher goals.

Men and Members of Majority Groups

Although most research is inconsistent regarding gender and job satisfaction, there are circumstances when the majority population is more satisfied. These situations may occur when there is unequal treatment in a workplace. For example, men still have a large representation at the senior level. They have more work experience, and the overall compensation and benefits package is better for them than for their female counterparts. In contrast, as minorities tend to be underrepresented at many organizations, those who are present may not be satisfied. There is also a possibility that some minority faculty members may experience discrimination and not be given the same opportunities as their counterparts.

Given the increase of female and minority students at most institutions, many colleges and universities are seeking a faculty representative of this population. Therefore, studies should explore the perceived levels of job satisfaction among these underrepresented minority groups in institutional faculties. Swoboda's study (1990) found that minority faculty members tend to be stressed due to expectations as a result of their minority status. Many minority faculty members also take on the additional burden of being informal mentors to minority students, which tends to exceed the established obligations of the institution. Payne (1985) was one of the first researchers to examine the role perceptions of African-American faculty, but his work did not

find any significant differences in perceptions of their jobs. On a positive note, Thomas and Asunka (1995) concluded that women and minority faculty at predominantly white institutions were satisfied with their jobs.

Job Satisfaction of Faculty

Research has been conducted to explore faculty attitudes toward DE (Clark, 1993; Taylor & White, 1991) and examine rewards, motivators, and incentives for faculty to participate in it (Miller & Husmann, 1997; Wolcott, 1997). Reports reflect the fact that "about six percent of instructional faculty and staff who reported teaching one or more for-credit classes indicate that they taught at least one distance education class in the fall of 1998" (Bradburn, 2002, p. iv). Although the field of DE education is growing, Phipps and Merisotis (1999) found there is not much research on faculty issues.

Job Satisfaction of Faculty

The National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago conducted a telephone survey in 1999 to solicit feedback from faculty members regarding how they felt about their jobs. The pollsters contacted 1,511 full-time faculty members teaching at two- and four-year institutions. Ninety percent of the respondents stated they were satisfied with their jobs and would choose the field of teaching again. The top four reasons that professors stayed at an institution included (a) opportunity to educate students, (b) opportunity to work in an intellectually challenging environment, (c) freedom of choice in what to teach, and (d) freedom to spend time with family. The three least important factors were (a) reputations of their departments and institutions, (b) physical conditions on campus, and (c) opportunity for professional recognition (Sanderson, Phua & Herda, 2000).

Another survey was conducted at the University of Minnesota. In April 2004, the Human Resource Department was responsible for collecting data for the Pulse Survey, whose purpose was to get a "pulse" on how faculty and staff felt about their jobs. The Faculty Pulse Survey was divided into seven major areas, with job satisfaction being one. Overall, the majority of the faculty members was satisfied with their jobs, intended to stay with the university, and enjoyed working with coworkers and supervisor. Seventy-eight percent of the faculty experienced high levels of job satisfaction, while 71% would recommend a friend to work at the university and almost 75% would seek employment with their institution if they had to do it all over again (University of Minnesota, Office of Human Resources, n.d.).

It is important for institutions to have faculty members who are satisfied with their teaching experience. Although the major goal is to educate the students, faculty members have to feel good about what they are doing, and the institution has to provide a reason for them to stay. Research has shown that satisfied workers give their best and are more committed to the organization, whereas dissatisfied workers tend not to be committed to the organization but instead tend to work to promote themselves and satisfy their personal needs (Drysdale, 2005). These types of actions can be devastating in higher education because professors have much control over how they spend their time and energy, and job dissatisfaction among the faculty could create a decline in the quality of work produced (Tack & Patitu, 2000). Therefore, it is in the best interest of the institution to make sure its faculty members are satisfied with their workload and responsibilities.

Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching Distance Courses

Kamata and Bower's study (2005) found that faculty members were pleased and satisfied with their DE teaching experience if they had adequate training and preparation. Incentives were

not a strong motivator for the faculty to consider teaching DE courses; however, intrinsic motivators were found to be influential for faculty satisfaction and willingness to continue teaching in this delivery system. Four motivators for professors to become involved in DE were their ability to reach a new audience, the ability to develop new ideas, their personal interest in technology, and the intellectual challenge. Some reports and research have shown that teaching a DE course requires more time and effort on the part of the faculty (American Association of University Professors, 1999; American Council on Education, 2000). Yet although it took longer to develop DE courses, this did not adversely affect faculty members or divert them from teaching in this format. However, "some faculty interest groups have suggested that faculty workload will increase as distance education proliferates" (Bradburn, 2002, p. v.)

Schifter (2000) conducted a study to analyze the factors that influence faculty participation in DE. She found the top five motivating factors were "personal motivation to use technology, opportunity to develop new ideas, opportunity to improve teaching skills, opportunity to diversify program offerings and flexibility for students" (p. 3). The top five inhibiting factors were "lack of technical support provided by the institution, lack of release time, concern about faculty workload, lack of grants for material/expenses, and concern about the quality of the course" (p. 3).

Maguire (2005) reviewed literature that focused on the attitudes of faculty teaching DE courses, finding 13 studies that focused on faculty attitudes about teaching in a DE delivery system. The majority of these studies were completed between 1997 and 2003. The study's literature review provided a list of motivators and inhibitors for faculty teaching in the DE system, with the items on the list divided into three categories: intrinsic, extrinsic, and institutional.

Several studies found that faculty members valued intrinsic motivators over extrinsic motivators. Results of studies (Betts, 1998; Bonk, 2001; Lee, 2001; Schifter, 2000) confirmed one of the intrinsic motivators identified in the telephone survey conducted at the University of Chicago, in which the faculty viewed teaching DE courses as an opportunity to work in an intellectually challenging environment. In addition, some faculty members valued the option of being able to teach anywhere at any time (Betts, 1998; Schifter). This flexibility added to the level of overall job satisfaction.

Maguire (2005) identified several factors that could be considered extrinsic motivators, including (a) recognition from peers and opportunities for promotion and tenure (Bonk, 2001; Parisot, 1997); (b) opportunity to showcase their online work and solicit feedback from peers (Chizmar & Williams, 2001; Parisot, 1997); and (c) collaboration with faculty from other organizations (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000).

Organizations such as Quality Matters could be a resource to fulfill these faculty needs. Quality Matters (qualitymatters.org) is an organization established as a result of a Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant. One of its main objectives is to create a peer system to review online courses at various institutions. Each review team consists of three peers who are responsible for working with a faculty member to evaluate that person's course based on established criteria determined by the founding members of Quality Matters and recognized as the Quality Matters rubric. Each team member has a role during the evaluation process in which a chairperson, content expert, and instructional designer is assigned to each course. These individuals work as a team and review the course to make sure it exhibits the best practices of online learning.

Institutional motivators involve issues that require the institution or administration to implement policies and procedures that would enhance the quality of distance learning experiences. Two major areas identified in Maguire's (2005) study were teaching with technology and technical/administrative support. The faculty desired to educate the students regarding technology as well as the defined content material as the instructors believed that incorporating technology in the courses prepared the students for the world of work. In addition, the use of technology improved the quality of course development and teaching. This integration enhanced the learning experience (Betts, 1998; Bonk, 2001; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000; McKenzie, Mims, Bennett & Waugh, 2000; Schifter, 2000). Finally technology allowed the faculty to develop more courses, which increased the number of course offerings for students (Betts, 1998; Dooley & Murphrey; McKenzie et al.; Schifter, 2000).

Faculty value initiatives take the form of institutional recognition and support. Lee (2001) found that levels of job satisfaction and institutional commitment increased when faculty felt institutional support. Tenure and promotion were ranked high among the list of incentives that would satisfy this need (Betts, 1998; Bonk, 2001; Schifter, 2000). Monetary support was viewed to be another form of institutional recognition to motivate faculty to teach DE courses (Betts, 1998; Schifter, 2000; Schifter, 2002). Monetary support could come in the form of stipends, continuing education, overload pay, or increase in salary (Maguire, 2005).

Technological support encompasses several areas. Faculty members believed that institutions should provide adequate and continuous training for teaching online (Bonk, 2001). Although instructors believed that instructional design and development support were necessary in certain situations, they wanted the institution to respect their position as experts in the subject

matter (Bonk, 2001; Dooley & Murphrey, 2000). Thus, the faculty members wanted the institution to support and respect their right to determine what should be taught online.

The studies found technology to be an inhibitor as well a motivator, as some faculty members were resistant to change (Berge, 1998; Parisot, 1997) and did not see the need to add this medium to their courses. Also, some faculty members were afraid of technology (Parisot).

Technology was also an indirect cause of job insecurity (Dooley & Murphrey, 2000), as there was a fear that adding technology to courses would automate the process and eliminate faculty positions. Another fear involved the issue of intellectual property of online courses, as some faculty members were concerned that their work could be packaged and used by institutions without the need of a "live" instructor. Finally, there was a concern that for-profit corporations would overtake the market and pose a serious threat to traditional institutions.

Other faculty inhibitors included issues about course quality, accuracy of information on the Internet, appropriateness for traditional age students, decrease in student interaction, and copyright issues. Faculty workload continued to be a concern among faculty and accreditation bodies. Inhibitors that were considered institutional included faculty workload, lack of system support, lack of training for online delivery, time constraints and release time, and security issues. In addition, faculty members were concerned that their efforts to build the institution's reputation and portfolio of DE offerings were not valued to the same degree as research. This perception led many faculty members to believe they would not get proper credit in the tenure and promotion process (Betts, 1998; Lee, 2001; Wilson, 1998).

Job Satisfaction of Faculty Teaching Distance Courses in Business Programs

Preziosi and Gooden (2003) found that business faculty members were more satisfied when they taught traditional courses versus DE courses. The faculty believed they had a greater

impact on the students' learning outcomes when they were in a physical classroom. When Neyman (2002) conducted a study to determine the level of job satisfaction of full-time faculty teaching in AACSB-accredited colleges of business using a modified JDI as the survey instrument, her research indicated a significant difference in job satisfaction level of business faculty members teaching distance versus traditional courses. Also, there is a significant difference in the job satisfaction level between the two delivery systems based on the demographics used. This current study is a replication of Neyman's research which surveys the other major business accreditation organization, ACBSP.

Instruments

Measurement of job satisfaction can be considered subjective because the researcher is measuring an affective behavior. The feelings are processed through each individual's mind, in which there may not be a systematic, objective approach to the process. Although some instruments are more popular than others, the literature does not support a consensus among researchers as to which way is the best to measure job satisfaction (Wanous & Lawler, 1972). However, many researchers have found survey instruments to be more objective (Spector, 1997).

Satisfaction surveys are very popular among human resource professionals. These professionals have a practical purpose for satisfaction surveys, as job attitude surveys can provide organizations with useful information in dealing with their human problems. Arnold and Feldman (1982) cited five ways organizations can use job satisfaction surveys, including (a) diagnosing organizational problems, (b) evaluating the effects of organizational changes, (c) improving communication with employees, (d) assessing the likelihood of unionization; and (e) understanding absenteeism and turnover. Questionnaires tend to be objective while costing less

than observations and interviews and providing confidentiality; they can also be given to large populations of participants at one time (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

Satisfaction surveys may use open- or closed-ended questions. Open-ended questions allow the responders to answer in their own words, whereas the closed-ended questions have predetermined answer categories. Closed-ended surveys tend to be used when a researcher is concerned with using less time to administer the survey as they are not as time consuming as open-ended questionnaires.

Physiological measures and questionnaires asking about feelings can be used to detect the affective components of job satisfaction. One of the two major approaches used to measure job satisfaction is critical incident technique, which is a procedure for measuring job satisfaction in which employees describe incidents relating to their work that they find either especially satisfying or dissatisfying. There are several standardized instruments that use the critical incidents technique, as typical measures include: the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985); the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969); the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967); and the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Olham, 1975). The most widely cited survey instruments found in the literature include the JSS, the JDI, and the MSQ.

The JDI was chosen for this study because it was the instrument used in the study being replicated (Neyman, 2003). The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was introduced in Smith et al.'s (1969) publication of the Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, and has been in existence for almost 40 years (DeMeuse, 1985; Zedeck, 1987). According to Worrell (2004), the JDI Research Group has a record of more than 12,000 research studies using the JDI.

The JDI is a rating scale used for assessing job satisfaction which measures it by analyzing responses to 90 questions. The questions focus on five facets of job satisfaction: present pay, present job, supervision, coworkers, and opportunities for promotion. Individuals respond to this questionnaire by indicating whether various adjectives describe aspects of their work.

Establishing a Foundation: Higher Education and the Faculty

Higher Education Environment

Although the focus has been on understanding the different theories of job satisfaction, it is equally important to comprehend how the field of higher education works so as to know the context for the study. Understanding how the theories apply to employees of higher education exclusively is essential in understanding the employees' motives and behaviors. According to Guthrie (2005), the culture in institutions of higher learning differs from that of the corporate environment, and employees face different challenges. Corporations rely on institutions to provide qualified employees so that they can be prepared to solve corporate problems and make crucial decisions. The importance of higher education to knowledge-based economies and the demands of nontraditional students place an additional pressure on postsecondary institutions.

Changes will continue to occur in higher education as these institutions strive to meet the needs of students. Corporations will continue to move toward a knowledge-based economy and require cost effective ways to educate their employees. As these changes take place, the mission and objectives of institutions will change, and the faculty will respond. Today faculty members have to face challenges and obstacles different from those of their predecessors. These factors should be explored in this study to understand what may motivate the faculty.

Exploring and understanding the structure of institutions is necessary to process how the system serves the needs of students and affects the motivation for behavior among faculty members in American higher education (Berger & Calkins, 2003). The size and scope of the institution's mission will be reflected in the goals and objectives motivating the behavior of the faculty members.

Role of Faculty

The role of faculty is important to this study as well as higher education. Questions such as what motivates faculty members, why they make the choices they do, and what motivates them to remain in their positions represent the issues concerning the researcher. Thus it is important to provide the reader with a clear understanding of faculty members, their history, their roles and responsibilities, and the motivating influences and forces to which they are subject. The core values of higher education are intertwined in the roles and responsibilities of faculty members. They are responsible for research, teaching, and service, and are expected to fulfill these roles (Hamrick, 2003) that are critical in fulfilling the academic mission of their institutions. Each role serves as a mechanism for faculty members to share their knowledge with the academic community. However, the emphasis on roles varies widely among institutions (Hamrick).

The primary educational mission of higher education is teaching. Faculty members facilitate the learning process of students, but they are also expected to stay current in their field of study. Some institutions expect faculty to generate new knowledge in their field. As a result, conflicts may occur for faculty members between their roles of research and teaching (Hamrick, 2003). However, regardless of institutional classification, the role of teaching is consistent among faculty, whereas research and service roles may not be interpreted in the same light. The

teaching role takes precedence over the research and service roles at liberal arts colleges, regional universities, and community colleges where teaching takes up most of the faculty's time. However, at research universities, some faculty members hold research-only positions, whereas others are expected to teach in addition to research. In these institutions, teaching is perceived to be less prestigious and less well compensated than conducting research or securing external funding for projects (Hamrick).

Larger institutions see research and knowledge generation as an important part of their mission, but faculty with high profile research programs exhibit greater loyalty to their discipline and disciplinary communities than to their employing institutions (Hamrick, 2003). In contrast, research tends not to be a crucial goal at community colleges and virtual universities, which tend to emphasize the service role—an attempt to give back to the community (Hamrick). In these institutions, teaching is still the primary role of faculty, but often their educational programs also serve the local community. Some level of service is expected of faculty, although tenure-track faculty members may be exempt or discouraged from service commitments so that they can focus on research and teaching. Although some service functions may be prestigious and financially rewarding, research and teaching receive more respect as faculty members advance through the ranks (Hamrick).

Accreditation

According to its Website, The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) is a private, nonprofit national organization that coordinates accreditation activity in the United States. CHEA represents degree-granting colleges and universities as well as institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations. Accreditation is a process of

> external quality review used by higher education to scrutinize colleges, universities and higher education programs for quality assurance and quality improvement. Accreditation in the United States is more than 100 years old. In the United States, accreditation is carried out by private, nonprofit organizations designed for this specific purpose. External quality review of higher education is a non-governmental enterprise. In other countries, accreditation and quality assurance activities are typically carried out by government. (Council for Higher Education, 2001, p. 1)

The American accreditation structure is decentralized, with there being approximately 6,500 accredited schools. These institutions may be public or private, two- or four-year, nonprofit or for-profit. Accreditors are responsible for reviewing colleges and universities across the world. Currently, there are three types of accreditors: regional, national, and specialized; however, there is a move to eliminate regional accreditation and make all institutional accreditation national. As both regional and national accreditors approve public and private, nonprofit and for-profit, two- and four-year institutions, they are responsible for conducting a thorough review of institutional functions. Specialized accreditors approve specific programs or schools, including business, law, and medical schools.

Accreditation serves many purposes. First, accreditation validates that an institution is providing a quality program and meeting the minimum standards while being financially stable. In addition, it assists institutions in determining the transferability of courses as well as corporations who grant tuition assistance to their employees. Accreditation is also mandated for federal student aid funding; for example, federal student aid funds are available to students only if the institution they are attending is accredited by a recognized accrediting organization.

Accreditation of institutions and programs may have a cycle of up to 10 years, as there are not only several steps to the accreditation process, but the accreditors seek continuous improvement of the institution. Periodic reviews are common, and an institution or program seeking accreditation must go through a number of steps stipulated by an accrediting organization. Institutions must compile evidence of accomplishment by the institution, display supporting documentation, and prepare for a site visit.

Accreditation and Distance Education

According to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (n.d.), "17 of the 19 (89.4%) 'recognized' institutional accreditors (regional and national) are actively engaged in scrutinizing distance learning—applying accreditation standards, guidelines or policies to distance learning offerings and degrees to determine academic quality" (p. 1). Yet accreditors are not required to use the same practices in reviewing a DE program, as guidelines may vary according to the type of accreditation body. "The eight regional accrediting commissions are adopting a common platform for review of distance learning" (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, p. 1). However, nine national accreditors have developed individual standards for distance learning. These standards may include additional requirements from the accreditors.

Specialized Accreditation

As previously noted, there are two major accrediting bodies for business programs: the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). The AACSB is a not-for-profit corporation of educational institutions, corporations, and other organizations devoted to the promotion and improvement of higher education in business administration and management. AACSB International is the professional organization for management education and the premier

accrediting agency for bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs in business administration and accounting. This association organized in 1916 now includes more than 927 members worldwide (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, n.d.)

The ACBSP is the leading U.S. accreditation body for business schools and programs whose aim is teaching excellence. Founded in 1988 near Kansas City, MO, ACBSP emphasizes sound and engaged pedagogy in institutions of higher education, encouraging a healthy balance between research and classroom. As one of only two business school accreditation organizations to impact the distribution of US federal student loans, ACBSP plays a vital role in the business education landscape (Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, n.d.).

Summary

This study on assessing job satisfaction of business faculty is a project that will benefit ACBSP, one of the two accrediting agencies for business programs and the one of which the researcher's institution is a member. At the current time, the top officers have a preference for quantitative analysis. Based on the arguments mentioned above, the preferred method for the study was an analysis of online surveys collected from members of the accredited institutions. Questions were based on the guiding standards that need to be fulfilled in order for the institution to receive accreditation and/or reaffirmation. This research contributes information that can be valuable to two of the standards: Standard 5 and Standard 6. Standard 5 highlights faculty and staff focus, so the research on levels of job satisfaction will assist institutions in addressing subsections of this standard. Feedback on DE delivery systems will be valuable to Standard 6, which discusses educational and business process management. Members of the organization

may use the information obtained for the report as they prepare to gain approval and make institutional changes for faculty development and satisfaction.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Based on the parameters of the suggested research, one could categorize it as a descriptive correlational study. Descriptive studies involve observing the subjects without intervening. A descriptive method, such as a survey, is often used as the data collection technique for research when the goal is to provide descriptive information based on established criteria. The study utilized the survey methodology in order to determine the relationships among the variables. The survey involved the study of a large number of subjects drawn from a defined population. The collected information was analyzed to determine how experts in this field can understand the needs and types of incentives required for business faculty teaching in two or more delivery formats, especially distance learning formats. What follows is an explanation of research and sampling design, data collection and analysis process, and measures and procedures, as well as the pilot testing, limitations, and time line of the study.

Research Design

As the crux of the study is to collect data that seek to describe and determine potential perceptions and feelings of a large target population, the researcher determined a quantitative approach to be the most appropriate design for two reasons. First, quantitative research tests theories and tends to make generalizations about the results of the data collected. Second, it is the most appropriate approach when large numbers are involved.

This study solicited feedback from 284 institutions that received ACBSP accreditation for their business programs. The ACBSP Web champions at these institutions were asked to identify

full-time business faculty members who had taught both traditional and distance education (DE) classes within the last 3 years.

Researchers may use the descriptive design when the goal is to gather information about a specific characteristic within a particular area of study. This type of design assisted in finding answers to the first question of the proposed study, which focused on the level of job satisfaction experienced by full-time business faculty teaching traditional and DE courses at ACBSP-accredited colleges and universities according to JDI categories. By using the descriptive design, the researcher was able to collect information about the job satisfaction level of business faculty teaching in different delivery systems based on the different JDI categories.

When a researcher conducts a correlational study, the goal is to determine the relationship between variables. Correlational designs involve correlating data on two or more variables for each individual in a sample and computing a correlation coefficient. Two major purposes for this design are the exploration of causal relationships between variables and prediction of scores on one variable from participants' scores on other variables. Researchers are able to analyze the relationships among a large number of variables in a single study. The second question focuses on whether there is a correlation between certain personal characteristics and a faculty member's level of job satisfaction using the two different formats. The researcher was able to explore and analyze the relationship between each participant's personal characteristics and the level of job satisfaction experienced in each of the delivery systems.

Sampling Design

The target population was full-time business faculty who work at higher education institutions accredited by ACBSP. The sample for the study was based on two criteria: the

faculty member must have taught at least one DE course and at least one traditional course in the past 3 years at an ACBSP-accredited institution.

Data Collection

Surveys were the primary data collection technique, as survey research allowed the researcher to use instruments to gather data from a sample of people in order to measure their attitudes and opinions toward an issue (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996). In survey research, the researcher selects a sample of respondents from a population and administers a standardized questionnaire to them, with the questionnaire being a series of written questions a researcher supplies to subjects and requests their response. Usually the questionnaire is self-administered in that it is posted to the subjects, who are asked to complete it and post it back (Macionis & Plummer, 1998). In this study, the survey was administered to business faculty who taught at institutions accredited by ACBSP. An additional selection criterion was that the faculty member must have taught at least one traditional and at least one asynchronous course during the last 3 years.

Surveys come in a wide range of forms and can be distributed using a variety of media. In general, there are three categories of survey presentations: written, oral, and electronic. With the growth of the Internet and the expanded use of electronic mail for business communication, the electronic survey is becoming a more widely used survey method. According to Dillman and Bowker (2001), "We are witnessing an explosion in the use of Web surveys to collect sample survey information that was previously collected by other modes of surveying" (p. 1). The advantages of e-mail surveys include rapid surveying, less expense, faster transmission, and fewer chances of being ignored as junk mail (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998; Yun & Trumbo, 2000).

In their study, Kiesler and Sproull (1986) found that there were also fewer item completion mistakes and fewer items left blank on e-mail surveys as compared to mail.

Electronic surveys can take many forms. They can be distributed as electronic mail messages sent to potential respondents, or they can be posted as Web page forms on the Internet where they can be reached by nearly everyone anywhere who has Internet access. Given the potential large number of participants for this study, an electronic survey was utilized to collect the data for the two research questions. Although it was possible for a Web-based survey to have sampling bias in certain situations, this was not a major concern of this study because the faculty members had access to a computer and e-mail. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) survey was used in this study to be consistent with a similar study conducted by Susan Neyman (2003).

Measures

Although there are several job satisfaction instruments, the JDI was selected as the instrument for this study. There were two main reasons for this selection. First, it is the same instrument used in the study that is being replicated (Neyman, 2003). Second, this instrument is frequently used in studies conducted in organizational science (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek & Frings-Dresen, 2003).

The JDI, the most widely used measure of job satisfaction in the United States, has recently been modified and renormed (DeMeuse, 1985). The JDI measures five facets of employee satisfaction, which includes satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with co-workers. The JDI was introduced almost 40 years ago (Smith et al., 1969), then modified in 1985 by the JDI Research Group. The 1985 revision resulted in 11 of the original 72 items being

replaced, with the original JDI norms also being updated at that time. However, a national sample was not collected for the 1985 renorming; instead, the old norms were transformed using equipercentile equating (Smith et al., 1987).

The JDI emerged as an ideal instrument for the present study as it is highly regarded and well documented as valid and reliable. According to Kerr (1985), the JDI "possesses good content validity, impressive construct validity, and adequate reliability," and "very few instruments in industrial-organizational psychology have received the attention of researchers that the JDI has" (p. 755). Such scrutiny has revealed high performance of the JDI for all forms of validity, including concurrent, predictive, convergent, and discriminant validities (Kerr). The JDI produced results such as test-retest reliability above 75%, internal consistency of .81, convergent validity of .70, and stability across occupational groups (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The JDI is short and simple to fill out, which seems ideal from the point of view of maximization of response and practicality of scoring. Because it is well-regarded and simple to use, it has been employed in more job satisfaction studies than any other instrument (Crites, 1985); therefore, comparative data can be found. In addition, several studies have been conducted where the instrument was used to measure job satisfaction for faculty (Beach, 1997; Cosgrove, 2003; Dobbins, 1996; Hall, 2003; Maloney, 2003; McCracken, 2001; Neyman, 2002; Rush, 2003; Sullivan, 2001; White, 1998). The use of five different domains provided the researcher with a way to collect information on a variety of areas, thus avoiding the problem found by Flood and Scott (1987) that a study can yield erroneous conclusions if the measurements are too narrow.

The participants were given the opportunity to answer the questions twice on the first five sections of the survey. One set was for their traditional teaching experience, and one was for their distance learning experience. In addition, questions were asked about personal characteristics and demographics. The instrument had seven sections. The first section had questions about the work and work environment associated with teaching in each of the formats. The second section posed questions about the faculty members' immediate supervisor in each of the formats. The third section referred to the faculty members' perception of the compensation they received. The fourth section asked questions about promotion opportunities in each of the formats. The fifth section sought to find out the faculty members' perceptions of their peers. The sixth section requested information about the personal demographics of the faculty, with questions focusing on the faculty members' age, gender, ethnicity, tenure status, faculty rank, institution type, student preparation, and opportunities to get training using DE and technical support. Finally, the seventh section allowed the participants to provide open-ended comments.

The researcher contacted Bowling Green State University for permission to use the JDI. Permission was granted, and the researcher in turn agreed to share the raw data.

Procedures

The researcher compiled a list of ACBSP champions' names and e-mail addresses at ACBSP-accredited colleges and universities. A letter was sent to these individuals requesting a list of names and e-mail addresses of full-time faculty members at each institution who had taught at least one DE course and one traditional course within the past 3 years in the business program at an ACBSP-accredited college or university. The electronic survey was sent to the faculty members who met the above criteria.

The researcher recommended using a four-contact strategy with the target population. The first step was to send a pre-notice letter via e-mail. This allowed the researcher to determine which e-mail addresses were incorrect or invalid. The researcher resolved the problems with e-mail addresses that were returned, with the bad e-mail addresses being considered non-respondents. The second step was to send a survey packet, including a cover letter and a Web link to the survey. The third step was to send a thank-you/reminder e-mail message to all participants. All of the participants who require a fourth contact received a thank-you/reminder e-mail message. The researcher waited at least 10 days before ending the survey. This four-contact strategy required 25 days to complete.

Pilot Testing

A pilot study was conducted by surveying the business faculty at one of the accredited institutions in Region 2. Once the appropriate champion was contacted and had responded, each faculty member received an e-mail message with the online survey link and was asked to complete the survey within 5 days.

Data Analysis

The study sought to determine the level of job satisfaction of full-time faculty members teaching at ACBSP-accredited institutions who have taught at least one DE course and one traditional course within the past 3 years. Two research questions were posed to determine if there is a difference in the level of job satisfaction between the two environments.

Analysis of the first question was based on the responses to the JDI, in which the scores from each of the five categories were summed. The next step was to compare the JDI scores for

each section as they relate to the two delivery systems. The goal was to see if there was a significant difference between the categories relating to distance and traditional instruction methods. Differences between the two formats were analyzed using a paired sample *t* test.

Analysis of the second question was determined by the use of descriptive statistics, ANOVA (analysis of variance), and an independent *t* test. The information from the sixth and seventh sections of the survey were scored and analyzed to determine if there is a significant difference between the two delivery systems based on personal characteristics.

Limitations

Cost and time were potential limitations of the study. However, as Bowling Green State University gave permission for use of the JDI instrument, the cost was minimal and therefore was eliminated as a limitation. Another potential limitation was the faculty members' ability to respond within the time frame. The first phase took longer than expected. Some of the information regarding the Web champions listed in the ACBSP database was not accurate, and the researcher had to inquire as to whom was the appropriate individual to contact. In some cases, the researcher had to contact the department chairs to identify faculty members who potentially matched the criteria of the participants for this study. By the time the researcher sent out the survey to the potential participants, it was the week before the end of the semester for some institutions.

Timeline

Once the target start date was established, the researcher utilized the four-contact strategy. It was anticipated that this strategy would expand over a 25-day period.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

This chapter provides a brief overview of the data collection followed by an analysis of the results. The results of the study are presented in three sections. First, the data collected from four of the five JDI categories are summarized. Responses regarding the instructor's work, pay, opportunity for promotion, and supervision are compared as they apply to teaching a distance course versus teaching in a traditional classroom setting. A paired samples *t* test is used. As faculty members have the same colleagues regardless of whether they teach a distance or traditional course, the questions regarding the instructor's co-workers were asked only once and are reported using descriptive statistics. Questions regarding the respondents' general feelings about the job follow this format as well. This information addresses the first research question.

The second section analyzes the job satisfaction from teaching DE courses based upon the respondents' demographics. Job satisfaction from teaching distance courses is compared based upon the following demographics (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) number of years teaching in higher education, (e) type of institution, (f) ACBSP type of institution, (g) tenure status, (h) rank, (i) availability of technical support for faculty, (j) faculty training in using distance education, and (k) student preparation. The demographic comparisons are made using independent *t* tests, ANOVA, and descriptive statistics. The independent *t* test and ANOVA are used to calculate the demographic comparisons as they relate to the respondents' job satisfaction levels on the JDI and JIG categories in a DE environment. The independent *t* test will be used for the gender and institution type categories as there are only two sample groups. ANOVA will be used for the other categories as there are more than two sample groups. This information addresses the second research question.

The final section summarizes the comments provided by survey respondents to each of the open-ended questions.

Overview of Data Collection

The institutions included in the study were divided into categories based on the designated ACBSP region. According to the ACBSP database, the make-up of the accredited institutions was as follows: twenty-seven institutions in Region 1; thirty-eight institutions in Region 2; seventy-seven institutions in Region 3; sixty-three institutions in Region 4; twenty-three institutions in Region 5; forty-five institutions in Region 6; and eleven institutions in Region 7. Region 8 was left out of the study because the membership is composed of international institutions and the dissertation committee agreed that cultural characteristics could skew the results.

On October 31, 2006, the initial e-mail (Appendix A) describing the survey was sent the ACBSP champions of institutions accredited by ACBSP. They were asked to submit the names and contact information for full-time business faculty who met the established criteria of the study. Thirty-five ACBSP champions were able to provide information they believed would assist in this study. The distribution over the regions was as follows: three institutions from Region 1; twelve institutions from Region 2; fifteen institutions from Region 3; eight institutions from Region 4; ten institutions from Region 5; one institution from Region 6; and one institution from Region 7.

There were a variety of reasons given as to why the other institutions chose not to participate. Two Web champions indicated their institutions would not be able to participate, but a specific reason was not given. Five Web champions indicated their institutions would not

allow them to provide the contact information, but the researcher could go to their Websites to contact the business faculty directly. One institution on the list is no longer accredited by ACBSP. A number of schools indicated either (a) their institution did not have a DE program, or (b) the full-time business faculty did not teach in the DE program. This revelation led the researcher to add two assumptions to the study (a) the institutions had a DE program, and (b) full-time faculty had the opportunity to teach DE courses.

Based on the names and e-mail addresses supplied, an invitation to complete the research survey was sent to 461 individuals on November 20, 2006. Twenty-four of the invitations bounced back due to a problem with the e-mail message not being able to go through the institution's server. Thirty-four individuals contacted the researcher and indicated that they and/or other faculty members at their school did not meet the criteria for the survey and were thus unable to participate. Overall, 174 individuals viewed the survey. Of these 146 participants (84%) started the survey, and 119 participants completed the entire survey, making the completion rate 82%. The average time it took for the participants to complete the survey was 14 minutes.

Susan Neyman (2002) conducted a study on job satisfaction of full-time business faculty in institutions accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). The ACBSP joins the AACSB as the other of the two largest recognized accrediting bodies for business schools. The purpose of this study was to replicate Neyman's research by surveying the full-time business faculty in the ACBSP.

This study focused on two areas. First, the research sought to determine if there was a difference in the level of job satisfaction between teaching a traditional class versus a DE course. The research focused on those professors who have taught both traditional classroom courses and

at least one DE course within the last 3 years. The study asked participants 144 questions with reference to traditional instruction methods, then the same questions as they applied to distance education. Five facets of job satisfaction were measured using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). These dimensions include (a) the work itself, (b) supervision, (c) pay, (d) promotions, and (e) co-workers. Second, the study was designed to find out if there was a correlation between faculty job satisfaction and certain characteristics such as (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) number of years teaching in higher education, (e) type of institution, (f) ACBSP type of institution, (g) tenure status, (h) rank, (i) availability of technical support for faculty, (j) faculty training in using distance education, and (k) student preparation.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

Is there a difference in job satisfaction from teaching a traditional course versus teaching a distance course as experienced by full-time faculty members who have taught both traditional and DE courses at an ACBSP-accredited college of business in the last 3 years?

Analysis of Job Descriptive Index Categories

The questions contained in the JDI were divided into five categories relating to instruction. After the data was collected, the categories were scored according to the JDI coding guidelines. The possible range of scores for each category is from 0 to 54. A score of 27 is the middle of the range and considered the midpoint or neutral zone. According to the JDI manual, "scores well above 27 (i.e. 32 or above) indicate satisfaction and scores well below 27 (i.e. 22 or below) indicate dissatisfaction" (p. 24).

The categories regarding work, pay, promotion, and supervision were analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test comparing the DE responses to the traditional teaching responses. The descriptive statistics from the JDI category regarding co-workers and the Job in General (JIG) category are also reported. The results from the analysis of each segment follows.

Work on present job. The questionnaire had 18 questions regarding teaching. The analysis of the responses to the questions in the JDI category regarding the instructor's work revealed a statistically significant difference at the .05 level between teaching a distance course and teaching a traditional class (see Table 1). The analysis was based on the mean scores of the respondents which evidenced statistically significant differences. Based on the JDI formula, the data revealed that the respondents were satisfied with their work—teaching. The mean for the traditional model was 44 and the mean for the DE platform was 40.

Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Appendix E1) to each of the questions listed in the work category for both delivery systems, it was found that approximately 16% of the respondents chose not to answer these questions by leaving them blank. The statistics for frequencies of responses revealed most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes. Although this trend was seen in both delivery systems, the trend was stronger in the traditional model. However, there were two categories where the responses were almost split between yes and no. In spite of the majority of the respondents stating that the work was not routine or repetitive, 40.4% of the DE responses and 37.7% of traditional responses indicated it was routine. In addition, 31.5% of the traditional responses and 37% of the DE responses indicated the work was repetitive. Also, 63% of the respondents were not sure when asked the question about using their abilities in the DE format, but none of the respondents felt this way in the traditional format.

Pay. The section of the JDI that asked questions about compensation consisted of nine questions. The analysis of the responses to the questions in the JDI category regarding the instructor's pay revealed a statistically significant difference at the .05 level between the pay for teaching a distance course and for teaching a traditional class (see Table 2). The analysis was based on the mean scores of the respondents which evidenced statistically significant differences. Based on the JDI formula, the data revealed that the respondents were satisfied (M = 33) with their pay as it related to the traditional model. However, the respondents were somewhat neutral (M = 26) in their feelings about pay for teaching DE courses. Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Appendix E2) to each of the questions listed in the pay category, it was found that approximately 15% of the respondents for the traditional model and approximately 20% of the respondents for the distance education model chose not to answer this question. Although 58% of the respondents thought the pay for teaching DE courses was not bad, 43% of the respondents thought the salary was less than they deserved and 45% of the respondents believed they were not paid well for teaching DE courses, with 37% believing they were underpaid.

Table 1. Comparison Between the Work Involved in Teaching a Distance Education Course and Teaching in a Traditional Classroom

Paired Samples Statistics	N	Mean	Paired Differences	*t*	*df*	Significance*
Traditional	122	44				
Distance	122	40				
			Traditional vs. Distance	2.782	121	.006

Note. Table 1 report the means and differences calculated for both the traditional and DE delivery systems as they relate to the JDI category of questions regarding the different aspects of work. Narrative information can be found in the text preceding Table 1. *p < .05, two-tailed.

Table 2. Comparison Between the Pay for Teaching a Distance Education Course and the Compensation for Teaching in a Traditional Classroom

Paired Samples Statistics	N	Mean	Paired Differences	*t*	*df*	Significance*
Traditional	124	33				
Distance	124	26				
			Traditional vs. Distance	5.070	123	.000

Note. Table 2 reports the means and differences calculated for both the traditional and DE delivery systems as they relate to the JDI category of questions regarding the different aspects of pay. Narrative information can be found in the text preceding Table 2. *p < .05, two-tailed.

Promotion. The questionnaire contained nine questions. The analysis of the responses to the JDI category that asked about opportunities for promotion revealed no significant difference at the .05 level (see Table 3). A comparison of the mean scores indicates no statistically significant differences between the potential for promotion for teaching a distance course and for teaching a traditional classroom course. Based on the JDI formula, the data revealed that the respondents were somewhat neutral about promotion opportunities in both delivery systems. The mean for the traditional model was 26, and the mean for the DE platform was 29. The demographics and open-ended comments section could possibly shed light on these results. As approximately 24% of the respondents were full professors, they may have marked "not sure" on many of the questions because the rank of full professor is the highest level at many institutions, as usually there are no other opportunities for promotion after obtaining full professorship.

Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Appendix E3) to each of the questions listed in the promotion category for teaching DE courses, it was found that approximately 10.3% of the respondents chose not to answer this question for the traditional model, and 33.0% of the respondents from the distance model left the question blank. It appears there was difficulty in answering the questions when it came to promotion opportunities. In addition, there were three questions where the responses to *yes* and no were almost evenly divided. These questions included (a) promotion on ability, (b) infrequent promotions, (c) good chance for promotion, and (d) fairly good chance for promotions. On a positive note, 60% of the respondents believed the promotion policy was fair for the traditional model. However, only 45% of the respondents felt the same when answering the question on the DE model.

Supervision. The questionnaire contained 18 questions about the instructor's supervisor. The analysis of the responses to the JDI category that asked questions about the instructor's supervisor revealed no significant difference at the .05 level (see Table 4). A comparison of the mean scores indicate no statistically significant differences between supervision received in teaching a distance course and in teaching a traditional classroom course. Based on the JDI formula, the data revealed that the respondents were satisfied with the supervision they received in both delivery systems. The mean for the traditional model was 42, and the mean for the DE platform was 39.

Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Appendix E4) to each of the questions listed in the supervisor category for teaching DE courses, it was found that approximately 17% of the respondents chose not to answer these questions by leaving them blank. The rate was approximately 10% for teaching traditional courses. The statistics for frequencies of responses reveal most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes in both delivery systems. However, there was a question (favoritism) where the responses were close between yes and no.

Co-workers. As instructors have the same faculty colleagues regardless of whether they teach distance or traditional courses, the questions about colleagues were not repeated for both types of teaching methods. Instead the question was only asked once about faculty colleagues. There were 18 questions in this category. The following summary of descriptive statistics provides an overview of faculty colleagues as perceived by instructors who have taught at least one distance course and one traditional course in the past 3 years.

Table 3. Comparison Between the Potential for Promotion for Teaching a Distance Education Course and Teaching in a Traditional Classroom

Paired Samples Statistics	N	Mean	Paired Differences	*t*	*df*	Significance*
Traditional	97	26				
Distance	97	29				
			Traditional vs. Distance	-1.142	97	.256

Note. Table 3 reports the means and differences calculated for both the traditional and distance education delivery systems as they relate to the JDI category of questions regarding the different aspects of promotion opportunities. Narrative information can be found in the text preceding Table 3. *p > .05, two-tailed.

Table 4. Comparison Between the Supervisor for Teaching a Distance Education Course and Teaching in a Traditional Classroom

Paired Samples Statistics	N	Mean	Paired Differences	*t*	*df*	Significance*
Traditional	123	42				
Distance	123	39				
			Traditional vs. Distance	.952	122	.343

Note. Table 4 reports the means and differences calculated for both the traditional and DE delivery systems as they relate to the JDI category of questions regarding the different aspects of supervision. Narrative information can be found in the text preceding Table 4. *p > .05, two-tailed.

Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Appendix E5) to each of the questions listed in the co-worker category, it was found that approximately 10% of the respondents chose not to answer these questions by leaving them blank. The statistics for frequencies of responses reveal most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes. However, there was a question regarding whether co-workers were "fast" where the responses were almost evenly split between yes and no, with 42% of the respondents believing that co-workers were not quick enough and 38% believing their co-workers were fast.

General comments about job. There were 18 questions in this section. As the purpose of this section was to get a "big picture view" of how faculty felt about their jobs in general, the questions were not repeated for both types of teaching methods. Instead the questions were asked only once to get the respondent's opinion about the job as a whole. The summary of descriptive statistics provides an overview of faculty colleagues as perceived by instructors who have taught at least one distance course and one traditional course in the past 3 years.

Upon review of the frequencies of responses (see Table E6) to each of the questions listed in the JIG category, it was found that approximately 20% of the respondents chose not to answer these questions by leaving them blank. The statistics for frequencies of responses reveal most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes. However, there were two questions where the responses were almost equally split between yes and no. The questions that fell into this category focused on whether the respondents felt their job was superior and ideal. Although approximately 34% of the respondents felt their job was ideal, 30% of the respondents did not

believe their job was ideal or were not sure how they felt. Forty-two percent of the respondents felt teaching was superior and 28% of the respondents felt that it was not superior.

Research Question 2

Is there a difference in the job satisfaction level gained from teaching DE as experienced by full-time faculty in ACBSP-accredited colleges of business who have taught at least one distance course in the past 3 years, based on the following characteristics (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) number of years teaching in higher education, (e) type of institution, (f) ACBSP type of institution, (g) tenure status, (h) rank, (i) availability of technical support for faculty, (j) faculty training in using distance education, and (k) student preparation?

Personal Characteristics

Seventy-two percent of the respondents were between the ages of 43 and 60. Fifty-two percent of the respondents were female. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were Caucasian. Of the minorities who participated in the study, 2% were Asian, 1% was Hispanic, 1% was Native American, 1% was Biracial, and 6% were African American.

Although there was diversity in the number of years that the participants taught in higher education, 20% of the participants had worked between 6 and 10 years in higher education. Eighty-four percent of the participants were employed at a public institution, and 57% of the participants worked at institutions that offered associates degrees. Seventy-six percent of the survey participants were either instructors or assistant/full professors. Over half (59%) of the participants reported they were non-tenured.

Almost one third (30%) of the respondents had teaching as their top responsibility with advising (23%) as a close second, which supports ACBSP's emphasis on teaching excellence. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents taught Web-based courses. During the last 3 years, 21% of

the respondents taught the same DE course, and 45% of the respondents taught 2-3 different courses. The results for traditional classes were the opposite. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents taught more than ten different traditional classes during the last three years. There could be a variety of explanations for these results. For example, there may not be opportunities for the instructors to teach DE courses. One of the instructors who did not meet the criteria indicated that although she wanted the opportunity to teach more DE courses, she did not have the chance because the more senior instructors requested them.

The survey results indicate that 63% of the respondents stated DE courses were staffed by faculty who volunteered to teach them. An exploration of the selection process for DE assignments may have provided information on the probability of full-time faculty utilization. Ninety-five percent of classes were taught by respondents who had an enrollment of 1 to 60 students, and 78% of the instructors indicated they had taught undergraduate classes.

Twenty percent of classes taught by participants were in the field of management, 14% were marketing, 12% were accounting, and 11% were in the area of information technology. However, approximately 18% of the classes were subjects that were not listed in the study. With the exception of the "other" category, the allocation of courses taught are similar to the distribution that Neyman (2002) found in her study. Neyman reported that "40% of classes taught by participants were in the field of management, 17% were marketing, 12% were accounting classes, and 12% were in the area of information systems" (p. 141). She believed that there could be a response bias stemming from the faculty member's field of expertise. Her conclusion was based on the fact that management and marketing faculty may be more inclined than accounting faculty to respond to a survey of this nature because of their profession.

Over half (54%) agreed that the compensation for teaching DE courses was adequate, and 80% of the respondents stated that teaching DE courses was a part of their regular teaching load. Only 12% of the respondents indicated that DE courses were considered overloads. Technical support was given high ratings with 77% of the respondents agreeing that technical support was adequate, and 73% of the respondents agreeing that DE training was adequate. On a scale of 1-5 (1=least prepared, 5=most prepared) for student preparedness, the average score for DE students was 2.76 compared to 2.94 for traditional classroom students. Although these results indicate the perception was that traditional students were more adequately prepared, the frequency of respondents showed most of them had a neutral feeling as to whether the students were adequately prepared (52% for distance education compared to 54% for traditional).

According to Tello and Crewson (2003), tests to determine statistical difference are involved any time there are reports with means. To confirm whether there is a statistically significant difference between groups that are measured with the same variables, a test must be conducted. Independent *t* tests and ANOVA were used to compare the levels of job satisfaction in a DE environment with personal and professional characteristics. Both of these tests will assist the researcher in determining whether the differences between the means of two or more samples are significant. When $p < .05$, the researcher concludes the group mean is significantly different from the constant. The independent *t* test will be used for the gender and institution type categories as there are only two sample groups. ANOVA will be used for the other categories as there are more than two sample groups.

Gender. The data concerning the gender of the respondents was compared to the means of the five JDI categories (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers) in addition to the

JIG category using an independent *t* test. A summary is provided for each of these categories, while Tables 5 and 6 list the statistics for further review. The Levene Test was not significant ($p > .05$) in any of the categories; therefore, equal variance assumed is appropriate, and the difference between the means is not significant. The effect sizes were small.

Age. The respondents were asked to provide their age based on the following categories: (a) 25-33, (b) 34-42, (c) 43-51, (d) 52-60, (e) 61-68, and (f) over 68. The data concerning the age of the respondents was compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, age does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories. However, the Levene statistic was not significant at the .05 level for the pay, promotion, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but was statistically significant for the work category. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the six groups formed by age are not homogenous in variances for the pay, promotion, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the work category. A summary is provided for each of these categories and can be reviewed in Table 7.

Ethnicity. The respondents were asked to provide their ethnicity based on the following categories (a) Caucasian, (b) African American, (c) Hispanic, (d) Asian, (e) Native American, (f) Biracial, and (f) Other. The data concerning the ethnicity of the respondents was compared to means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for five of the categories (work, promotion, supervision, co-worker, and JIG), but was statistically significant for the pay category. However, the Levene statistic was not

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics Regarding Instructor Gender and the JDI/JIG Categories

Category	N	M	SD
Work			
Male	58	39.3448	12.05769
Female	64	39.8125	10.58432
Pay			
Male	59	25.8305	10.69507
Female	65	25.8462	10.29143
Promotion			
Male	46	31.0435	17.89718
Female	51	26.2745	17.51351
Supervision			
Male	59	40.2203	14.86847
Female	64	39.4063	15.87623
Co-Worker			
Male	59	38.3220	13.15615
Female	64	42.3906	12.54784
JIG			
Male	56	44.5536	11.04687
Female	63	44.0159	10.65060

Table 6. Independent *t* Test for Gender of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories

Category	*df*	*t*	p	ES
Work				
Equal variances assumed	120.000	-.228	.820	.041
Equal variances not assumed	114.074	-.228	.821	
Pay				
Equal variances assumed	122.000	-.008	.993	.002
Equal variances not assumed	119.784	-.008	.993	
Promotion				
Equal variances assumed	95.000	1.325	.188	.269
Equal variances not assumed	93.517	1.324	.189	
Supervision				
Equal variances assumed	121.000	.293	.770	.071
Equal variances not assumed	120.987	.293	.770	
Co-Worker				
Equal variances assumed	121.000	-1.755	.082	.212
Equal variances not assumed	119.013	-1.752	.082	
JIG				
Equal variances assumed	117.000	.270	.788	.050
Equal variances not assumed	114.247	.270	.788	

Table 7. Analysis of Variance for Age of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source	SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work						
Between Groups	779.885	5	155.977	1.242	.294	.103
Within Groups	14571.623	116	125.617			
Total	15351.508	121				
Pay						
Between Groups	755.545	5	151.109	1.409	.226	.109
Within Groups	12657.229	118	107.265			
Total	13412.774	123				
Promotion						
Between Groups	2229.871	5	445.974	1.446	.216	.125
Within Groups	28070.253	91	308.464			
Total	30300.124	96				
Supervision						
Between Groups	451.276	5	90.255	.374	.866	.056
Within Groups	28270.642	117	241.629			
Total	28721.919	122				
Co-Worker						
Between Groups	472.735	5	94.547	.553	.736	.069
Within Groups	19993.557	117	170.885			
Total	20466.293	122				
JIG						
Between Groups	405.613	5	81.123	.687	.634	.078
Within Groups	13347.782	113	118.122			
Total	13753.395	118				

significant at the .05 level for the pay, work, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but was statistically significant for the promotion category. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the seven groups formed by ethnicity are not homogenous in variances for the pay, work, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the promotion category. A summary is provided for each of these categories, and can be reviewed in Table 8.

Number of years teaching in higher education. The respondents were asked to provide their number of years experience teaching in higher education based on the following categories (a) 1-5 years, (b) 6-10 years, (c) 11-15 years, (d) 16-20 years, (e) 21-25 years, (f) 26-30 years, and (f) more than 30 years. The data concerning the teaching experience of the respondents was compared to means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, an instructor's number of years teaching in higher education does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories. However, the Levene statistic was not significant at the .05 level for the pay, work, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but was statistically significant for the promotion category. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the six groups formed by years of teaching experience are not homogenous in variances for the pay, work, supervision, co-worker, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the promotion category. A summary is provided for each of these categories, and can be reviewed in Table 9.

Type of institution. The data concerning the type of institution which the respondents work was compared to the means of the five JDI categories (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers) in addition to the JIG category using an independent *t* test. A summary is

Table 8. Analysis of Variance for Ethnicity of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source	SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work						
Between Groups	960.552	6	160.092	1.269	.278	.105
Within Groups	14261.240	113	126.206			
Total	15221.792	119				
Pay						
Between Groups	1394.638	6	232.440	2.246	.044	.139
Within Groups	11903.755	115	103.511			
Total	13298.393	121				
Promotion						
Between Groups	1294.540	6	215.757	.661	.681	.086
Within Groups	28706.892	88	326.215			
Total	30001.432	94				
Supervision						
Between Groups	472.885	6	78.814	.321	.925	.053
Within Groups	27970.074	114	245.352			
Total	28442.959	120				
Co-Worker						
Between Groups	451.592	6	75.265	.432	.856	.061
Within Groups	19877.185	114	174.361			
Total	20328.777	120				
JIG						
Between Groups	278.308	6	46.385	.381	.890	.059
Within Groups	13404.462	110	121.859			
Total	13682.769	116				

Table 9. Analysis of Variance for Instructor's Years of Teaching Experience and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	581.067	6	96.844	.754	.607	.081
	Within Groups	14770.442	115	128.439			
	Total	15351.508	121				
Pay							
	Between Groups	1019.187	6	169.864	1.604	.152	.116
	Within Groups	12393.587	117	105.928			
	Total	13412.774	123				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	3238.962	6	539.827	1.795	.109	.140
	Within Groups	27061.162	90	300.680			
	Total	30300.124	96				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	1949.042	6	324.840	1.407	.218	.110
	Within Groups	26772.877	116	230.801			
	Total	28721.919	122				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	456.490	6	76.082	.441	.850	.062
	Within Groups	20009.803	116	172.498			
	Total	20466.293	122				
JIG							
	Between Groups	698.985	6	116.497	.999	.429	.094
	Within Groups	13054.410	112	116.557			
	Total	13753.395	118				

provided for each of these categories, and Tables 10 and 11 list the statistics for further review. The Levene Test was not significant ($p > .05$) in any of the categories; therefore, equal variance assumed is appropriate, and the difference between the means is not significant. The effect sizes were small.

ACBSP type of institution. The respondents were asked to provide their institution's ACBSP type based on the following categories (a) Associates, (b) Associates and Bachelor/Graduate, (c) Bachelor and Graduate, and (d) not sure. The data concerning the respondents' ACBSP type of institution were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for five of the categories (work, promotion, supervision, co-worker, and JIG), but was statistically significant for the pay category. As the Levene statistic is not significant at the .05 level, the researcher concludes that the four groups formed by the institution's ACBSP type are not homogenous in variances. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 12.

Tenure status. The respondents were asked to provide their tenure status based on the following categories (a) Tenured, (b) Non-tenured, Tenured track, and (c) Non-tenured track. The data concerning the tenure of the respondents were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, tenure does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics Regarding Institution Type and the JDI/JIG Categories

Category	N	M	SD
Work			
Public	102	39.3725	11.41731
Private	20	40.7000	10.65290
Pay			
Public	104	25.8269	10.72556
Private	20	25.9000	9.07222
Promotion			
Public	83	27.6867	17.61508
Private	14	33.5714	18.48373
Supervision			
Public	103	39.6505	15.40353
Private	20	40.5500	15.40155
Co-Worker			
Public	103	39.6699	13.15615
Private	20	44.4000	12.54784
JIG			
Public	99	43.7475	10.97803
Private	20	46.8500	9.68599

Table 11. Independent *t* Test for Gender of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories

Category	*df*	*t*	p	ES
Work				
Equal variances assumed	120.000	-.480	.632	.120
Equal variances not assumed	28.253	-.503	.619	
Pay				
Equal variances assumed	122.000	-.029	.977	.007
Equal variances not assumed	30.184	-.032	.975	
Promotion				
Equal variances assumed	95.000	-1.148	.254	.326
Equal variances not assumed	17.224	-1.109	.283	
Supervision				
Equal variances assumed	121.000	.239	.812	.058
Equal variances not assumed	26.908	.239	.813	
Co-Worker				
Equal variances assumed	121.000	-1.502	.136	.368
Equal variances not assumed	36.525	-1.921	.063	
JIG				
Equal variances assumed	117.000	-1.174	.243	.300
Equal variances not assumed	29.753	-1.276	.212	

Table 12. Analysis of Variance for Instructor's ACBSP Type of Institution and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	643.867	3	214.622	1.712	.168	.120
	Within Groups	14666.216	117	125.352			
	Total	15310.083	120				
Pay							
	Between Groups	948.575	3	316.192	3.023	.032	.157
	Within Groups	12446.742	119	104.594			
	Total	13395.317	122				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	691.616	3	230.539	.719	.543	.088
	Within Groups	29496.342	92	320.612			
	Total	30187.958	95				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	356.035	3	118.678	.513	.674	.066
	Within Groups	27281.440	118	231.199			
	Total	27637.475	121				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	243.141	3	81.047	.501	.682	.065
	Within Groups	19095.818	118	161.829			
	Total	19338.959	121				
JIG							
	Between Groups	28.670	3	9.557	.083	.969	.027
	Within Groups	13080.796	114	114.744			
	Total	13109.466	117				

However, the Levene statistic was not significant at the .05 level for the pay, work, supervision, promotion, and JIG categories, but was statistically significant for the co-worker category. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the three groups formed by tenure status are not homogenous in variances for the pay, work, supervision, promotion, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the co-worker category. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 13.

Rank. The respondents were asked to provide their rank based on the following categories (a) Instructor, (b) Assistant Professor, (c) Associate Professor, (d) Full Professor, (e) University Professor, and (f) Visiting Professor. The data concerning the rank of the respondents were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, rank does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories. However, the Levene statistic was not significant at the .05 level for the work, supervision, promotion, co-worker, and JIG categories, but was statistically significant for the pay category. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the six groups formed by rank are not homogenous in variances for the work, supervision, promotion, co-worker, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the pay category. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 14.

Technical support for faculty. The respondents were asked to provide their perception of technical support based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. The data concerning the respondents' perception of technical support were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis

Table 13. Analysis of Variance for Tenure Status of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	130.401	2	65.201	.553	.577	.069
	Within Groups	13787.566	117	117.842			
	Total	13917.967	119				
Pay							
	Between Groups	41.711	2	20.856	.187	.829	.040
	Within Groups	13248.813	119	111.335			
	Total	13290.525	121				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	647.322	2	323.661	1.021	.364	.104
	Within Groups	29494.011	93	317.140			
	Total	30141.333	95				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	1055.591	2	527.795	2.285	.106	.138
	Within Groups	27256.194	118	230.985			
	Total	28311.785	120				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	361.639	2	180.820	1.074	.345	.095
	Within Groups	19862.014	118	168.322			
	Total	20223.653	120				
JIG							
	Between Groups	165.866	2	82.933	.701	.498	.078
	Within Groups	13488.715	114	118.322			
	Total	13654.581	116				

Table 14. Analysis of Variance for Rank of Instructor and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work	Between Groups	651.183	6	108.531	.849	.535	.086
	Within Groups	14700.325	115	127.829			
	Total	15351.508	121				
Pay	Between Groups	666.173	6	111.029	1.019	.416	.093
	Within Groups	12746.601	117	108.945			
	Total	13412.774	123				
Promotion	Between Groups	638.362	6	106.394	.323	.923	.060
	Within Groups	29661.762	90	329.575			
	Total	30300.124	96				
Supervision	Between Groups	1033.819	6	172.303	.722	.633	.079
	Within Groups	27688.100	116	238.691			
	Total	28721.919	122				
Co-Worker	Between Groups	158.208	6	26.368	.151	.989	.036
	Within Groups	20308.085	116	175.070			
	Total	20466.293	122				
JIG	Between Groups	876.508	6	146.085	1.271	.277	.106
	Within Groups	12876.887	112	114.972			
	Total	13753.395	118				

of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, perception of technical support does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories. As the Levene statistic is not significant at the .05 level, the researcher concludes that the five Likert categories are not homogenous in variances. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 15.

Faculty training in distance education. The respondents were asked to provide their perception of technical support based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. The data concerning the respondents' perception of faculty training were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, the respondents' perception of faculty training does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories. As the Levene statistic is not significant at the .05 level, the researcher concludes that the five Likert categories are not homogenous in variances. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 16.

Student preparation. The respondents were asked to provide their perception of student preparation for taking DE courses based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. The data concerning the respondents' perception of student preparation were compared to the means of the five JDI categories in addition to the JIG category using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, and the analysis was not significant for any of the categories. Therefore, the respondents' perception of student preparation does not make a difference in JDI and JIG categories.

Table 15. Analysis of Variance for Instructor's Perception of Technical Support and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	282.518	3	94.173	.729	.537	.079
	Within Groups	14849.061	115	129.122			
	Total	15131.580	118				
Pay							
	Between Groups	153.750	3	51.250	.461	.710	.063
	Within Groups	12997.059	117	111.086			
	Total	13150.810	120				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	1138.210	3	379.403	1.204	.313	.114
	Within Groups	28671.221	91	315.068			
	Total	29809.432	94				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	308.188	3	102.729	.427	.734	.061
	Within Groups	27931.804	116	240.791			
	Total	28239.992	119				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	1293.297	3	431.099	2.621	.054	.149
	Within Groups	19075.903	116	164.447			
	Total	20369.200	119				
JIG							
	Between Groups	26.507	3	8.836	.074	.974	.026
	Within Groups	13395.734	112	119.605			
	Total	13422.241	115				

Table 16. Analysis of Variance for Instructor's Perception of Faculty Training and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	834.740	4	208.685	1.664	.163	.120
	Within Groups	14296.840	114	125.411			
	Total	15131.580	118				
Pay							
	Between Groups	564.652	4	141.163	1.301	.274	.105
	Within Groups	12586.158	116	108.501			
	Total	13150.810	120				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	704.641	4	176.160	.545	.703	.078
	Within Groups	29104.791	90	323.387			
	Total	29809.432	94				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	509.221	4	127.305	.528	.715	.068
	Within Groups	27730.770	115	241.137			
	Total	28239.992	119				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	827.388	4	206.847	1.217	.307	.102
	Within Groups	19541.812	115	169.929			
	Total	20369.200	119				
JIG							
	Between Groups	788.720	4	197.180	1.732	.148	.123
	Within Groups	12633.522	111	113.816			
	Total	13422.241	115				

However, although the Levene statistic was not significant at the .05 level for the pay, work, co-worker, and JIG categories, it was statistically significant for the promotion and supervision categories. Based on this information, the researcher concluded that the five-point Likert scale groups are not homogenous in variances for the pay, work, co-worker, and JIG categories, but the groups are homogenous in variances for the promotion and supervision categories. A summary is provided for each of these categories that can be reviewed in Table 17.

Comments. Two questions gave the respondents an opportunity to provide narrative comments about the study. The specific comments are listed in Appendix I. The questions were (a) are there any additional comments that you would like to include? and (b) do you have any suggestions or recommendations for future survey/research? Major themes for the first question focused on (a) supervision, (b) student interaction, (c) favoritism, (d) promotions, (e) class hour time, (f) survey design, and (g) administration and support. Major themes for the second question focused on (a) survey design, (b) administrative leadership, (c) promotions, (d) graduate perception and satisfaction with traditional versus DE courses, and (e) study on individual school and separate disciplinary averages.

Table 17. Analysis of Variance for Instructor's Perception of Student Preparation and the JDI/JIG Categories Regarding Teaching Distance Education Courses

Source		SS	*df*	MS	F	P	ES
Work							
	Between Groups	399.862	4	99.965	.774	.545	.082
	Within Groups	14731.718	114	129.226			
	Total	15131.580	118				
Pay							
	Between Groups	367.160	4	91.790	.833	.507	.084
	Within Groups	12783.650	116	110.204			
	Total	13150.810	120				
Promotion							
	Between Groups	514.145	4	128.536	.395	.812	.066
	Within Groups	29295.287	90	325.503			
	Total	29809.432	94				
Supervision							
	Between Groups	1721.009	4	430.252	1.866	.121	.126
	Within Groups	26518.982	115	230.600			
	Total	28239.992	119				
Co-Worker							
	Between Groups	993.857	4	248.464	1.475	.214	.112
	Within Groups	19375.343	115	168.481			
	Total	20369.200	119				
JIG							
	Between Groups	219.153	4	54.788	.461	.764	.064
	Within Groups	13203.089	111	118.947			
	Total	13422.241	115				

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a brief overview of the study followed by findings, conclusions, and recommendations. It also presents a profile of the survey respondents participating in the study. Following the overview, the chapter indicates conclusions deduced from the study along with recommendations for practitioners, and finally, directions for further research.

Overview of the Study

A study was conducted to determine if there are differences between the level of job satisfaction from teaching distance courses and teaching in the traditional classroom. Additionally, the study examined the differences in job satisfaction vis-à-vis selected faculty characteristics and professional demographics.

The data collection instrument was the Job Descriptive Index (Smith et al., 1969). The questionnaire was composed of questions about five general aspects of the instructor's job: work involved, supervisor, compensation, opportunity for promotion, and colleagues. In addition, a section inquired about personal, professional, and institutional demographics for each respondent. A survey was distributed to the ACBSP champions at 284 ACBSP-accredited institutions in the United States. In all, 461 instructors from 50 institutions received the survey, producing 119 completed questionnaires from instructors who indicated they had taught at least one DE course and one traditional classroom course in the last 3 years. A profile of instructors in ACBSP-accredited colleges of business who have taught a distance course and a traditional course in the past 3 years was developed.

Findings

The findings of this study provide answers to the two research questions raised; they are summarized in the following discussion. The first research question addressed was: "Is there a difference in the job satisfaction experienced from teaching a traditional classroom course versus teaching a distance course by full-time business faculty members who taught both DE and traditional classes in an ACBSP-accredited college of business in the last 3 years?" The data compiled in this study suggest that there are statistically significant as well as insignificant differences between job satisfaction achieved from teaching distance courses and teaching a traditional classroom. Based on a confidence level of 95%, the JDI categories of work and pay produced statistically significant differences, whereas the categories of promotion and supervision produced no statistically significant differences.

Once the JDI formula was calculated, the data revealed that the respondents were satisfied with their work—teaching. The mean for the traditional model was 44 and the mean for the DE platform was 40. In the work category, the statistics for frequencies of responses revealed most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes. Although this trend was seen in both delivery systems, the trend was stronger in the traditional model. Preziosi and Gooden (2003) found that business faculty members were more satisfied when they taught traditional courses versus DE courses. The faculty believed they had a greater impact on the students' learning outcomes when they were in a physical classroom. Another explanation for this finding could be connected to the responses that were given for the questions regarding use of ability. Sixty-three percent of the respondents were not sure when asked the question about using their abilities in the DE format, but none of the respondents felt this way in the traditional format.

There appears to be a greater level of confidence in skill set when teaching in the traditional environment.

Although the respondents were satisfied with their pay for teaching traditional courses, they were somewhat neutral in their feelings about pay for teaching DE courses. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents thought the pay for teaching DE courses was not bad, 43% of the respondents thought the salary was less than they deserved and 45% of the respondents believed that they were not paid well for teaching DE courses. These results are consistent with other studies that found faculty members were not fully satisfied with the salary for teaching DE courses. Wolcott (1997) found the faculty to be concerned about the equity of rewards for DE teaching, as the members do not believe they are receiving the recognition for individual work and pay increases they deserve for their efforts in supporting institutional goals.

The responses and comment section provided possible explanations as to why there was no statistically significant differences in the promotion and supervision category. The full professors were unsure as to how to answer these questions because they had no other opportunities for promotion. In addition, the organizational structure had some faculty reporting to more than one person. Therefore, some of the respondents may have found it hard to focus on a single person when answering the questions about supervision.

Approximately 10% of the respondents chose not to answer some of the questions in the co-worker category, and 20% of the respondents chose not to answer some of the questions in the JIG category. However, the frequencies of responses indicate that most of the respondents gave high ratings to those descriptors with positive attributes and low ratings to those descriptors with negative attributes. Given the number of no responses to various questions, the study does not produce strong evidence that the results are meaningful. As with Neyman's study (2002), this

study had a small sample size. When comparing the total number of full-time business faculty who worked at institutions with ACBSP accreditation, the number of faculty meeting the criteria was relatively low.

The second research question posed by the study was "Is there a difference in the job satisfaction level gained from teaching distance education by full-time faculty in ACBSP-accredited colleges of business who have taught at least one asynchronous and one traditional course in the past 3 years, based on personal, professional, and institutional demographics?" Based on a confidence level of 95%, most of the findings produce no significant differences. However, the differences found between groups for the JDI categories are negligible. Given the small sample size, there is a strong probability that any statistically significant differences were random rather than systematic in nature.

Conclusions

This study suggests that full-time business faculty members who teach in ACBSP-accredited programs are generally content and satisfied with teaching in both the traditional and DE models, but recognize that there are some organizational problems with upward mobility at a certain level and with effectiveness of structure especially as these elements relate to distance education. However, this study remains inconclusive. After reviewing the comments in the open-ended section of the survey and receiving e-mails from individuals who viewed the questions, the researcher realized the JDI may not have been the appropriate instrument for this study. Although many other faculty studies (Cosgrove, 2003; Hall, 2003; Maloney, 2003; Neyman, 2002; Rush, 2003) have used the JDI to measure job satisfaction, the design of the instrument could be a reason for the lack of responses to some of the questions in the categories.

Some of the respondents also felt the questions were repetitive. Finally, Neyman believed the JDI was not able to adequately detect significant differences associated with the independent variables.

Overall, for distance education to continue to be a viable delivery system in higher education, faculty members must be satisfied with their jobs (Neyman, 2002). A person's motivation and aspirations and how well these needs are satisfied by the individual's work also affect job attitudes. Increases in job satisfaction and reduction in turnover have been found to increase organizational productivity (Trevor, 2001).

Recommendations for Further Research

There has been little research done in the area of job satisfaction among faculty members, especially as it relates to the different types of delivery systems. Future research might include the following areas

1. Determine how many ACBSP institutions have some type of distance education program at their institution and if full-time business faculty teach in it.
2. Develop an instrument that measures the job satisfaction levels of faculty members.
3. Evaluate who actually teaches distance education courses at an institution (i.e., full-time faculty or adjunct faculty members).
4. Explore the participation of various ethnic groups involved in teaching across the different delivery methods.
5. Examine and evaluate the assignment process and compensation system for distance education courses.

6. Create a system that measures and rates institutional effectiveness in administering a distance education program.
7. Examine and evaluate the promotion system as it relates to the various delivery systems.
8. Compare and contrast job satisfaction levels among faculty teaching in traditional, distance education, and blended delivery systems.
9. Survey graduates who have taken courses in various delivery systems and measure their perceptions of whether the system was successful.
10. Conduct a longitudinal study of job satisfaction levels among faculty members teaching in the different delivery systems.

Recommendations for Distance Education Practitioners

Based on the finding of this study, the following recommendations are being made to administrators of DE programs in an effort to improve the job satisfaction level of full-time business faculty teaching in ACBSP-accredited programs.

1. Develop and communicate clear policies and procedures that govern the various delivery systems at institutions. Faculty members need to be clear about the reporting structure, believe the selection process to be fair, and understand how teaching in each system affects opportunities for promotion and tenure. Faculty value initiatives take the form of institutional recognition and support. Lee (2001) found that levels of job satisfaction and institutional commitment increased when faculty felt institutional support. Tenure and promotion were ranked high among the list of incentives that

would satisfy this need (Betts, 1998; Bonk, 2001; Rockwell et al., 1999; Schifter, 2000).

2. Create and distribute a job satisfaction survey to the faculty on an annual basis to determine areas of improvement. These areas could include: administrative support, technical support, structural changes, classroom sizes, and workload. Kamata and Bower's study (2005) found that faculty members were pleased and satisfied with their DE teaching experience if they had adequate training and preparation. Once areas have been identified, attempts to resolve the issues should be taken and the results communicated to the faculty.
3. Review the course schedule and college calendar to determine if faculty members have ample time to make necessary changes to courses. DE practitioners want to make sure that the faculty members do not have to use their breaks to get a course ready for the next class. Faculty members should take their breaks so they do not burn out.
4. Work with the Human Resources Department to create a compensation system for developing and teaching DE courses as many faculty members believe there is more work involved. Monetary support was viewed to be another form of institutional recognition to motivate faculty to teach DE courses (Betts, 1998; Jones & Moller, 2002; Schifter, 2000; Schifter, 2002). Monetary support could come in the form of stipends, continuing education, overload pay, or increases in salary (Maguire, 2005).
5. Explain the workload and job requirements to potential candidates so they have a clear understanding of institutional expectations as they relate to the various components of a faculty position. Some reports and research have shown that

teaching a DE course requires more time and effort on the part of the faculty (American Association of University Professors, 1999; American Council on Education, 2000). Potential candidates should know the allocation of responsibilities (i.e., teaching, advising, research, and community service) prior to accepting a position. Pollack, Whitbred and Contractor (2000) found that the characteristics of a job are good predictors of a person's job satisfaction.

6. Create a hiring strategy that involves actively pursuing organizations that cater to potential candidates who tend to be satisfied with teaching DE education courses. It is important that institutions be able to determine niche markets for hiring qualified DE instructors, otherwise they may have to commit resources to train potential candidates without experience but who desire to teach DE courses.
7. Provide professional development opportunities for faculty members so they can increase their skills in the different delivery systems. This initiative can be seen as an effort to retain quality faculty. Retention is a key factor in building an institution's academic reputation that is necessary to recruit high caliber candidates. Also, it may be helpful to include the faculty in the planning process acting as collaborators, instead of having others determine what would be best for the faculty members to learn.
8. Work with the senior management team to determine if, when, and how a DE program fits into the vision, mission, and objectives of the institution. Will the full-time faculty be required to teach in it? Given pedagogical beliefs and the adult learner market, does it fit better with a lifelong learning initiative, or will it be available to traditional students?

9. This study suggests that business faculty do not like repetitious jobs. Therefore, administrators may want to periodically evaluate job content to make sure that it provides variety. In addition, institutions can make sure that faculty members have the tools to make their DE courses creative and different.

It is important for institutions to have faculty members who are satisfied with their teaching experience. Although the major goal is to educate the students, faculty members have to feel good about what they are doing, and the institution has to provide a reason for them to stay. Research has shown that satisfied workers give their best and are more committed to the organization, whereas dissatisfied workers tend not to be committed to the organization; instead they tend to work to promote themselves and satisfy their personal needs (Drysdale, 2005).

REFERENCES

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *4*(2), 142-175. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

American Association of University Professors, Special Committee on Distance Education and Intellectual Property Issues. (1999). *Distance education and intellectual property*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from http://aaup.org/statements/Redbook/DistanceEd.htm.

American Council on Education. (2000). *Developing a distance education policy for 21st century learning*. Washington, DC: Author.

Arnold, H. J., & Feldman, D. C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*(3), 350-360. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs. Welcome to ACBSP Gateway (n.d.). *About ACBSP*. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from https://www.acbsp.org.

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, Welcome (n.d.). Retrieved August 8, 2006, from http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/.

Beach, M. M. (1997). *Perceptions of job satisfaction of nursing faculty in Mississippi's nursing degree programs*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9729769)

Belanger, F., & Jordan, D. H. (2000). *Evaluation and implementation of distance learning: Technologies, tools, and techniques.* Hershey, PA: Idea Group.

Belilos, C. (1997). Understanding employee drives and motivation: The first step towards motivation at work. Retrieved May 5, 2005, from http://easytraining.com/motivation.htm.

Berge, Z.L. (1998). Barriers to online teaching in post-secondary institutions: Can policy changes fix it? Retrieved October 19, 2005, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/Berge12.html.

Berger, J.B., & Calkins, M.V. (2003). System. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of education* (pp. 1041-1045). New York: Macmillan.

Betts, K.S. (1998). An institutional overview: Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study, *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *8*(1). Retrieved February 22, 2006, from http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/spring81/maguire81.htm.

Blustain, H., Goldstein, P., & Lozier, G. (1999). Assessing the new competitive landscape. In R. N. Katz and Associates, (Eds.), *New Competition In Higher Education*, (pp. 51-72). San Franciso, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bradburn, E. M. (2002). Distance education instruction by postsecondary faculty and staff: Fall 1998. Retrieved August 31, 2005, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002155,

Bonk, C.J. (2001). Online teaching in an online world. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from http://www.coursehsare.com/reports.php.

Chizmar, J.F. & Williams, D.B. (2001). What do faculty want? *Educause Quarterly*, *1*, 18-24. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from http://www/educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eqm0112.pdf.

Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty towards distance education: A national survey. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, *7*(2), 19-33. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from http://www.itdl.org/Journal/May_06/article04.htm.

Conrad, R. (1999). Developing learner self-direction in a webcentric learning environment. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning, Madison, WI.

Cosgrove, J. R. (2003). *Faculty perceptions of occupational therapy program director leader behavior: Impact upon faculty job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, CT. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3079366)

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2001, September). The role of accreditation and assuring quality in electronically delivered distance learning. Retrieved May 29, 2006, from http://www.chea.org/pdf/fact_sheet_2dist_learn_02.pdf.

Crawford , C. M., & Gannon-Cook, R. (2002). Faculty Attitudes Towards Distance Education: Enhancing the Support and Rewards System for Innovative Integration of Technology Within Coursework. East Lansing , MI : National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED471121)

Crites, J. 0. (1985). Review of the Job Descriptive Index. In J. V. Mitchell (Ed.), *The ninth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 753-754). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute.

DeMeuse, K. P. (1985). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *23*, 53-59.

Diamond, R. M. (1993). Instituting change in the faculty reward system. In R. M. Diamond and B. E. Adam (Eds.), *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000. New Directions for Higher Education, 81*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diem, K. G. (2002, December). Using research methods to evaluate your extension program. *Journal of Extension*, *40*(6), Retrieved May 4, 2006, from http://www/joe/org/joe/2002december/a1.shtml.

Dille, B., & Mezack, M. (1991). Identifying predictors of high risk among community college telecourse students. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *5*(1), 24-35.

Dillman, D. A., & Bowker, D. K. (2001). The Web questionnaire challenge to survey methodologists. In U. Reips & M. Bosnjak (Eds.), *Dimensions of Internet science*. (pp. 1-16). Lengerich, Germany: Pabst.

Dobbins, E. J. (1996). *The relationship of professional development participation to job satisfaction of faculty in the two-year technical college*. Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University, SC. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9703426)

Dooley, K.E. & Murphrey, T.P. (2000). How the perspectives of administrators, faculty and support units impact the rate of distance education adoption. Retrieved October 26, 2003, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter34/dooley34.html.

Drysdale, D.S. (2005). *Faculty job satisfaction: Retaining faculty in the new millennium*. Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, Bozeman. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3161802)

Edgerton, R. (1993). The re-examination of faculty priorities. *Change, 25*(4), 10-25.

Flood, A.B., & Scott, W.R. (1987). *Hospital structure and performance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fox, R. (2000). Taking care of business – online technologies changing practice at universities? *Conference proceedings: Teaching and Learning forum 2000 – Flexible Futures in Tertiary Teaching*. Curtin University. Retrieved July 25, 2005, from http://cleo.murdoch.edu/au/confs/tlf/tlf2000/fox.html.

Frone, M. R., Cooper, M. L., & Russell, M. (1994). Stressful life events, gender, and substance use: An application of Tobit regression. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, *8*(2), 59-69. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Gallagher, P., and McCormick, K. (1999). Student satisfaction with two-way interactive distance education for delivery of early childhood special education coursework. *Journal of Special Education Technology 14*(1) 32 – 47. Retrieved on May 1, 2006, from http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/login.jhtml?_requestid=122960.

Gee, D. G. (1990). *The impact of students' preferred learning style variables in a distance education course: A case study.* Portales: Eastern New Mexico University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 836).

Guthrie, J.W., Ed. (2003). *Encyclopedia of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(2), 159-146. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Hall, C. (2003). *Job satisfaction of sport management faculty in the U.S.A*. Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, 2003). Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3137433)

Hamrick, F.A. (2003). Faculty roles and responsibilities. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of education* (pp. 789-794). New York: Macmillan.

Howard, J. I., & Frink, D. D. (1996). The effects of organizational restructure on employee satisfaction. *Group and Organizational Management*, *21*(3), 278-303. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from ABI/INFORM database.

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(2), 251-273. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Jakobson, L. (2005, January). Study quantifies effect of happy workers on bottom line: Employee satisfaction found to have real value. Retrieved May 30, 2005, from https://www.incentivemag.com/incentive/index.jsp.

Jones, A.E. & Moller, L. (2002). A comparison of continuing education and resident faculty attitudes towards using distance education in a higher education institution in Pennsylvania. *College and University Media Review*, *9*(1), 11-37.

Jones, R. (2003). A recommendation for managing the predicted growth in college enrollment at a time of adverse economic conditions. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *6*(1). Retrieved June, 2003, from http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/spring61/jones61.htm.

Judge, T.A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*(6), 939-948. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Kamata, A. & Bower, B.L. (2001, May). Faculty going the distance: Motivations, incentives, and satisfaction in Florida community colleges. Paper presented at the 19th International Conference on Technology and Education, Tallahassee, FL.

Keegan, D. (1996). *Foundations of distance education. (3rd Ed.).* London: Routledge.

Kerr, B.A. (1985). Review of the Job Descriptive Index. In J. V. Mitchell (Ed.), *The ninth mental measurements yearbook* (pp. 754-756). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute.

Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1986). Response effects in the electronic survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *50*, 402-413.

Lee, J. (2001). Instructional support for distance education and faculty motivation, commitment, satisfaction. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *32*(2), 153-160. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/bjet/2001/00000032/00000002/art00186;jsession9d=7lckbijhupnsj.alice.

Levine, J., & Doyle, M. (1994). *Guide for Designing Effective Distance Bridging Instruction (or How can you help people learn when you can't see them?)* Michigan State University Extension, East Lansing, MI. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache:GagdPSlsrHgJ:web1.msue.msu.edu/msue/iac/disasterresp/FamilyIssues/E-2545(1).pdf+guide+for+designing+effective+distance+bridging&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us.

Lindsey, B. (1998). The man with the plan – Frederick Winslow Taylor, father of scientific management. *Reason 8*(29). Retrieved May 30, 2006, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1568/is_n8_v29/ai_20201383.

Lynch, W., & Corry, M. (1998, March). Faculty recruitment, training, and compensation for distance education. Washington, DC: Proceedings of the Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. 421 101).

Macionis, J. J., & Plummer, K. (1998). *Sociology: A global introduction*. London: Prentice Hall.

Maguire, L. (2005) Literature review – faculty participation in online distance education: Barriers and motivators. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *8*(1).

Retrieved May 30, 2006, from http://www.westga.edu/%7Edistance/ojdla/spring81/maguire81.htm.

Maloney, M. M. (2003). *Faculty participation in the decision making process: Its impact upon job satisfaction at Connecticut community colleges*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, CT). Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3073289)

McCracken, C. G. (2001). *The relationship between stress levels and job satisfaction among community college faculty in east Tennessee*. Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3031157)

McKenzie, B.K., Mims, N., Bennett, E.K., & Waugh, M. (2000). Needs, concerns, and practices of online instructors. Retrieved October 19, 2005, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall33/mckenzie33.html.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.

Miller, M. T., & Husmann, D. E. (1996). A holistic model for primary factors in the ecology of distance education course offerings. *Journal of Distance Education*, *11*(1), 101-110.

Miller, M., & Husmann, D. (1997). Motivation and incentives for community college faculty involvement in distance learning teaching opportunities. A paper presented at the meeting of the Council on Universities and Colleges, Anaheim, CA.

Mottaz, C. J. (1987). Age and work satisfaction. *Work and Occupation*, *14*(3), 387-409. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Murphy, K. (1992). *How to create environments for active rather than passive learning*. Proceedings of the JTCA Teleconferencing Yearbook 1992 (pp. 131-136). Washington, DC: International Teleconferencing Association.

Nelson, T. (2000). The message in the (digital) bottle. *Education Week*, *20*(15), 44.

Newman, A., Callahan, A., & Gallagher, S. (2002, December). Strategies for supporting off-campus growth. *Educase Center for Applied Research*, 1-3. Retrieved January 19, 2006, from www.educase.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERS0203/ekf0203.pdf.

Neyman, S. E. (2002). *Distance education: A measurement of job satisfaction of full-time faculty in AACSB accredited colleges of business*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3097330)

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oblinger, D., Barone, C. A., & Hawkins, B. L. (2001). Distributed education and its challenges: An overview. Distributed Education Series: No. 1. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and EDUCAUSE. Retrieved May 20, 2006, from http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/distributed-learning/distributed-learning-03.pdf.

O'Malley, J., and McCraw, H. (1999). Students Perceptions of Distance Education, Online Learning, and the Traditional Classroom. *Online Journal of Distance education Administration, 2*(4). Retrieved May 1, 2006 from, http://www.westga.edu/!distance/omalley24.html.

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology: Special Theory and Literature*, *48*(4), 775-802. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Oshagbemi, T. (1998, May). The impact of age on the job satisfaction of university teachers. Research in Education. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3765/is_199805/ai_8801662.

Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Gender differences in the job satisfaction of university teachers. *Women in Management Review*, *15*(7), 331-343. Retrieved May 20, 2006, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200404/ai_n9345191/pg_3.

Parisot, A.H. (1997). Distance education as a catalyst for engaging teaching in the community college: Implications for institutional policy. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *99*, 5-13.

Payne, R. D. (1985). *Characteristics, activities, and role perceptions of black female faculty in state and state-related Pennsylvania institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, PA. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://www.vccaedu.org/inquiry/inquiry-spring2001/i-61-corbin.html.

Pearson, C. A. (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction in a self-managed system for monitoring group achievement. *Human Relations*, *44*(5), 517-537. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design and analysis: An integrated approach.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Perraton, H. (1988). A theory for distance education. In D. Stewart, D., Keegan, & B. Holmberg (Eds.), Distance education: International perspectives (pp. 95-113). New York: Routledge.

Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (1999). What's the difference? A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

Pollack, T., Whitbred, R., & Contractor, N. (2000). Social information processing and job characteristics – A simultaneous test of two theories with implications for job satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, *26*(2), 292-330. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Preziosi, R. C. & Godden, D. J. (2003). A comparative analysis of faculty job satisfaction for traditional versus online instruction in graduate business education. *Assessment Journal*. Nova Southeastern University. Report No. H808-01-03. Retrieved January 19, 2006, from http://www.huizenga.nova.edu/about/Accreditation/ResearchReports/HS09-01-03FacultySatisfactionOnlineVsOnground.pdf.

Quality Matters, Welcome. Retrieved August 8, 2006 from www.qualitymatters.org/.

Rush, R. R. (2003). *The influence of selected factors on burnout among faculty in higher education*. Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3112713)

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, *43*(4), 395-407. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from ABI/INFORM Global database.

Sanderson, A., Phua, V.C., & Herda, D. (2000). *The American faculty poll*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 442527).

Schaefer, D. R., & Dillman, D. A. (1998). Development of standard e-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *62*(3), 378-397. Retrieved April 10, 2006, from http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/papers/E-Mailppr.pdf.

Schifter, C. C. (2000). Faculty participation in asynchronous learning networks: A case study of motivating and inhibiting factors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning*, *4*(1), 15–22. Retrieved May 31, 2006, from http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/jaln/v4n1/pdf/v4n1_schifter.pdf.

Schifter, C.C. (2002). *Perception differences about participating in distance education*. Retrieved October 18, 2005, from http://www/westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring51/schifter51.html.

Shachar, M. & Neumann, Y. (2003). Differences between traditional and distance education academic performances: A meta-analytic approach. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Education, 4*(2). Retrieved on May 1, 2006 from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/issue/view/16.

Smith, P. C., Balzer, W., Brannick, M., Chia, W., Eggleston, S., Gibson et al. (1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *24*, 31-33.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *13*(6), 693-713. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from PsycINFO Database.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sullivan, M. A. (2001). *Relationships among planned mentoring programs, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in nurse faculty mentees*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama at Birmingham. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3040939)

Swoboda, M. 1990. Retaining and promoting women and minority faculty: Problems and possibilities. Madison: Office of Equal Opportunity Programs and Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin. Retrieved May 1, 2006, http://www.vccaedu.org/inquiry/inquiry-spring2001/i-61-corbin.html.

Tack, M.W., & Patitu, C.L. (2000). Faculty and job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril. (Report four.) ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports. School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University, Washington DC. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://www.ericdigest.org/1993/job.htm.

Tang, T.L. (1999). Sex differences in satisfaction with pay and co-workers: Faculty and staff at a public institution of higher education. *Public Personnel Management*, *28*(3), 345-349. Retrieved May 20, 2006, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200404/ai_n9345191/pg_3.

Taylor, J. C., & White, V. J. (1991). Faculty attitudes towards teaching in the distance education mode: An exploratory investigation. *Research in Distance Education*, *9*(3), 7-11. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from http://www.itdl.org/Journal/May_06/article04.htm.

Tello, R., & Crewson, P. E. (2003). Hypothesis testing II: Means. *Radiology*, 227, 1-4. Retrieved September 10, 2005, from http://radiology.rsnajnls.org/cgi/content/full/227/1/1.

Terpstra, D.E., & Honoree, A.L. (2004, Spring). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education*. Retrieved May 20, 2006, from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200404/ai_n9345191.

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, AACSB International (n.d.). *Accreditation*. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from http://www.aacsb.org.

Thomas, G., & Asunka, K. (1995). Employment and quality of life of minority and women faculty in a predominantly white institution. In G. Thomas (Ed.), *Race and ethnicity in America: Meeting the challenge in the 21st century* (pp. 295-308). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis. Retrieved May 1, 2006, from http://www.vccaedu.org/inquiry/inquiry-spring2001/i-61-corbin.html.

Trevor, C.O. (2001). Interactions among actual ease-of-movement determinants and job satisfaction in the prediction of voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(4), 621-638. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from ABI/INFORM Global database.

United States Department of Education, Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (n.d.). *Operating principles*. Retrieved August 17, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/fipse/princp.html.

University of Minnesota, Office of Human Resources. (n.d). Retrieved May 2, 2006, from http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/pulse/faculty/jobsatisfaction.html.

Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. A. M., & Frings_Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction – a systematic review. *Occupational Medicine, 53*, 191-200.

Wan, Z., & Leightley, L.E. (2006). Job satisfaction and workforce demographics: A longitudinal study of the U.S. forest products industry. Forest and Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi State University. Retrieved July 1, 2006, from http://www.cft.msstate.edu/fwrc/pubs/jobsatisfaction.pdf.

Wanous, J.P., & Lawler, III, E.D. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *56*(2), 95-105.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

White, A. W. (1998). *Factors and professional development activities which impact job satisfaction of health information administration faculty*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia. Retrieved May 23, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 9918995)

Wilson, C. (1998). Concerns of instructors delivering distance learning via the Web Retrieved October 16, 2005, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/wilson13.html.

Wittington, N. (1987). Is instructional television educationally effective? A research review. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 1*(1), 47-57. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from EBSCOhost database.

Wolcott, L.L. (1997). Tenure, promotion, and distance education: Examining the culture of faculty rewards. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, *11*(2), 3-18. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from EBSCOhost database.

Worrell, T. G., Skaggs, G.E., & Brown, M.B. (2006). School psychologists' job satisfaction: A 22-year perspective in the USA. *School Psychology International*, *27*(2), 131-145. Retrieved July 10, 2006, from http://spi.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/27/2/131.

Yun, G.W., & Trumbo, C.W. (2000). Comparative response to a survey executed by post, e-mail, & web form. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *6*(1). Retrieved March 20, 2006, from http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol16/issue1/yun.html.

Zedeck, S. (1987, October). Satisfaction in union members and their spouses. Paper presented at the Job Satisfaction: Advances in Research and Practice Conference, Bowling Green, OH.

Zillmann, M. (2000). *Motivation*. Retrieved June 5, 2006, from http://academic.emporia.edu/smithwil/00fallmg443/eja/zilllman.html.

APPENDIX A. LIST OF INSTITUIONS WITH ACBSP ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Region 1

Bronx Community College – CUNY
College of Mount Saint Vincent
College of the North Atlantic
Community College of Rhode Island
County College of Morris
Erie Community College - State University of New York
Georgian Court University
Holyoke Community College
Kennebec Valley Community College
Medgar Evers College City University of New York
Morrisville State College
New Hampshire Community Technical College – Manchester
New Hampshire Community Technical College – Stratham
New Hampshire Technical Institute
New Jersey City University
Northern Maine Community College
Norwich University
Plymouth State University
Queensborough Community College – CUNY
Schenectady County Community College
Southern New Hampshire University
Sullivan County Community College
SUNY Orange County Community College
The College of Saint Rose
Three Rivers Community College
University of Bridgeport
Wagner College

Region 2

Arcadia University
Baltimore City Community College
Bluefield State College
Bowie State University
Bucks County Community College
Butler County Community College
College of Southern Maryland
Delaware Technical & Community College – Owens Campus
Delaware Technical & Community College - Terry Campus
Delaware Technical & Community College - Wilmington Campus
DeSales University
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Elizabethtown College
Fairmont State University
Gallaudet University

Gannon University
Geneva College
Goldey-Beacom College
Harrisburg Area Community College
La Roche College
Lehigh Carbon Community College
Lycoming College
Marshall Community and Technical College
Marymount University
Marywood University
Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Neumann College
Northampton Community College
Pennsylvania College of Technology
Roanoke College
Saint Vincent College
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
University of District of Columbia
Virginia Union University
Virginia Western Community College
West Virginia State University
Wilkes University
York College of Pennsylvania

Region 3

Aiken Technical College
Alabama State University
Albany State University
Athens State University
Athens Technical College
Atlanta Metropolitan College
Bishop State Community College
Calhoun Community College
Central Carolina Technical College
Chattahoochee Technical College
Claflin University
Cumberland University
Delta State University
Denmark Technical College
Dyersburg State Community College
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Fisk University
Florence-Darlington Technical College
Florida Memorial University
Freed-Hardeman University
Gadsden State Community College
Gainesville College

Gardner-Webb University
Georgia Southwestern State University
Greenville Technical College
High Point University
Horry-Georgetown Technical College
Jackson State Community College
Jefferson State Community College
Johnson C. Smith University
Jones County Junior College
Kentucky State University
LaGrange College
Lambuth University
Lawson State Community College
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Lipscomb University
Methodist College
Midlands Technical College
Mississippi College
Mississippi University for Women
Mississippi Valley State University
Morris College
Motlow State Community College
Nashville State Community College
North Carolina Central University
North Georgia College and State University
Northeast State Technical Community College
Oakwood College
Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
Paine College
Pellissippi State Technical Community College
Piedmont Technical College
Queens University of Charlotte
Reid State Technical College
Roane State Community College
Southern Polytechnic State University
Southwest Tennessee Community College
Spartanburg Technical College
Spring Hill College
Technical College of the Lowcountry
The University of West Alabama
Tri-County Technical College
Trident Technical College
Troy University Dothan
Troy University Montgomery
Troy University Sorrell
University of Mobile
University of North Alabama

University of South Carolina Lancaster
Volunteer State Community College
Voorhees College
Wallace State Community College
Walters State Community College
Williamsburg Technical College
Wingate University
York Technical College

Region 4

Alpena Community College
Anderson University
Ashland University
Capital University
Cardinal Stritch University
Cedarville University
Chicago State University
City Colleges of Chicago Harold Washington College
City Colleges of Chicago Wilbur Wright College
Columbus State Community College
Concordia University, St. Paul
Dominican University
Edgewood College
Governors State University
Harper College
Hocking College
Indiana University East
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Bloomington
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Columbus
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Evansville
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Ft. Wayne
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Gary
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Indianapolis
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Kokomo
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Lafayette
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Madison
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Muncie
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Richmond
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana – Sellersburg
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana - South Bend
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana - Terre Haute
Jackson Community College
James A. Rhodes State College
Joliet Junior College
Kent State University Ashtabula Campus
Kent State University East Liverpool Campus
Kent State University Geauga Campus

Kent State University Main Campus
Kent State University Salem Campus
Kent State University Trumbull Campus-Lead
Kent State University Tuscarawas Campus
Kettering University
Lawrence Technological University
Millikin University
Mount Vernon Nazarene University
Normandale Community College
North Central State College
North Hennepin Community College
Northwest State Community College
Northwestern Michigan College
Owens Community College
Purdue University - North Central
Roosevelt University
Saint Xavier University
Shawnee State University
Sinclair Community College
Stark State College of Technology
The University of Akron - Summit College
Tiffin University
Trinity Christian College
University of Indianapolis
University of Northwestern Ohio
Vincennes University

Region 5

Baker University
Butler Community College
Chadron State College
Dakota State University
Doane College
Drury University
Harris-Stowe State University
Johnson County Community College
Kansas City Kansas Community College
Kirkwood Community College
Lincoln University of Missouri
Maryville University
Metropolitan Community College
Missouri Southern State University
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Neosho County Community College
Northwest Missouri State University
Pratt Community College
Seward County Community College

Southeast Community College
Southwest Baptist University
St. Ambrose University
Three Rivers Community College

Region 6

Angelo State University
Austin Community College-Pinnacle Campus
Cameron University
Carl Albert State College
Central New Mexico Community College
Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas
Dallas Baptist University
Delgado Community College
Dona Ana Branch Community College
East Central University
Eastern New Mexico University
Hardin-Simmons University
Harding University
Houston Baptist University
Jarvis Christian College
Lamar State College-Port Arthur
Langston University
Louisiana College
Midwestern State University
National Park Community College
New Mexico Highlands University
Northeastern State University
Northern New Mexico College
Northern Oklahoma College
Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma Christian University
Oklahoma City Community College
Oklahoma City University
Our Lady of the Lake University
Philander Smith College
Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas
San Juan College
South Texas College
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute
Tarleton State University
Texas A&M University – Kingsville
Texas Lutheran University
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Dallas
University of St.Thomas

University of the Incarnate Word
West Texas A&M University
Western New Mexico University
Xavier University of Louisiana

Region 7

Biola University
California Baptist University
California State University – Dominguez Hills
Grand Canyon University
Northwest Nazarene University
Point Loma Nazarene University
Salt Lake Community College
Southern Utah University
Walla Walla College
Westminster College
Woodbury University

APPENDIX B. LETTER TO ACBSP CHAMPIONS

Dear ACBSP Champion,

I am a doctoral student in the Organization and Management program at Capella University. I am currently writing a dissertation on "Distance Education: A Measurement of Job Satisfaction of Full-Time Faculty in ACBSP Accredited Colleges of Business". Steve Parscale, Director of Accreditation at ACBSP, gave me permission to use the contact information in the ACBSP Gateway database. I am contacting you because your institution's business program is accredited by ACBSP, and your name is listed as the contact person.

Given your role as an ACBSP Champion, I am hoping that you will be able to assist me with my research. I would appreciate it if you could send me the names and email addresses of your business faculty who have taught both traditional and distance education courses at an ACBSP-accredited college of business in the last three years. I appreciate your understanding of the time-sensitive nature of the project. Could you please send me this information by (deadline date)?

Once I receive this information from you, I will send the individuals a link to an online survey to complete. Thank you in advance for your assistance. My desire is that I will be able to share the results of the survey at the 2007 ACBSP Conference in Orlando, Florida. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Additional contacts include Capella University (1-888-CAPELLA) and my dissertation advisor.

Sincerely,

Marie Gould

APPENDIX C. LETTER TO TARGET POPULATION

Greetings, Fellow Business Faculty!

I am a doctoral student in the Organization and Management program at Capella University. I am currently writing a dissertation on "Distance Education: A Measurement of Job Satisfaction of Full-Time Faculty in ACBSP Accredited Colleges of Business". According to the ABSP database, your institution is accredited by ACBSP, and your institutional ACBSP contact person provided me with your name because you meet the criteria of the target population for this study.

I solicited a list of Business faculty members who have taught both traditional and distance education courses at an ACBSP-accredited college of business in the last three years. Since you meet the criteria, I am asking you to complete an online survey for my study. Your responses will be very valuable to my research, and I will be grateful to you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to complete the short survey. I would appreciate it if you could complete this survey by (deadline date). I believe the results of this study will help all of us who teach in both the distance and traditional environments.

Below you will find a link to a Web site, which contains a survey about your job satisfaction as it relates to teaching distance and traditional courses. Once you enter the Website, you will receive instructions as to how to proceed. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes, and it will ask you to identify your institution. This information will be used for tracking purposes only, and your individual information will be kept confidential. The online survey that I am using is password protected, and your information has been assigned a code number.

My desire is that I will be able to share the results of the survey at the 2007 ACBSP Conference in Orlando, Florida. However, in exchange for your time and insight, I will be happy to provide you with my findings prior to the conference. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Additional contacts include Capella University (1-888-CAPELLA) and my dissertation advisor, Dr. John Klocinski.
Sincerely,

Marie Gould

APPENDIX D. SURVEY

Hello:

You are invited to participate in my dissertation, Distance Education: A Measurement of Job Satisfaction of Full-Time Faculty in ACBSP Accredited Colleges of Business. In this survey, participants will be asked to complete a survey that asks questions about personal demographics and how satisfied they are with the traditional and distance education delivery systems at their institutions. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. There are three sections: demographics, questions about your level of satisfaction teaching in a traditional environment, and questions about your level of satisfaction teaching in a distance education environment. The 1997 version of the Job Descriptive Index is the instrument used for the sections on level of job satisfaction.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. If you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point. However, it is very important for me to learn your opinions to successfully complete my dissertation.

Your survey responses will be strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be coded and will remain confidential. If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, you may contact Marie Gould at or by email at the email address specified below. Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start with the survey now by clicking on the Continue button below.

Please respond to the questions listed below.

DEMOGRAPHICS

	25-33	34-42	43-51	52-60	61-68	Over 68
AGE	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Male	Female
GENDER	☐	☐

	Caucasian	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Biracial	Other
ETHNICITY	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Tenured	Non-Tenured, Tenure Track	Non-Tenured Track
TENURE STATUS	☐	☐	☐

	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	University Professor	Visiting Professor	Other
FACULTY RANK	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	More than 30
NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Public	Private
TYPE OF INSTITUTION WHERE YOU ARE CURRENTLY TEACHING	☐	☐

	Associates	Associates and Bachelors/Graduate	Bachelors and Graduate Degrees	Not sure
WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING MOST ACCURATELY DESCRIBES YOUR ACBSP INSTITUTION TYPE	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Teaching	Research	Service	Advising	Administrative	Other
WHAT IS THE ALLOCATION OF YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A FACULTY MEMBER AT YOUR INSTITUTION (Check all that apply)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	ACCT	BUS LAW	ECON	FIN	IT	MGT	MKT	Entrepreneurship	Other
WHAT TYPE(S) OF COURSES HAVE YOU TAUGHT VIA DISTANCE EDUCATION (Check all that apply)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	CD-Rom	Web-Based	Compressed Video	Satellite	Two-Way Video	Video Taped	Independent Study	Other
WHAT TYPE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES HAVE YOU TAUGHT IN THE PAST THREE YEARS (Check all that apply)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
THE COMPENSATION FOR TEACHING DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES AT YOUR INSTITUTION IS ADEQUATE.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
THE LEVEL OF TECHNICAL SUPPORT AVAILABLE TO YOU FOR TEACHING A DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSE IS ADEQUATE.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
THE AMOUNT OF TRAINING AVAILABLE TO YOU FOR TEACHING A DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSE IS ADEQUATE.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1	2	3	4	5
ON A SCALE FROM 1-5, (with 1=below college level and 5=above college level), HOW DO YOU PERCEIVE THE ACADEMIC PREPARATION OF THE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES YOU HAVE TAUGHT?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1	2	3	4	5
ON A SCALE FROM 1-5, (with 1=below college level and 5=above college level), HOW DO YOU PERCEIVE THE ACADEMIC PREPARATION OF THE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN TRADITIONAL COURSES YOU HAVE TAUGHT?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAUGHT THE SAME DISTANCE COURSE IN THE PAST THREE YEARS?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10
11. >10

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT ASYNCHRONOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES TAUGHT IN PAST THREE YEARS.

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10
11. >10

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TRADITIONAL COURSES TAUGHT IN PAST THREE YEARS.

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10
11. >10

	Overload	Release Time	Course Enrollment	Part of Regular	Other

				Teaching Load	
HOW ARE FACULTY COMPENSATED FOR TEACHING DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES AT YOUR INSTITUTION?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Volunteer	Assigned	Mandatory	Other Method
HOW ARE FACULTY SELECTED TO TEACH DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES AT YOUR INSTITUTION?	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151-180	181-200	>200
WHAT IS THE LARGEST ENROLLMENT FOR A DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSE YOU HAVE TAUGHT?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Both
WHAT LEVEL OF COURSES HAVE YOU TAUGHT VIA DISTANCE EDUCATION?	☐	☐	☐

Please respond to the questions in the following sections based on your experience teaching traditional courses.

TRADITIONAL COURSES

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work experience? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

	YES, it describes my work	NO, it does not describe my work	?, I cannot decide
Fascinating	☐	☐	☐
Routine	☐	☐	☐
Satisfying	☐	☐	☐
Boring	☐	☐	☐
Good	☐	☐	☐
Gives sense of accomplishment	☐	☐	☐
Respected	☐	☐	☐
Uncomfortable	☐	☐	☐
Pleasant	☐	☐	☐
Useful	☐	☐	☐

Challenging	☐	☐	☐
Simple	☐	☐	☐
Repetitive	☐	☐	☐
Creative	☐	☐	☐
Dull	☐	☐	☐
Uninteresting	☐	☐	☐
Can see results	☐	☐	☐
Uses my abilities	☐	☐	☐

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

PAY

	YES, it describes my pay	NO, it does not describe my pay	?, I cannot decide
Income adequate for normal expenses	☐	☐	☐
Fair	☐	☐	☐
Barely live on income	☐	☐	☐
Bad	☐	☐	☐
Income provides luxuries	☐	☐	☐
Less than I deserve	☐	☐	☐
Well paid	☐	☐	☐
Insecure	☐	☐	☐
Underpaid	☐	☐	☐

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

	YES, it describes my opportunities for promotion	NO, it does not describe them	?, I cannot decide
Good opportunities for promotion	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities somewhat limited	☐	☐	☐
Promotion on ability	☐	☐	☐
Dead-end job	☐	☐	☐
Good chance for promotion	☐	☐	☐
Unfair promotion policy	☐	☐	☐
Infrequent promotions	☐	☐	☐
Regular promotions	☐	☐	☐
Fairly good chance of promotion	☐	☐	☐

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

SUPERVISION

	YES, it describes the supervision I receive	NO, it does not describe my supervision experience	?, I cannot decide
Ask my advice	☐	☐	☐
Hard to please	☐	☐	☐
Impolite	☐	☐	☐
Praises good work	☐	☐	☐
Tactful	☐	☐	☐
Influential	☐	☐	☐
Up-to-date	☐	☐	☐
Doesn't supervise enough	☐	☐	☐
Has favorites	☐	☐	☐
Tells me where I stand	☐	☐	☐
Annoying	☐	☐	☐
Stubborn	☐	☐	☐

Knows job well	☐	☐	☐
Bad	☐	☐	☐
Intelligent	☐	☐	☐
Poor planner	☐	☐	☐
Around when needed	☐	☐	☐
Lazy	☐	☐	☐

Please respond to the questions in the following sections based on your experience teaching distance education courses.

DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work experience? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

	YES, it describes my work	NO, it does not describe my work	?, I cannot decide
Fascinating	☐	☐	☐
Routine	☐	☐	☐
Satisfying	☐	☐	☐
Boring	☐	☐	☐
Good	☐	☐	☐
Gives sense of accomplishment	☐	☐	☐
Respected	☐	☐	☐
Uncomfortable	☐	☐	☐
Pleasant	☐	☐	☐
Useful	☐	☐	☐
Challenging	☐	☐	☐
Simple	☐	☐	☐
Repetitive	☐	☐	☐
Creative	☐	☐	☐
Dull	☐	☐	☐
Uninteresting	☐	☐	☐
Can see results	☐	☐	☐
Uses my abilities	☐	☐	☐

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

PAY

	YES, it describes my pay	NO, it does not describe my pay	?, I cannot decide
Income adequate for normal expenses	☐	☐	☐
Fair	☐	☐	☐
Barely live on income	☐	☐	☐
Bad	☐	☐	☐
Income provides luxuries	☐	☐	☐
Less than I deserve	☐	☐	☐
Well paid	☐	☐	☐
Insecure	☐	☐	☐
Underpaid	☐	☐	☐

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

	YES, it describes my opportunities for promotion	NO, it does not describe them	?, I cannot decide
Good opportunities for promotion	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities somewhat limited	☐	☐	☐
Promotion on ability	☐	☐	☐
Dead-end job	☐	☐	☐
Good chance for promotion	☐	☐	☐
Unfair promotion policy	☐	☐	☐
Infrequent promotions	☐	☐	☐
Regular promotions	☐	☐	☐
Fairly good chance of promotion	☐	☐	☐

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

SUPERVISION

	YES, it describes the supervision I receive	NO, it does not describe my supervision experience	?, I cannot decide
Ask my advice	☐	☐	☐
Hard to please	☐	☐	☐
Impolite	☐	☐	☐
Praises good work	☐	☐	☐
Tactful	☐	☐	☐
Influential	☐	☐	☐
Up-to-date	☐	☐	☐
Doesn't supervise enough	☐	☐	☐
Has favorites	☐	☐	☐
Tells me where I stand	☐	☐	☐
Annoying	☐	☐	☐
Stubborn	☐	☐	☐
Knows job well	☐	☐	☐
Bad	☐	☐	☐
Intelligent	☐	☐	☐
Poor planner	☐	☐	☐
Around when needed	☐	☐	☐
Lazy	☐	☐	☐

Please respond to the following questions based on your overall experience as a full-time faculty member in Business.

OVERALL GENERAL QUESTIONS

Think of the majority of people with whom you work or meet in connection with your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if

it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

	YES, it describes my co-workers	NO, it does not describe my co-workers	?, I cannot decide
Stimulating	☐	☐	☐
Boring	☐	☐	☐
Slow	☐	☐	☐
Helpful	☐	☐	☐
Stupid	☐	☐	☐
Responsible	☐	☐	☐
Fast	☐	☐	☐
Intelligent	☐	☐	☐
Easy to make enemies	☐	☐	☐
Talk too much	☐	☐	☐
Smart	☐	☐	☐
Lazy	☐	☐	☐
Unpleasant	☐	☐	☐
Gossipy	☐	☐	☐
Active	☐	☐	☐
Narrow interests	☐	☐	☐
Loyal	☐	☐	☐
Stubborn	☐	☐	☐

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? Select (1) Y for Yes if it describes your work, (2) N for No if it does not describe it, and (3) ? for ? if you cannot decide.

JOB IN GENERAL

	YES, it describes my job	NO, it does not describe my job	?, I cannot decide
Pleasant	☐	☐	☐

Bad	☐	☐	☐
Ideal	☐	☐	☐
Waste of time	☐	☐	☐
Good	☐	☐	☐
Undesirable	☐	☐	☐
Worthwhile	☐	☐	☐
Worse than most	☐	☐	☐
Acceptable	☐	☐	☐
Superior	☐	☐	☐
Better than most	☐	☐	☐
Disagreeable	☐	☐	☐
Makes me content	☐	☐	☐
Inadequate	☐	☐	☐
Excellent	☐	☐	☐
Rotten	☐	☐	☐
Enjoyable	☐	☐	☐
Poor	☐	☐	☐

ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO INCLUDE?

DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE SURVEYS/RESEARCH?

APPENDIX E. FREQUENCIES OF JDI CATEGORIES

Table E1. Frequency of Responses for Work Category by Delivery System

Question	Traditional		Distance Education	
	f	P	*f*	P
Fascinating				
Yes	75	51.4	71	48.6
No	32	21.9	40	27.4
Not Sure	15	10.3	11	7.5
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Routine				
Yes	55	37.7	59	40.4
No	67	45.9	61	41.8
Not Sure	0	0.0	2	1.4
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.6
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Satisfying				
Yes	110	75.3	75	51.4
No	8	5.5	18	12.3
Not Sure	4	2.7	29	19.8
Subtotal	122	83.5	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.5	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Boring				
Yes	8	5.5	33	22.6
No	111	76.0	83	56.8
Not Sure	3	2.1	6	4.1
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E1 (Continued)

Good				
Yes	110	75.3	99	67.8
No	9	6.2	14	9.6
Not Sure	3	2.1	9	6.2
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.6
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Gives sense of accomplishment				
Yes	111	76.0	94	64.4
No	8	5.5	20	13.7
Not Sure	3	2.1	8	5.5
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.6
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Respected				
Yes	104	71.2	91	62.3
No	15	10.3	16	11.0
Not Sure	3	2.1	15	10.3
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.6
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Uncomfortable				
Yes	3	2.1	38	26.0
No	119	81.5	78	53.4
Not Sure	0	0	6	4.1
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Pleasant				
Yes	106	72.6	90	61.6
No	12	8.2	24	16.4
Not Sure	4	2.7	8	5.5
Subtotal	122	83.5	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.5	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E1 (Continued)

Useful				
Yes	118	80.8	104	71.2
No	2	1.4	12	8.2
Not Sure	2	1.4	6	4.1
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Challenging				
Yes	112	76.7	106	72.6
No	9	6.2	15	10.3
Not Sure	1	1.0	1	1.0
Subtotal	122	83.9	122	83.9
Missing	24	16.1	24	16.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Simple				
Yes	10	6.8	7	4.8
No	112	76.7	98	67.1
Not Sure	0	0	17	11.6
Subtotal	122	83.5	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.5	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Repetitive				
Yes	46	31.5	54	37.0
No	76	52.1	60	41.1
Not Sure	0	0.0	8	5.4
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Creative				
Yes	100	68.5	91	62.3
No	19	13.0	26	17.8
Not Sure	3	2.1	5	3.4
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E1 (Continued)

Dull				
Yes	6	4.1	10	6.8
No	116	79.5	108	74.0
Not Sure	0	0	4	2.7
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Uninteresting				
Yes	6	4.1	9	6.2
No	116	79.5	109	74.7
Not Sure	0	0.0	4	2.7
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.6
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Can see results				
Yes	108	74.0	92	63.0
No	9	6.2	20	13.7
Not Sure	5	3.4	10	6.8
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Uses my abilities				
Yes	114	78.1	25	17.1
No	8	5.5	5	3.4
Not Sure	0	0	92	63.0
Subtotal	122	83.6	122	83.5
Missing	24	16.4	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E2. Frequency of Responses for Pay Category by Delivery System

Question	Traditional		Distance Education	
	f	P	*f*	P
Income adequate for Normal expenses				
Yes	93	63.7	74	50.7
No	23	15.8	21	14.4
Not Sure	8	5.5	9	6.2
Subtotal	124	85.0	104	71.3
Missing	22	15.0	42	28.7
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Fair				
Yes	77	52.7	58	39.7
No	34	23.3	38	26.0
Not Sure	13	8.9	7	4.8
Subtotal	124	84.9	103	70.5
Missing	22	15.1	43	29.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Bad				
Yes	22	15.1	18	12.3
No	100	68.5	85	58.2
Not Sure	2	1.4	21	14.4
Subtotal	124	85.0	124	84.9
Missing	22	15.0	22	15.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Income provides luxuries				
Yes	23	15.8	1	0.7
No	91	62.3	122	83.6
Not Sure	10	6.8	1	0.7
Subtotal	124	84.9	124	85.0
Missing	22	15.1	22	15.0
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E2 (Continued)

Less than I deserve				
Yes	54	37.0	62	42.5
No	60	41.1	40	27.4
Not Sure	10	6.8	22	15.1
Subtotal	124	84.9	124	85.0
Missing	22	15.1	22	15.0
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Well paid				
Yes	31	21.2	28	19.2
No	75	51.4	66	45.2
Not Sure	18	12.3	9	6.2
Subtotal	124	84.9	103	70.6
Missing	22	15.1	43	29.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Barely live on income				
Yes	8	5.5	26	17.8
No	115	78.8	78	53.4
Not Sure	1	0.7	20	13.7
Subtotal	124	85.0	124	84.9
Missing	22	15.0	22	15.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Insecure				
Yes	10	6.8	22	15.1
No	100	68.5	75	51.4
Not Sure	14	9.6	27	18.5
Subtotal	124	84.9	124	85.0
Missing	22	15.1	22	15.0
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Underpaid				
Yes	59	40.4	54	37.0
No	53	36.3	46	31.5
Not Sure	12	8.2	24	16.4
Subtotal	124	84.9	124	84.9
Missing	22	15.1	22	15.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E3. Frequency of Responses for Promotion Category by Delivery System

Question	Traditional		Distance Education	
	f	P	*f*	P
Good opportunities for Promotion				
Yes	40	27.4	30	20.5
No	74	50.7	59	40.4
Not Sure	17	11.6	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	67.7
Missing	15	10.3	49	32.3
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Opportunities somewhat Limited				
Yes	81	55.5	58	39.7
No	45	30.8	35	24.0
Not Sure	5	3.4	4	2.7
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Promotion on ability				
Yes	50	34.2	41	28.1
No	65	44.5	46	31.5
Not Sure	16	11.0	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Dead-end job				
Yes	30	20.5	20	13.7
No	86	58.9	67	45.9
Not Sure	15	10.3	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E3 (Continued)

Good chance for promotion				
Yes	49	33.6	37	25.3
No	63	43.2	50	34.2
Not Sure	19	13.0	10	6.8
Subtotal	97	89.8	97	66.3
Missing	15	10.2	49	33.7
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Unfair promotion policy				
Yes	20	13.7	15	10.3
No	88	60.3	66	45.2
Not Sure	23	15.8	16	11.0
Subtotal	131	89.8	97	66.5
Missing	15	10.2	49	33.5
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Infrequent promotions				
Yes	58	39.7	44	30.1
No	59	40.4	43	29.5
Not Sure	14	9.6	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Regular promotions				
Yes	41	28.1	34	23.3
No	74	50.7	52	35.6
Not Sure	16	11.0	11	7.5
Subtotal	131	87.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Fairly good chance for promotion				
Yes	54	37.0	42	28.8
No	51	34.9	42	28.8
Not Sure	26	17.8	13	8.9
Subtotal	131	89.7	97	66.4
Missing	15	10.3	49	33.6
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E4. Frequency of Responses for Supervision Category by Delivery System

Question	Traditional		Distance Education	
	f	P	*f*	P
Ask for advice				
Yes	97	66.4	80	54.8
No	28	19.2	38	26.0
Not Sure	6	4.1	5	3.4
Subtotal	131	89.7	123	84.2
Missing	15	10.3	23	15.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Hard to please				
Yes	15	10.3	18	12.3
No	111	76.0	96	65.8
Not Sure	5	3.4	6	4.1
Subtotal	131	89.7	120	82.2
Missing	15	10.3	26	17.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Impolite				
Yes	11	10.3	18	12.3
No	118	76.0	96	65.8
Not Sure	2	3.4	6	4.1
Subtotal	131	89.7	120	82.2
Missing	15	10.3	26	17.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Praises good work				
Yes	104	71.2	88	60.3
No	22	15.1	31	21.2
Not Sure	5	3.4	4	2.7
Subtotal	131	89.7	123	84.2
Missing	15	10.3	23	15.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E4 (Continued)

Tactful				
Yes	99	67.8	85	58.2
No	27	18.5	30	20.5
Not Sure	5	3.4	8	5.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	123	84.2
Missing	15	10.3	23	15.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Influential				
Yes	82	56.2	75	51.4
No	31	21.2	35	24.0
Not Sure	18	12.3	11	7.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Up-to-date				
Yes	86	58.9	85	58.2
No	27	18.5	32	21.9
Not Sure	18	12.3	6	4.1
Subtotal	131	89.7	123	84.2
Missing	15	10.3	23	15.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Doesn’t supervise enough				
Yes	19	13.0	24	16.4
No	99	67.8	86	58.9
Not Sure	13	8.9	11	7.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Has favorites				
Yes	48	32.9	52	35.6
No	71	48.6	62	42.5
Not Sure	12	8.2	7	4.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E4 (Continued)

Tells me where I stand				
Yes	86	58.9	78	53.4
No	36	24.7	33	22.6
Not Sure	9	6.2	9	6.2
Subtotal	131	89.7	120	82.2
Missing	15	10.3	26	17.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Annoying				
Yes	16	11.0	16	11.0
No	108	74.0	97	66.4
Not Sure	7	4.8	8	5.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Stubborn				
Yes	19	13.0	21	14.4
No	103	70.5	92	63.0
Not Sure	9	6.2	8	5.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Knows job well				
Yes	92	63.0	89	61.0
No	25	17.1	22	15.1
Not Sure	14	9.6	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Bad				
Yes	11	7.5	16	11.0
No	110	75.3	100	68.5
Not Sure	10	6.8	5	3.4
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E4 (Continued)

Intelligent				
Yes	107	73.3	96	65.8
No	14	9.6	19	13.0
Not Sure	10	6.8	7	4.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	122	83.6
Missing	15	10.3	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Poor planner				
Yes	28	19.2	26	17.8
No	90	61.6	88	60.3
Not Sure	13	8.9	7	4.8
Subtotal	131	89.7	121	82.9
Missing	15	10.3	25	17.1
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Around when needed				
Yes	91	62.3	89	61.0
No	26	17.8	25	17.1
Not Sure	14	9.6	8	5.5
Subtotal	131	89.7	122	83.6
Missing	15	10.3	24	16.4
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0
Lazy				
Yes	6	4.1	9	6.2
No	119	81.5	107	73.3
Not Sure	6	4.1	4	2.7
Subtotal	131	89.7	120	82.2
Missing	15	10.3	26	17.8
TOTAL	146	100.0	146	100.0

Table E5. Frequency of Responses for Co-Worker Category

Question	*f*	P
Stimulating		
Yes	95	65.1
No	27	18.5
Not Sure	12	8.2
Subtotal	134	91.8
Missing	72	8.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Boring		
Yes	16	11.0
No	109	74.7
Not Sure	7	4.8
Subtotal	132	90.4
Missing	14	9.6
TOTAL	146	100.0
Slow		
Yes	20	13.7
No	104	71.2
Not Sure	6	4.1
Subtotal	130	89.0
Missing	16	11.0
TOTAL	146	100.0
Helpful		
Yes	116	79.5
No	14	9.6
Not Sure	3	2.1
Subtotal	135	91.1
Missing	13	8.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Stupid		
Yes	7	4.8
No	115	78.8
Not Sure	8	5.5
Subtotal	130	89.0
Missing	16	11.0
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E5 (Continued)

Responsible		
Yes	109	74.7
No	12	8.2
Not Sure	12	8.2
Subtotal	133	91.1
Missing	13	8.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Fast	*f*	P
Yes	56	38.4
No	61	41.8
Not Sure	16	11.0
Subtotal	133	91.1
Missing	13	8.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Intelligent		
Yes	117	80.1
No	7	4.8
Not Sure	10	6.8
Subtotal	134	91.8
Missing	12	8.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Easy to make enemies		
Yes	27	18.5
No	94	64.4
Not Sure	11	7.5
Subtotal	132	90.4
Missing	14	9.6
TOTAL	146	100.0
Talk too much		
Yes	25	17.1
No	96	65.8
Not Sure	10	6.8
Subtotal	131	89.7
Missing	15	10.3
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E5 (Continued)

Smart		
Yes	105	71.9
No	5	3.4
Not Sure	21	14.4
Subtotal	131	89.7
Missing	15	10.3
TOTAL	146	100.0
Lazy		
Yes	11	7.5
No	105	71.9
Not Sure	14	9.6
Subtotal	130	89.0
Missing	16	11.0
TOTAL	146	100.0
Unpleasant		
Yes	8	5.5
No	115	78.8
Not Sure	8	5.5
Subtotal	131	89.7
Missing	15	10.3
TOTAL	146	100.0
Gossipy	*f*	P
Yes	39	26.7
No	83	56.8
Not Sure	10	6.8
Subtotal	132	90.4
Missing	14	9.6
TOTAL	146	100.0
Active		
Yes	102	69.9
No	22	15.1
Not Sure`	9	6.2
Subtotal	133	91.1
Missing	13	8.9
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E5 (Continued)

Narrow Interests		
Yes	36	24.7
No	83	56.8
Not Sure	12	8.2
Subtotal	131	89.7
Missing	15	10.3
TOTAL	146	100.0
Loyal		
Yes	88	60.3
No	24	16.4
Not Sure	21	14.4
Subtotal	133	91.1
Missing	13	8.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Stubborn		
Yes	24	16.4
No	98	67.1
Not Sure	9	6.2
Subtotal	131	89.7
Missing	15	10.3
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E6. Frequency of Responses for JIG Category

Question	*f*	P
Pleasant		
Yes	98	67.1
No	13	8.9
Not Sure	4	2.7
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Bad		
Yes	5	3.4
No	107	73.3
Not Sure	3	2.1
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Ideal		
Yes	50	34.2
No	44	30.1
Not Sure	20	13.7
Subtotal	114	78.1
Missing	32	21.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Waste of time		
Yes	2	1.4
No	110	75.3
Not Sure	2	1.4
Subtotal	114	78.1
Missing	32	21.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Good		
Yes	107	73.3
No	8	5.5
Not Sure	2	1.4
Subtotal	117	80.1
Missing	29	19.9
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E6 (Continued)

Undesirable		
Yes	6	4.1
No	107	73.3
Not Sure	1	0.7
Subtotal	114	78.1
Missing	32	21.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Worthwhile		
Yes	110	75.3
No	3	2.1
Not Sure	3	2.1
Subtotal	116	79.5
Missing	30	21.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Worst than most		
Yes	5	3.4
No	106	72.6
Not Sure	3	2.1
Subtotal	114	78.1
Missing	32	21.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Acceptable		
Yes	104	71.2
No	10	6.8
Not Sure	2	1.4
Subtotal	116	79.5
Missing	30	20.5
TOTAL	146	100.0
Superior		
Yes	61	41.8
No	41	28.1
Not Sure	14	9.6
Subtotal	116	79.5
Missing	30	20.5
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E6 (Continued)

Better than most		
Yes	92	63.0
No	16	11.0
Not Sure	7	4.8
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Disagreeable		
Yes	7	4.8
No	106	72.6
Not Sure	2	1.4
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Makes me content		
Yes	85	58.2
No	19	13.0
Not Sure	12	8.2
Subtotal	116	79.5
Missing	30	20.5
TOTAL	146	100.0
Inadequate	*f*	P
Yes	11	7.5
No	98	67.1
Not Sure	6	4.1
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Excellent		
Yes	67	45.9
No	37	25.3
Not Sure	11	7.5
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0

Table E6 (Continued)

Rotten		
Yes	2	1.4
No	107	73.3
Not Sure	6	4.1
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0
Enjoyable		
Yes	102	69.9
No	11	7.5
Not Sure	4	2.7
Subtotal	117	80.1
Missing	29	19.9
TOTAL	146	100.0
Poor		
Yes	4	2.7
No	105	71.9
Not Sure	6	4.1
Subtotal	115	78.8
Missing	31	21.2
TOTAL	146	100.0