

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
WITH GROUP COHESION

by

Mark G. Resheske

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree With a Major in

Applied Psychology-Industrial Organizational Concentration

Approved: 4 Semester Credits

Research Advisor: Dr. Mitchell Sherman

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
May, 2001

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751

ABSTRACT

Resheske Mark G.

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP

WITH GROUP COHESION

Applied Psychology Dr. Mitchell Sherman 05/2001 48 pages

American Psychological Association (APA) Manual used in this study

This study investigated job satisfaction among full time faculty of the College of Human Development at a Wisconsin University. The research method used an anonymous survey that was voluntarily completed and returned to the researcher. The population of the study was the full time faculty of the College of Human Development at UW-Stout. Thirty-six full time faculty members participated in the study. The UW Employee Satisfaction Survey was used to measure the level of job satisfaction.

The results indicate that overall the faculty of the College of Human Development at UW-Stout are satisfied with their current employment. The study determined that group cohesion does play a role in overall job satisfaction. Measures of group cohesion had a significant relationship with overall job satisfaction. The study also determined that job autonomy, working with the students and fellow colleagues and supervisors were the top three best reasons for working here. It was also determined that pay, having more time and assistance with meeting deadlines and having equal workloads between colleagues were the three top priorities for improving the work environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT | 2 |
| CHAPTER ONE-INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| DEFINITIONS | 5 |
| PROBLEM STATEMENT | 7 |
| HYPOTHESIS | 7 |
| OBJECTIVES | 8 |
| CHAPTER TWO-LITERATURE REVIEW | 9 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 10 |
| CHAPTER THREE-METHODOLOGY | 20 |
| POPULATION AND SUBJECTS | 21 |
| DATA ANALYSIS | 22 |
| CHAPTER FOUR-RESULTS | 23 |
| RESEARCH FINDINGS | 24 |
| CHAPTER FIVE-CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 28 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 29 |
| REFERENCES | 30 |
| APPENDIX A | 34 |
| APPENDIX B | 45 |
| APPENDIX C | 46 |
| APPENDIX D | 47 |

CHAPTER I

Introduction

This chapter will introduce the topic of group cohesion and its relationship with job satisfaction. The importance of work will also be discussed along with the problem statement, research hypothesis, and research objectives.

Job satisfaction has been defined as the degree to which employees have a positive affective orientation towards employment by the organization (Price, 1997). Another defines job satisfaction as an affective (emotional) reaction to a job that results from the incumbents comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (Cranny, Smith, Stone, 1992, p.1). This later definition seems to be generally agreed upon throughout the literature.

A group tends to be used to “represent a large number of social aggregates, including, for example, minimal groups (Robinson, 1996). Group cohesion which may be defined as “a dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs” (Carron & Brawley, 2000). It is important to note that cohesion in a group can change over time in both its extent and various forms throughout the process of group formation, group development, group maintenance, and group dissolution (Carron & Brawley, 2000). This change can be due to basic changes in emotional states of group members as well as developing relationships among group members.

“Work determines a person’s worth and place in society and it influences one’s psychological identity and sense of well being. Work establishes one in the community of human kind. It links a person to others, advances the goals of culture, and gives purpose to ones very existence” (Szymanski & Parker, 1996, p.1). The statement that “work is a purposeful human activity, directed toward the satisfaction of human needs and desires” is excellent for our discussion (Best, 1973, p.2). It is obvious that work needs to be satisfying to the job incumbent for a mutually beneficial relationship to occur between employee and employer. In this study factors that could enhance job satisfaction in the healthcare industry through increased group cohesion will be discussed.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of the study is to describe the current level of job satisfaction and its relationship to factors of cohesion among the full time faculty of the College of Human development at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, as measured by the UW Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS).

Research Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that factors of group cohesion will be associated with job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is important for organizations to address due to its impact on absenteeism, (1) turnover, (2) and pro-social “citizenship” behaviors such as helping coworkers, helping customers and being more cooperative with all social ties (Karl & Sutton, 1998, p.515). Literature also shows that increased productivity was found to be related to higher satisfaction (Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993, p.15). “Multiple regression analysis showed that age, marital status, and group cohesion were positively associated with organizational trust” (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). Organizational trust is a feeling of confidence and support in an employer; it is the belief that an employer will be straight forward and will follow through on commitments. Trust is a significant predictor of satisfaction with supervision and performance appraisal. Organizational trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are all considered part of the customary nets of affective organizational attachment and employee attitudes” (Gilbert & Tang, 1998).

Objectives

This study will focus on the following three objectives:

1. To determine the level of job satisfaction reported by the (UW-Stout) full time faculty of the College of Human Development on the UW Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey.
2. Demographics will be identified such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, department and tenure to verify if they relate to job satisfaction.
3. To determine the relationship between factors of job satisfaction by completing a factor analysis of the constructs in relation to overall satisfaction ratings.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

This chapter will summarize current literature on job satisfaction and group cohesion, explore theories related to job satisfaction, and discuss the importance of being aware of employee's current satisfaction levels. Throughout this discussion the previously stated definitions of job satisfaction, group, and cohesion will be applied.

Job Satisfaction

The history of job satisfaction stems back to the early 1900's with the situationist perspective on job satisfaction. This perspective states that satisfaction is determined by certain characteristics of the job and characteristics of the job environment itself. This view has been present in the literature since the first studies by Hauser, Taylor and the various projects at the Western Electric plants in Hawthorne (Cranny, Smith & Stone 1992). These studies follow the assumption that when a certain set of job conditions are present a certain level of job satisfaction will follow. The Hawthorne Studies are considered to be the most important investigation of the human dimensions of industrial relations in the early 20th century. They were done at the Bell Telephone Western Electric manufacturing plant in Chicago beginning in 1924 through the early years of the Depression. The Hawthorne plant created an Industrial Research Division in the early 1920's. Personnel managers developed experiments to explore the effects of various conditions of work on morale and productivity (Brannigan & Zwerman 2001). "Today, reference to the "Hawthorne Effect" denotes a situation in which the introduction of experimental conditions designed to identify salient aspects of behavior has the consequence of changing the behavior it is designed to identify. The initial Hawthorne

effect referred to the observation that the productivity of the workers increased over time with every variation in the work conditions introduced by the experiments” (Brannigan & Zwerman 2001). Simply stated when people realize that their behavior is being watched they change how they act. The development of the Hawthorne studies also denotes the beginning of applied psychology, as we know it today. These early studies mark the birth of research on job satisfaction relating to ergonomics, design and productivity.

One of the most popular and researched measures of job satisfaction is the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). “The JDI is a 72-item adjective checklist type questionnaire developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin in 1969” (Gregson, 1991). This measure basis itself on five facets of job satisfaction. The first facet is the work itself, satisfaction with work itself is measured in terms of the core job characteristics such as autonomy, skill variety, feedback, task identity, and task significance (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Supervision, the second facet, is measured in such ways as how supervisors provide feedback, assess employees performance ratings, and delegate work assignments. Coworkers, the third facet, are measured in terms of social support, networking, and possible benefits attached to those relationships (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992). Pay, the fourth facet, is an important source of satisfaction because it provides a potential source of self-esteem as well as the generic opportunity for anything money can buy (Brockner, 1988). Obviously satisfaction with pay is measured primarily by current income but also by opportunities for salary increases. Promotion is the final facet and the one that the JDI explicitly assesses how perceptions about the future can affect job satisfaction. Today the facets of the JDI are generally assessed by modifying the adjective checklist and using a Likert scale on statements such as, “opportunities for advancement are plentiful”

measured from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992).

Another popular and highly researched measure of job satisfaction is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The MSQ can be scored for twenty facets; scores from one question for each facet provide a single overall composite score. The MSQ is commonly used in conjunction with the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ). “These instruments were designed for use with adult career counseling clients with work experience. They are particularly useful for clients that might be called “career changers,” that is, adults with considerable work experience in one or more chosen occupations who are dissatisfied with their work and remain undecided about their career future” (Thompson & Blain, 1992). The MIQ assesses the relative importance of each vocational need to the respondent. The MSQ, a measure of job satisfaction, assesses the degree of respondent satisfaction with each need in their current work environment. Scoring for the MSQ is relatively simple: percentile scores of 25 or lower indicate low satisfaction, percentile scores of 26 to 74 indicate moderate satisfaction, and scores of 75 or higher indicate high satisfaction. The MIQ uses scale scores ranging from –1.0 to 3.0. Low importance is indicated by scores below 0.0, moderate importance is indicated by scores between 0.0 and 1.4, and high importance is indicated by scores of 1.5 or higher (Thompson & Blain, 1992).

Job satisfaction is one of the most studied constructs in the areas of industrial organizational psychology, social psychology, organizational behavior, personnel and human resource management, and organizational management. This makes sense in that knowledge of the determinants, the consequences, and other correlates of job satisfaction

can be vital to organizational success (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992). Proper management can only be attained through knowing what affects job satisfaction.

A study conducted in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas reported similarities among workers. “10,339 workers were surveyed across 10 European countries, Russia, Japan, and the United States. Researchers consistently identified the same top five key attributes in a job: ability to balance work and personal life, work that is truly enjoyable, security for the future, good pay or salary and enjoyable co-workers. Across the four major geographic regions studied, workers specifically emphasized the importance of potential advancement and the opportunity to build skills as a way to maintain employability and job security” (Yankelovich Partners, 1998 p.42).

A survey polling members of the Association for Investment Management and Research found that 81% of the managers said they were satisfied or very satisfied with their job. When asked to identify the factors that create positive feelings about their job, most managers named professional achievement, personal or professional growth, the work itself and their degree of responsibility more important than compensation. Factors they viewed as creating negative feelings about their jobs were company policies, administration, relationships with supervisors, compensation and the negative impact of work on their personal lives (Cardona, 1996, p.9). In order to decrease some of these negative feelings and increase productivity it has been proposed to reduce the number of work days employees miss by increasing job satisfaction, redesigning disability plans and involving supervisors in management (Maurice, 1998, p.13).

Employers interested in remaining competitive in today’s world economy need to concentrate on retaining quality employees. “Rewarding employees for work well done

increases satisfaction and productivity” (Walker, 1998, p.18). Simple practices like this can aid the atmosphere of the work environment. “Giving recognition and rewards outside the paycheck such as recognizing key employees by name may also help” (Metzler, 1998, p.37-42). Other research indicates that customer satisfaction and loyalty are excellent predictors of profitability...the strongest predictors of customer satisfaction: employees’ general satisfaction with their jobs and employees’ satisfaction with their work/life balance” (McDonald & Hutcheson, 1999, p.18).

Again its important to note that job satisfaction is subject to change. “Results of studies comparing differences between age groups and level of job satisfaction report an increases in job satisfaction with age” (Osipow, 1968). “From an employees standpoint, job satisfaction is a desirable outcome in itself. From a managerial or organizational effectiveness standpoint, job satisfaction is important due to its impact on absenteeism (1) turnover, (2) and pro-social “citizenship” behaviors such as helping coworkers, helping customers, and being more cooperative. (3) Thus, to redesign jobs, reward systems, and human resource management policies that will result in optimum job satisfaction and productivity, managers need to know what employees value” (Karl & Sutton, 1998, p.515). In order to know what employees value it is necessary for organizations to assess and pay attention to current levels of job satisfaction.

Current studies on job satisfaction are plentiful with some interesting results. In one study the relationship among career experience, life satisfaction, and organizational factors for managers of healthcare organizations is explored. Within this study a two-stage Delphi analysis of American College of Healthcare Executives (ACHE) members identified nine domains of important job skills, knowledge, and abilities necessary for

success as healthcare managers. The nine domains, ranked in order of importance, are cost/finance, leadership, professional staff interactions, healthcare delivery concepts, accessibility, ethics, quality/risk management, technology, and marketing (Wiggins & Bowman, 2000). Notice leadership and professional staff interactions falling in second and third in order of importance for domains necessary for success. The same study shows that managers aspiring to become CEOs and those who do not reported similar levels of job satisfaction. It is also stated that personal satisfaction from one's employment, peer recognition, advancements, and positive feelings about personal success are excellent subjective measures of career success (Wiggins & Bowman, 2000).

Another study focusing on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) analyzing peer ratings of altruistic OCB in a sample of 96 U.S. nurses showed that the contextual variables of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and trust in management were pertinent for the participants (Wagner & Rush, 2000). "Such behaviors have been described as having an accumulative positive effect on organizational functioning" (Organ, 1990). "OCB researchers have investigated context-relevant attitudes such as job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, trust in management and peers, and organizational commitment as antecedents of OCB in U.S. populations" (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Of these attitudes, job satisfaction has been most consistently associated with OCB. Feeling satisfied reflect appraisals of the fairness of the social exchange (treatment) that the employee has with the organization. It is also suggested that satisfaction is a by-product of leader fairness and job satisfaction is one of the most reliable predictors of OCB (Wagner & Rush, 2000).

Until recently most research on job satisfaction was done in the industrial sector with attempts to adapt findings to higher education. While the above findings have relevance, job satisfaction for faculty must be examined. Given the impending shortage of prospective faculty to fill the numerous vacancies, the topics of job satisfaction for faculty, recruitment, and retention must be given attention. Consequently, university officials and current faculty in higher education must recognize the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction among faculty and eliminate them; as well as, recognize the factors that increase job satisfaction and enhance them (Tack & Patitu, 1992). Low levels of satisfaction and morale can lead to decreased teacher productivity and burnout, which is associated with a loss of concern for and detachment from the people one works with, decreased quality of teaching, depression, greater use of sick leave, efforts to leave the profession, and a cynical and dehumanized perception of students (Mendal, 1987).

Prior research suggests that internal stressors on faculty include achievement and recognition for achievement, autonomy, growth and development, the quality of students, the reputation of the institution and one's colleagues, responsibility, the interaction between students and teachers and its effect on students' learning, and the work itself. Factors that prevent job dissatisfaction describe relationships to the context or environment in which individuals work, representing such variables as interpersonal relationships, salary, tenure, policies and administration, rank, supervision, working conditions, the fit between the faculty role and the person involved, and collective bargaining. (Tack & Patitu, 1992). A recent report on job satisfaction among American teachers identified that more administrative support and leadership, good student behavior, a positive school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy as working conditions

associated with higher job satisfaction. A weak relationship was found between faculty satisfaction and salary and benefits. Research also shows that demographic variable such as age and gender have little or no significant impact on job satisfaction (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).

Theories

A number of theories exist on motivation, which relate to job satisfaction. The following chart describes the category, theory and theme of that theory to provide the relevant information in a brief manner.

| CAREGORY | THEORY | MAJOR THEME |
|-------------|---------------------|--|
| NEEDS | Maslow | Satiate needs to change behavior |
| | Alderfer ERG | Can satisfy multiple needs simultaneously |
| INDIVIDUAL | Achievement | Personality trait |
| | Intrinsic | Some are more motivated than others |
| COGNITIVE | Goal setting | Set goals to change behavior |
| | Expectancy | Links between behaviors, performance, and rewards |
| | ProMES | Links above categories w/evaluations and needs |
| SITUATIONAL | Job Characteristics | Modify task/job to increase motivation |
| | Operant Approach | Change rewards/punishments to change behavior |
| | Herzberg 2-factor | Hygiene factors lead to dissatisfaction; motivators result in satisfaction |

(Johnson, 2000)

Group Cohesion

“A group’s cohesiveness is measured by the degree to which a group sticks together, or by the strength of a group member’s desire to remain part of his or her work group. Cohesion is enhanced by severity of initiation into the group, perceptions of a “common enemy” or external threat, time spent together, and a history of group success. In a cohesive group, members feel attracted to one another and the group as a whole, and the group becomes an important source of information sharing. A feeling of inclusion in one’s work group may yield benefits of greater organizational understanding” (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). This greater organizational understanding can have a broad range of positive impacts on the functioning of the organization from stability to the bottom line. It has been stated that individuals in a highly cohesive work group may also experience a high level of organizational trust. “Trust has been labeled as a significant predictor of satisfaction with supervision and performance appraisal. Four basic factors breed trust: (1) open communication, (2) giving workers a greater share in decision making, (3) sharing of critical information, and (4) true sharing of perceptions and feelings. Organizational trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are all considered part of the customary nets of affective organizational attachment and employee attitudes. Furthermore, some have suggested that job satisfaction is one of the many components comprising organizational commitment” (Gilbert & Tang, 1998).

Research has also suggested that a lack of predictability and safety in organizational relationships result in low organizational commitment, decreased human relations and organizational performance, low employee morale and product quality, and increased absenteeism and turnover. If employees feel betrayed by management, they

may engage in even more destructive organizational behaviors, such as neglect, or in extreme cases, sabotage (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). Therefore group cohesion relates directly to job satisfaction namely through human relations with fellow employees and supervisors. These factors in turn can have drastic effects on overall organizational performance.

It has been stated earlier that open communication breeds trust which in turn aids in cohesiveness and satisfaction. “The more that an individual is part of the channels providing essential information, the more that he or she may experience organizational trust” (Mishra & Morrissey, 1990). Information flows to employees through informal networks and work group cohesion. Information not available through formal means, such as official company memoranda and formally prescribed working relationships, is transmitted through social integration and mentoring. Social integration is a multi-dimensional construct, including the factors of attraction to the group and heightened social interactions among members (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). “Benefits from increased organizational communication provided by social integration and mentoring include material resources, job mobility information, functional expertise, and political information. Consequently, access to organizational communication channels has been suggested to enhance organizational trust, job satisfaction, and group cohesion” (Gilbert & Tang, 1998). Again prior research suggests that group cohesion should impact job satisfaction and that being aware, measuring and assessing these factors is a necessity for the smooth operation of an organization.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The UW Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS) was the instrument used to obtain the data for this study. The instrument was created by Mark Resheske (MSAP student), and Mitchel Sherman, Ph. D. The instrument was designed to elicit information on communication, fairness of the compensation system, supervisor empowerment of the employees, and group cohesion in the workplace. The instrument takes about five to ten minutes to complete and contains a voluntary consent form at the top. It will be used to address the following research objectives:

1. To determine the level of job satisfaction reported by (UW-Stout) full time faculty of the College of Human Development on the UW Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey.
2. Demographics will be identified such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, department, and tenure to verify if they relate to job satisfaction.
3. To determine the relationship between factors of job satisfaction by completing a factor analysis of the constructs in relation to overall satisfaction ratings.

Specific Procedures

Several procedures needed to be completed in order for this study to occur. First, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was needed to ensure that the procedures used for data collection were ethical. Upon receiving approval the study could begin. A packet consisting of: a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and the return address for the completed survey (Appendix B), a consent form ensuring voluntary participation in the study as well as confidentiality of the data (Appendix C), and the UW-Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey (Appendix D) was then assembled.

Population and Subjects

The selected participants were the full time faculty of the College of Human Development within the University of Wisconsin-Stout. This consisted of eight departments including: the Department of Education, School Counseling, and School Psychology, the Department of Food and Nutrition, the Department of Hospitality and Tourism, the Department of Human Development, Family Living and Community Educational Services, the Department of Physical Education and Athletics, the Department of Psychology, the Department of Rehabilitation and Counseling, and the Stout Rehabilitation Institute. One hundred thirty-seven surveys were hand delivered to the above department secretaries who then distributed them to the full time faculties members mailbox. The department names and addresses were obtained from the 2000-2001 University Informational Directory.

Data Collection/Instrumentation

The attached cover letter (Appendix B) explained that the surveys, distributed on April 25, 2001, were to be returned to the psychology department by noon on Wednesday May 2, 2001. This gave the employees one week to complete the surveys. Through the use of campus mail, which is typically next day delivery, the process was quick and postage free. The completed surveys were picked up at the psychology department at UW-Stout on Wednesday May 2, 2001 at approximately 1:00 p.m.

The UW-Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey was developed by Mark Resheske and Mitchell Sherman Ph.D. The content was researched and deemed appropriate for the study by both parties. The instrument (Appendix D) uses a five point Likert scale to rank the items. The ranges are as follows: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3)neutral, (4)

agree, and (5) strongly agree. Six demographic questions were asked as well as two qualitative questions.

Data Analysis

The collection of responses on the UW-Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey was analyzed using SPSS 10.0 software (Statistical Packages for the Social Scientist). The following manipulations were carried out on the data: mean, standard deviation, frequencies, correlations, and a factor analysis (Appendix A).

CHAPTER IV

Results

The UW-Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey was composed of thirty-eight (38) questions designed to elicit information on the work environment. The first six questions were based on demographics such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, department, and number of years with the University. The following thirty-two (32) questions were based on a Likert scale and coded as numbered in the methodology section. The last two questions elicited qualitative data and were grouped in a frequency table.

The (ESS) was hand delivered to the eight departments of the college of Human Development at UW-Stout. Thirty-six (36) surveys out of one hundred thirty seven (137) were returned for a response rate of twenty-six percent (26%).

The purpose of the study is to describe the current level of job satisfaction and its relationship to factors of cohesion among the full time faculty of the College of Human Development. The focus was on the following objectives:

1. To determine the level of job satisfaction reported by (UW-Stout) full time faculty of the College of Human Development on the UW Stout Employee Satisfaction Survey.
2. Demographics will be identified such as age, gender, marital status, number of children, department, and tenure to verify if they relate to job satisfaction.
3. To determine the relationship between factors of job satisfaction by completing a factor analysis of the constructs in relation to overall satisfaction ratings.

The data was analyzed by computing means, standard deviations, frequencies, correlations, and conducting a factor analysis.

Research Findings

A display of the satisfaction levels for the faculty are in Appendix A of this report. This contains the SPSS printout of the encoded data. This data contains the information that was collected, analyzed, and used to determine the important constructs relating to faculty satisfaction. The primary descriptive results are as follows:

- Overall the results are positive. The faculty views this organization as a good place to work.
- The top rated (highest mean listed first) satisfaction level deemed important by the faculty were: providing a valuable service, having the opportunity to do a variety of tasks, supervisors have an open door policy, responsibility for planning their own work activities, and using professional skills (education, training) regularly.
- The lowest rated (lowest mean listed first) satisfaction level deemed important by the faculty were: satisfaction with benefit package, and feeling fairly compensated for work.

The demographic questions provided no significant results relating to job satisfaction. The mean age of the respondents was approximately forty-five (45) years old. There were fifteen male and nineteen female respondents, two of the respondents were unknown. The mean number of children was 1.5 per respondent. The mean number of years working with the University was approximately ten (10) years.

The bulk of the instrument composed of questions rated on a Likert scale provided some interesting information. A Pearson Correlation was computed for all the variables. Due to the purpose of this study the primary relationship examined was the correlations between all the variables and the rating of overall job satisfaction (overall this is a good

place to work). Several associations were found that support the hypothesis that constructs representative of group cohesion will be associated with job satisfaction. The items on the instrument representative of group cohesion in accordance with the current literature are question numbers 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 17, 25, 27 and 28.

The highest association with overall job satisfaction was with part of number 28 (I feel comfortable talking to senior management about job content) with a correlation of .532. The second highest was satisfaction with career advancement with a correlation of .530. Third was working in an environment where there is cooperation and respect with a correlation of .491. The fourth highest correlation was .479 with being comfortable with talking to my supervisor about job content (part of question number 27). The fifth highest correlation (.458) was with talking to senior management about problems with a supervisor. Sixth was having the opportunity to do a variety of tasks with a correlation of .452. The seventh highest correlation (.447) was with open communication throughout the workplace (question number 10). If I put extra effort into my work someone will notice was eight highest with a correlation of .438. Job performance evaluations done by my supervisor are fair and based on clear performance standards (question number 9) was ninth highest with a correlation of .437. Feeling motivated at work and work assignments are delegated fairly tied at the tenth spot with a correlation of .426. Senior management are aware of activities in my department was eleventh highest with a correlation of .423 (question number 8). Feeling comfortable talking to senior management about company policies (part of question number 28) was twelfth with a correlation of .410. Providing a valuable service to clients was the thirteenth with a

correlation of .403. All of these thirteen associations were within the .02 significance level.

The qualitative data involving the three best things about working at UW-Stout and the three things that could best improve the work environment were analyzed according to frequency of responses and tabulated.

| Three best things about working here: | Frequency: |
|--|-------------------|
| Job Autonomy/Flexible hours | 20 |
| Working with students | 11 |
| Colleagues/Supervisors | 11 |

| Three things that could best improve the work environment: | Frequency: |
|---|-------------------|
| Pay | 11 |
| More time to meet deadlines/Assistance | 10 |
| Equal work loads between colleagues | 10 |

Several other constructs evolved from the qualitative data that were interesting. Things included in the three best things about working here were: job tasks, stimulating and collegial environment, location, learning, benefits, and lack of pressure to perform. Other ideas included in the things that could best improve my work environment were: avoid gossip, cordial co-workers, more cohesiveness between departments, trust and open communication, fewer committees, lighten work load, less hoops to jump through to get

things accomplished, more training opportunities, better office and classroom facilities, easier access to technology, and a stable budget.

The factor analysis also yielded some interesting results. A five component extraction was performed. The first factor yielded a significant finding towards supervisory relationships with all with this factor above .5. The second factor was task cooperation which also had correlations above the .5 level. The third factor had to do with the universities mission which was again above the .5 level. The fourth and fifth factors align with Herzbergs two factor theory. Motivation and hygiene factors were both significant with correlations well above the .5 level (see Appendix A).

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

The prior research suggests that job satisfaction can effect employee morale, turnover, absenteeism, and pro-social behavior, which can be crucial for organizational success. This not only applies to traditional business but the University system as well. The job satisfaction of our teachers is critical for the success of our Universities as effective organizations.

Overall the faculty of the College of Human Development is quite satisfied and views the University as a good place to work. The faculty views its supervisory relationships, cooperation with tasks, the universities mission as well as motivation and hygiene factors as important for their job satisfaction. Several constructs of group cohesion also emerged as having a strong and significant association with job satisfaction. In order from most to least they are: feeling comfortable talking to senior management about job content, feeling comfortable talking to the supervisor about job content, having open communication throughout the workplace, having performance evaluations done by your supervisor be fair and based on clear performance standards, and having senior management aware of activities in your department. However they were not the only associations. As shown in the results section satisfaction with career advancement had a strong association with job satisfaction. Working in an environment of cooperation and mutual respect was also important to the faculties job satisfaction. Topics such as talking with senior management about problems with and simple open communication throughout the workforce was among some others associated. The faculty enjoys having the opportunity to do a variety of tasks and the fact that extra effort

is noticed. Feeling motivated at work is just as important as having work assignments delegated fairly. Finally the faculty believes they are providing a valuable service to students. The faculty also enjoys its job autonomy. They also enjoy working with the students, their colleagues, and supervisors. Other ideas were expressed when asked to identify the three best things about working at the University. These ideas include: the job tasks themselves, Working in a stimulating collegial environment, the location of the University, working in a continual learning environment, having excellent benefits and lack of pressure to perform.

However, the faculty feels that more pay would be the best way to improve the work environment. More time and assistance in meeting deadlines would also be appreciated. The faculty also feels that the work-loads are not equal between colleagues. Ideas were also given in ways to improve the University work environment. These ideas include: avoiding gossip, more cordial co-workers, more cohesiveness between departments, trust and open communication, having fewer committees, having a lighter workload, less red tape, more training opportunities, having better office and classroom facilities, easier access to technology, and having a more stable budget.

The results of the current study support the notion that group cohesion and other constructs are important to the job satisfaction of faculty. It is recommended that these results be kept in mind when structuring all aspects of faculty positions. While not all suggestions are feasible due to time and budget constraints it is recommended to be aware of current satisfaction levels of employees in order to address problems efficiently. This will result in a smoother operating University system that is more apt to successfully serve its purpose as an organization.

Recommendations

A further recommendation would be to update the instrument to specifically address university titles such as department chair or university as a whole. A study of the entire University faculty would also prove interesting. With this study being a success in measuring job satisfaction another larger study would allow all of the Colleges and departments to be involved in the data pool. It is also recommended that this be replicated in the future before policy changes are made that involve the faculties work environment. This will ensure that levels of job satisfaction be maintained at an above average level.

References

- Best, F. (1973). Introduction in F. Best (Ed.). The Future of Work. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
- Brannigan, A. & Zwerman, W. (2001). The Real Hawthorne Effect. Society, Vol. 38 Issue 2, p.55.
- Brockner, J. (1988). Self esteem at work: Research, theory and practice. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Cardona, M. M. (1996). Job satisfaction not due to cash. Pensions & investments, 24 9-18.
- Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R. (2000). Cohesion: conceptual and measurement issues. Small Group Research, 31, 89.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., Stone, E. F. (1992). Job Satisfaction. Lexington Books: New York, New York.
- Gilbert, J. A., Tang, L. P. (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedents. Public Personnel Management, 27, 321.
- Gregson, T. (1991). The separate constructs of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Educational & Psychological Measurement, Vol. 51 Issue 1.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.
- Johnson, B. W. (2000). Analysis of the Factors Involved in Restaurant Management Job Satisfaction and Retention for Famous Daves of America. Research Paper, University of Wisconsin Stout.
- Karl & Sutton (1998). Job values in today's workforce: a comparison of public and

- private sector employees. Public Personnel Management, 27, 515-528.
- Maurice, A. (1998). Happy workers miss fewer days: study. National Underwriter/Property & Casualty Risk & Benefits, 102, 13-18.
- McDonald, B. D. & Hutcheson, D. (1999). Employee loyalty, commitment directly impact the bottom line. Business Press, 11, 18-27.
- Mendal, P. C. (1987). "An Investigation of Factors That Influence Teacher Morale and Satisfaction with Work Conditions." Doctoral dissertation. Eugene, Oregon: Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1987. 106p.
- Metzler, J. (1998). The little things that can help retain employees. Internetweek, 743, 37-42.
- Mishra, J., & Morrissey, M. A. (1990). Trust in employee/employer relationships: A survey of West Michigan managers. Public Personnel Management, 19.4, winter 1990, 443-463.
- National Center for Education Statistics. "Job Satisfaction among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation." Washington, D.C.: Author, July 1997.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol.12, pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Osipow, S. (1968). Theories of career development. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Price, J. L. (1997). Handbook of organizational measurement. International Journal of

- Manpower, 18, 303-558.
- Robinson, W. P. (1996). Social groups and identities: developing the legacy of Henri Taifel. Oxford UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Szymanski, E. M. & Parker, R. M. (1996). Work and Disability. Austin, Texas: Pro-Ed, Inc.
- Tack, M. W. & Patitu, C. L. (1992). Faculty Job Satisfaction: Women and Minorities in Peril. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education*, Washington, D.C.
- Thompson, J. M. & Blain, M. D. (1992). Presenting Feedback on the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Career Development Quarterly, Vol. 41 Issue 1, p.62
- Wagner, S. L. & Rush, M. C. (2000). Altruistic Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Context, Disposition and Age. Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 140 Issue 3, p.379
- Walker, J. (1998). Satisfying employees is a profitable strategy. New Hampshire Business Review, 20, 17-20.
- Wiggins, C. & Bowman, S. Y. (2000). Career Success and Life Satisfaction for Female and Male Healthcare Managers. Hospital Topics, Vol. 78 Issue 3.
- Wilkinson & Wagner (1993). Supervisory leadership styles and state vocational rehabilitation counselor job satisfaction and productivity. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 37, 15-25.
- Yankelovich Partners (1998). Workers around the world share similar attitudes toward jobs. Houston Business Journal, 29, 39-43.

Appendix A--SPSS Results

| Correlations | | Overall this organizatio n is a good place to work |
|---|------------------------|---|
| I feel fairly compensat ed for my work | Pearson Correlation | .163 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .349 |
| | N | 35 |
| If I put extra effort into my work someone will notice | Pearson Correlation | .438 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .008 |
| | N | 35 |
| I work in an environme nt where ther is mutual respect | Pearson Correlation | .491 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .003 |
| | N | 35 |
| My supervisor cares about my personal needs | Pearson Correlation | .192 |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .270 |
| | N | 35 |
| Problems in the workplace are addressed quickly and adequately | Pearson Correlation | .358 |
| | Sig. (2- | .035 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
| | | tailed) | |
| | | N | 35 |
| My supervisor praises employee suggestions that aid in solving organizational problems | Pearson Correlation | | .101 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .571 |
| | | N | 34 |
| Supervisors are involved in the daily operations of my department | Pearson Correlation | | -.015 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .934 |
| | | N | 35 |
| Senior management are aware of activities in my department | Pearson Correlation | | .423 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .013 |
| | | N | 34 |
| Job performance evaluation s done by my supervisor are fair and based on clear performance standards | Pearson Correlation | | .437 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | .009 |
| | | N | 35 |
| There is open communic | Pearson Correlation | | .447 |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|------|
| ation throughout the workplace | Sig. (2-tailed) | .007 |
| | N | 35 |
| I have a clear well written job description | Pearson Correlation | .367 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .030 |
| | N | 35 |
| The organization's mission and vision is realistic, clear, and attainable | Pearson Correlation | .382 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .023 |
| | N | 35 |
| My fellow employees know how to get the job done | Pearson Correlation | .311 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .069 |
| | N | 35 |
| I am responsible for planning my work activities | Pearson Correlation | .385 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .022 |
| | N | 35 |
| I feel motivated at work | Pearson Correlation | .426 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .011 |
| | N | 35 |
| I provide a valuable service to clients | Pearson Correlation | .403 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .017 |
| | N | 35 |
| I work in a team | Pearson Correlation | .220 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------|--|
| environme nt | | | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .204 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I feel stressed at work | Pearson Correlation | -.477 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .004 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I deal with manageab le workload | Pearson Correlation | .063 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .720 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I use my profession al skills (education , training) regularly | Pearson Correlation | .388 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .024 | |
| | N | 34 | |
| Work assignmen ts are delegated fairly | Pearson Correlation | .426 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .011 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I work in a safe comfortabl e environme nt | Pearson Correlation | .338 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .047 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I have the opportunit y to do a variety of tasks | Pearson Correlation | .375 | |
| | Sig. (2- tailed) | .029 | |
| | N | 34 | |
| I have the opportunit y to do a | Pearson Correlation | .452 | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|------|
| variety of tasks | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .006 |
| | N | 35 |
| My supervisor has an open door policy and there is always a welcoming feeling present | Pearson Correlation | .267 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .121 |
| | N | 35 |
| The diversity/firmative action programs adequately address the needs of the organization | Pearson Correlation | .243 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .159 |
| | N | 35 |
| I feel comfortable talking to my supervisor about:pay | Pearson Correlation | .093 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .599 |
| | N | 34 |
| :problem with co-worker | Pearson Correlation | .323 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .058 |
| | N | 35 |
| :senior management | Pearson Correlation | .341 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .048 |
| | N | 34 |
| :job content | Pearson Correlation | .479 |
| | Sig. (2- | .004 |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|------|--|
| | tailed) | | |
| | N | 35 | |
| I feel comfortable talking to senior management about: | Pearson Correlation | .379 | |
| pay | Sig. (2-tailed) | .030 | |
| | N | 33 | |
| :problem with supervisor | Pearson Correlation | .458 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .007 | |
| | N | 33 | |
| :company policies | Pearson Correlation | .410 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .018 | |
| | N | 33 | |
| :job content | Pearson Correlation | .532 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 | |
| | N | 33 | |
| I am satisfied with: | Pearson Correlation | .217 | |
| pay | Sig. (2-tailed) | .210 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| :my benefit package (insurance etc) | Pearson Correlation | .308 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .072 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| :my career advancement | Pearson Correlation | .530 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| :my job security | Pearson Correlation | .180 | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .302 | |
| | N | 35 | |
| :time off (vacation, sick leave) | Pearson Correlation | .057 | |

Sig. (2-tailed) .747
 N 35

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

| gender | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | male | 15 | 41.7 | 44.1 | 44.1 |
| | female | 19 | 52.8 | 55.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 34 | 94.4 | 100.0 | |
| Missing | 99 | 2 | 5.6 | | |
| Total | | 36 | 100.0 | | |

Rotated Component Matrix

| Component | Component | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| age | .266 | -.289 | .215 | -.158 | .503 |
| I feel fairly compensated for my work | 7.888E-02 | .136 | -8.081E-02 | 1.454E-02 | .835 |
| If I put extra effort into my work someone will notice I work in an environment where there is mutual respect | -9.018E-02 | -2.549E-02 | .136 | .386 | .627 |
| My supervisor cares about my personal needs | .183 | .885 | 6.683E-02 | 2.868E-02 | 8.558E-02 |
| Problems in the | .442 | -8.095E-02 | .487 | .247 | .332 |
| | .293 | .119 | .272 | .676 | 4.444E-02 |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| workplace are addressed quickly and adequately | .117 | -.285 | .598 | .125 | .278 |
| My supervisor praises employee suggestions that aid in solving organizational problems | .395 | -.319 | 8.395E-02 | .451 | 3.951E-02 |
| Supervisors are involved in the daily operations of my department | .190 | 9.919E-02 | .291 | .728 | -6.238E-02 |
| Senior management are aware of activities in my department | -3.256E-02 | .521 | .364 | .459 | 9.242E-02 |
| Job performance evaluations done by my supervisor are fair and based on clear performance standards | .374 | .724 | 9.028E-03 | 4.047E-02 | -1.681E-02 |
| There is open communication throughout the workplace | -8.309E-02 | 9.113E-02 | -.139 | .756 | 5.438E-02 |
| I have a clear well written job description | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|-------|------------|------------|------------|
| The organization's mission and vision is realistic, clear, and attainable | -3.948E-02 | .261 | -.238 | .684 | -3.851E-02 |
| My fellow employees know how to get the job done | .173 | .670 | -9.408E-03 | -.188 | .157 |
| I am responsible for planning my work activities | .142 | .428 | .557 | -.166 | .179 |
| I feel motivated at work | -.158 | .207 | .781 | -4.821E-02 | -.181 |
| I provide a valuable service to clients | 7.285E-02 | .117 | .451 | 3.909E-02 | -.370 |
| I work in a team environment | -.110 | .160 | .799 | -.105 | .101 |
| I feel stressed at work | -5.505E-04 | -.125 | -.189 | -.550 | -.523 |
| I deal with a manageable workload | -.219 | -.390 | -9.012E-02 | .452 | .347 |
| I use my professional skills (education, training) regularly | .204 | .344 | .346 | -.609 | -9.492E-02 |
| Work assignments are delegated fairly | -3.241E-02 | .687 | .300 | .194 | -9.490E-02 |
| I work in a safe comfortable environment | .386 | .392 | .130 | -.301 | .443 |
| I have the opportunity | .182 | .618 | 9.257E-02 | 7.724E-02 | 4.946E-02 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| y to do a variety of tasks | | | | | |
| I have the opportunity to do a variety of tasks | 1.876E-02 | .178 | .604 | 6.933E-02 | .212 |
| My supervisor has an open door policy and there is always a welcoming feeling present | .574 | -7.964E-02 | .598 | .184 | -5.988E-02 |
| The diversity/affirmative action programs adequately address the needs of the organization | .555 | -6.549E-02 | .387 | .361 | .224 |
| I feel comfortable talking to my supervisor about:pay | .804 | 9.669E-02 | -.240 | -.154 | -5.877E-02 |
| :problem with co-worker | .866 | 8.731E-02 | 5.575E-02 | -.137 | 3.719E-02 |
| :senior management | .840 | .217 | .106 | -7.583E-02 | -1.819E-02 |
| :job content | .617 | .168 | .502 | -3.317E-02 | -4.335E-02 |
| I feel comfortable talking to senior management about:pay | .660 | .276 | -3.636E-02 | .227 | .353 |
| :problem with supervisor | .688 | .459 | -.185 | .229 | .206 |
| :company policies | .674 | .417 | -5.851E-02 | .200 | -2.287E-02 |
| :job | .437 | .418 | .295 | .505 | 5.537E-02 |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|-------|-----------|------|
| content I am satisfied with:my pay | -3.963E- 02 | .279 | -.102 | 1.785E-02 | .755 |
| :my benefit package (insurance etc) | .413 | .151 | .378 | 6.653E-02 | .177 |
| :my career advancem ent | .185 | .255 | .340 | .234 | .632 |
| :my job security | .464 | .243 | .261 | -.429 | .346 |
| :time off (vacation, sick leave) | .222 | -.177 | .420 | -.171 | .581 |
| Overall this organizatio n is a good place to work | .115 | .644 | .241 | .388 | .240 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a Rotation converged in 14 iterations.

Appendix B—Survey Cover Letter

Mark Resheske
MSAP Student
Psychology Department
UW-Stout

Dear faculty member:

I am currently working on my thesis, which is a study on job satisfaction. I would appreciate you filling out the attached satisfaction survey and returning it to the:

UW-Stout Psychology Department

(Attention: Mark Resheske)

Education and Human Services Building

Menomonie, WI 54751

Please send the completed survey through campus mail or drop it off by noon on Wednesday May 2, 2001. The data will be used for research purposes and to suggest possible improvements to the University. Thank you for your time and I appreciate your response.

Sincerely,

Mark Resheske

Appendix C—Consent Form

Consent Form

I understand that by returning this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand that the study focuses on aspects relating to job satisfaction and that the potential risks of participation are exceedingly small. I also understand that the information obtained from the successful completion of the study may be used for possible improvements within the organization. I am aware that the information being sought is confidential and for research purposes and in no way will attempts to identify respondents occur. The data will be stored on a database only accessible to the researcher and deleted after the research is completed. I realize I have the right to refuse participation and can withdraw from participating at any time without prejudice. I also have the right to refuse answering any specific questions that I deem inappropriate. This information will not become part of my permanent record.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about participation in the research should be addressed first to the researcher or research advisor and second to Dr. Ted Knous, Chair, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 HH, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715) 232-1126.

Appendix D—Survey Instrument

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY

Department of Psychology
Menomonie, WI 54751

The purpose of this survey is to review and improve the work environment of your company. Participation gives you the opportunity to provide valuable information so that the environment can be improved. Your participation is strictly voluntary. Information that you choose to provide will be anonymous and will be sent directly to researchers at UW-Stout who will incorporate your responses with those from your fellow employees. This information will not become part of your permanent record.

By filling out this survey you consent to the use of the data for research purposes.

I. Demographics:

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: M F
3. Marital Status: (circle one) Married Divorced Single
4. Number of children? _____
5. Number of years with the company _____
6. Name of your
Department: _____

SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree N=Neutral A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

II. Questionnaire

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. I feel fairly compensated for my work. | SD D N A SA |
| 2. If I put extra effort into my work, someone will notice. | SD D N A SA |
| 3. I work in an environment where there is cooperation and respect. | SD D N A SA |
| 4. My supervisor cares about my personal needs. | SD D N A SA |
| 5. Problems in the workplace are addressed quickly and adequately. | SD D N A SA |
| 6. My supervisor praises employee suggestions that aid in solving organizational problems. | SD D N A SA |
| 7. Supervisors are involved in the daily operations of my department. | SD D N A SA |
| 8. Senior management are aware of activities in my department. | SD D N A SA |
| 9. Job performance evaluations done by my supervisor are fair and based on clear performance standards. | SD D N A SA |
| 10. There is open communication throughout the workplace. | SD D N A SA |
| 11. I have a clear well written job description. | SD D N A SA |
| 12. The organization's mission and vision is realistic, clear, and attainable. | SD D N A SA |
| 13. My fellow employees know how to get the job done. | SD D N A SA |
| 14. I am responsible for planning my work activities. | SD D N A SA |
| 15. I feel motivated at work. | SD D N A SA |
| 16. I provide a valuable service to clients. | SD D N A SA |
| 17. I work in a team environment. | SD D N A SA |
| 18. I feel stressed at work. | SD D N A SA |
| 19. I deal with a manageable workload. | SD D N A SA |
| 20. I use my professional skills (education, training) regularly. | SD D N A SA |
| 21. Work assignments are delegated fairly. | SD D N A SA |

- 22. I work in a safe and comfortable environment. SD D N A SA
- 23. Training for my position is clear and helpful. SD D N A SA
- 24. I have the opportunity to do a variety of tasks. SD D N A SA
- 25. My supervisor has an open door policy and there is always a welcoming feeling present. SD D N A SA
- 26. The Diversity/Affirmative Action Programs adequately address the needs of the organization. SD D N A SA
- 27. I feel comfortable talking to my supervisor about:
 - A. Pay SD D N A SA
 - B. Problem with a co-worker SD D N A SA
 - C. Senior management SD D N A SA
 - D. Job Content SD D N A SA
- 28. I feel comfortable talking to senior management about:
 - A. Pay SD D N A SA
 - B. Problem with supervisor SD D N A SA
 - C. Company policies SD D N A SA
 - D. Job Content SD D N A SA
- 29. I am satisfied with:
 - A. My Pay SD D N A SA
 - B. My Benefit Package (Insurance etc) SD D N A SA
 - C. My Career Advancement SD D N A SA
 - D. My Job Security SD D N A SA
 - E. Time Off (vacation, sick leave) SD D N A SA
- 30. Overall this organization is a good place to work. SD D N A SA

31. The three things I like best about working here are:

32. The three things that could best improve my work environment are:

For information contact the Department of Psychology at 232-2658