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The problem of this study was the analysis of the attitudes relating to job satisfaction as experienced by Negro professors at public Southern white institutions of higher education and white professors at public Negro institutions of higher education. To facilitate the investigation, eleven research questions were used.

Data for the study were obtained by the use of the *Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale*, the *Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire*, and a "Personal Data Response Sheet." The *Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale* was used to measure the way professors feel about work performed as a faculty member at a desegregated institution of higher education. The instrument is a criterion measure used for the separation of extreme groups in which mean scores may be derived to determine the degree of job satisfaction in relation to job dissatisfaction. The *Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire* was used to compare the relationship of job satisfaction with certain social factors. When compared, the social factor items can represent a basis for analyzing attitudes.
relating to job satisfaction held by professors who are members of a desegregated faculty. A "Personal Data Response Sheet" was used for the purpose of obtaining pertinent information about each respondent. The classification of the personal data included

(1) number of years at present place of employment,
(2) race identification,
(3) highest earned academic degree, and
(4) number of years professional experience as an academic administrator and/or faculty member.

The personal information was used to analyze the relationship of the variables as affecting the professors' current level of job satisfaction.

Statistical analysis of the respondents' raw scores for the two instruments was accomplished by the use of two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance based on race and years at present employment, highest degree held, and years in the profession. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was computed for the following Negro and white professor groups:

(1) professors with a doctorate degree,
(2) professors with a master's degree,
(3) professors with less than a master's degree
(4) professors with two, but less than nine, years of professional experience,
(5) professors with nine, but less than sixteen, years of professional experience,

(6) professors with sixteen or more years of professional experience,

(7) professors employed at the same institution for two, but less than eight, years, and

(8) professors employed at the same institution for eight or more years.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was also computed for (1) all the Negro professors included in the study, (2) all the white professors included in the study, and (3) all respondents included in the study.

The study involved a random sample of 100 institutions and 478 Negro and white professors. The percentage of returned questionnaires was 55.23 for all professors, 75.00 for Negro professors, and 46.36 for white professors. The reluctance of white professors to commit their attitudes to writing exacerbated follow-up efforts. Personal caution against comments relevant to job satisfaction at a Negro institution of higher education, being misinterpreted to reflect a derogatory attitude toward faculty desegregation in general, precluded a higher percentage of returned questionnaires from white professors.

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. There was a significant difference in the level
of job satisfaction between Negro and white professors.

2. There was a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors with specific academic degrees and white professors with specific academic degrees.

3. A significant difference in the level of job satisfaction existed between Negro professors employed at the white institutions for a specified number of years and white professors employed at the Negro institutions for a specified number of years.

4. A significant difference in the level of job satisfaction existed between Negro professors with varied years of professional experience and white professors with varied years of professional experience.

5. There was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for professors according to race, years at present employment, highest degree held, and years of professional experience.

Conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. Negro professors at white institutions had a higher level of job satisfaction than white professors at Negro institutions.

2. The level of job satisfaction increases for Negro professors as higher academic degrees are obtained, but decreases for white professors as higher academic degrees are obtained.
3. The level of job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of employment at the institutions increase in number.

4. The level of job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of professional experience increase in number.

5. Certain social factors have a greater association with the level of job satisfaction held by Negro professors than with the level of job satisfaction held by white professors.

The conclusion that Negro professors at white institutions have a higher level of job satisfaction than white professors at Negro institutions is consistent with the findings of a previous survey of faculty members at Negro institutions of higher education. A major influence upon job satisfaction held by professors, as determined by several previous studies, is an institution's professional reputation and the recognized level of institutional prestige. Consequently, an institution's level of professional prestige can promote or become a barrier toward the achievement of faculty job satisfaction. Therefore, a primary and concerted effort on the part of administrators at predominantly Negro institutions of higher education should involve initiating approaches designed to improve the level of professional esteem generated by the institution as a means
toward improving faculty job satisfaction among the members of the desegregated faculty.

The conclusion that job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of employment and professional experience increase suggests that the potential for dissatisfaction vis-a-vis satisfaction is more acute during the beginning years of professional employment. Accordingly, administrators at predominantly white institutions, where faculty job satisfaction was found to be higher, are encouraged to continue to give careful consideration to job satisfaction producing criteria such as work assignments, teaching loads, salaries, opportunities for professional and social exchanges, and entry level rank assignments as a means toward promoting faculty desegregation and job satisfaction. Administrators at predominantly Negro institutions, where the level of faculty job satisfaction was lower, should give more attention to implementing and effectuating the job-satisfaction-producing factors as a means toward improving the job satisfaction of its desegregated faculty.

The implications of the conclusion that certain social factors have a greater association with the level of job satisfaction held by Negro professors than with the level of job satisfaction held by white professors suggest that the predominantly white institutions' external and surrounding environments influence, to a greater extent, the level of job satisfaction of Negro members of a desegregated faculty.
A more successful approach to faculty desegregation and job satisfaction suggests that administrators at predominantly white institutions initiate a cooperative relationship with community leaders to promote professional and social interactions and other social involvement by Negro members of the desegregated faculty.

Recommendations include the need for further study to determine the causes of job dissatisfaction among white professors employed by Negro institutions of higher education. Additionally, it is recommended that further research be conducted to analyze the faculty desegregation process at Southern public institutions of higher education.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Supreme Court's 1896 ruling in Plessy v. Ferguson established a "separate but equal" doctrine that became applicable to all facets of life in the Southern United States. The effect of the doctrine was most visible in pupil assignment to educational facilities in those States directly affected by the Court's ruling (7, pp. 443-445). Efforts to end the resulting de jure segregation in public education culminated with the 1954 decision rendered by the United States Court in the case Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas. The decision, as rendered, was directed primarily to student placement according to facilities and was addressed to elementary and secondary schools. Prior to 1954, however, litigation challenging the "separate but equal" doctrine concerned the doctrine's application to graduate education. The resolution of those lawsuits brought against graduate and professional schools provided the precedents upon which the Brown decision was ultimately based (21, p. 1).

In 1938, the case Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada challenged the doctrine's application to public graduate education. In that case, the Court held that the United States Constitution in the Fourteenth Amendment gave to the Negro the right to require the State of Missouri "to furnish
him within its borders facilities for legal education sub-
stantially equal to those which the State there afforded for
persons of the white race" (27, p. 64). The effect of the
Court's ruling was to cause the State of Missouri to discon-
tinue the practice of providing out-of-state tuition grants
for Negro students pursuing certain graduate programs (27,
p. 64; 7, pp. 445-446). In the 1948 case *Sipuel v. Board of
Regents*, the Court ruled unconstitutional the practice by the
State of Oklahoma of providing tuition grants for Negro
students to pursue a law degree at institutions outside of
the State. Consequently, separate law schools for Negroes
were established in Missouri and Oklahoma, among other States.
Finally, in 1949 and pursuant to persistent court action, the
plaintiff in the *Sipuel* case gained admission to the Univer-
sity of Oklahoma Law School (27, p. 64; 21, pp. 1-2).

The Supreme Court ruled on two additional cases before
it overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine. The prac-
tice of segregating Negro students within the confines of a
university or college campus was ruled unconstitutional by
the Court's 1950 decision in the case *McLaurin v. Oklahoma
State Regents* (27, p. 65). The same year, the Court ruled
in *Sweatt v. Painter* that a separate law school for Negroes
in Texas did not provide for the plaintiff "substantial
equality" in legal training compared to that available to
white students at the University of Texas Law School (27, p.
65; 7, p. 446).
The "separate but equal" doctrine was reexamined and ruled unconstitutional in the 1954 case Brown v. Board of Education. In the Brown decision, the Court ruled that state laws requiring separate educational facilities for Negro and white students were contrary to those individual rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A week following the Brown decision, the Court ruled in Hawkins v. Board of Education (University of Florida) that the Brown decision would apply to institutions of higher education (26, p. 16).

By 1954 and following the Brown decision, limited numbers of Negroes were enrolled in graduate and professional schools in all of the Southern States except Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina (21). Southern institutions, however, were not involved in serious efforts to desegregate faculties. In several of the States, efforts to accomplish student desegregation in graduate and undergraduate education resulted in massive and, in some cases, violent resistance (2; 7, p. 11; 21, p. 26; 24).

The first efforts to implement the Court's decisions and desegregate Southern public higher education involved students almost exclusively. Serious attempts to initiate and improve faculty desegregation began with the passage by the United States Congress of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Further impetus to faculty desegregation was provided by the Presidential Executive Order 11246 of 1965. Section VII, as
amended, of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits "discrimination in employment (including hiring, upgrading, salaries, fringe benefits, training, and other conditions of employment) on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex" (18; 26, p. 37). All educational institutions with fifteen or more employees are subject to the provision of the Act. Title VI of the Act prohibits discrimination against students in providing educational opportunities. The 1965 Executive Order 11246 prohibits discrimination in employment by all educational institutions with federal contracts totaling an amount in excess of $10,000. Thus, the Supreme Court decisions, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Executive Order 11246 of 1965 have in effect made discriminatory admissions and employment practices at institutions of higher education illegal.

The force of law has been the primary force in desegregation efforts, and transition from an all white or all Negro faculty has not always been easy. Negro institutions were often unable to offer adequate compensation to attract white faculty members (14, pp. 122-126). White institutions experienced difficulty in recruiting Negro faculty members because of residential segregation or the lack of adequate housing in the city where the institution was located, because of a lack of desire on the part of the Negro to be uprooted and placed in an unfamiliar competitive environment, and because of the limited availability pool of minority
faculty candidates which had the tendency to place salary requirements out of the reach of many white institutions (16, pp. 130-153; 20, pp. 74-75). Due primarily to legal requirements, however, Southern institutions of higher education practicing de jure segregation have begun efforts to desegregate faculties.

While in most instances limited faculty desegregation has been accomplished, little has been done to determine the attitudes held by those professors who are part of the faculty desegregation process (23, p. 37). Several recommendations of methods to achieve a greater degree of faculty desegregation have been provided in recent years (8; 10; 14, p. 163; 22). However, the success of faculty desegregation has been reported in terms of numbers (12, 20).

Problems that interfere with the total success of faculty desegregation are of vital concern to administrators who are charged with the responsibility of implementing federal desegregation laws. Administrators agree that limited desegregation can be accomplished with minimum effort. However, the efforts to make a faculty member of the opposite race feel secure and comfortable as a viable force within the structure of the institution, resulting in improved faculty recruitment and retention, are more complex. It then becomes important for college and university administrators to identify conditions and practices deemed favorable to increasing faculty desegregation as promoted and evidenced
by professors' attitudes regarding job satisfaction. The identification of conditions and practices contributing to job satisfaction can provide the basis for improving faculty desegregation.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the analysis of the attitudes relating to job satisfaction as experienced by Negro professors at public Southern white institutions of higher education and white professors at public Southern Negro institutions of higher education.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were as follows:

1. To determine the status of job satisfaction currently held by
   a. Negro professors holding academic positions for a period of at least two years since 1954 at a public Southern institution of higher education with a predominantly white student enrollment;
   b. White professors holding academic positions for a period of at least two years since 1954 at a public Southern institution of higher education with a predominantly Negro student enrollment;

2. To investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors; and
3. To synthesize the information collected and to present implications and recommendations about job satisfaction related to faculty desegregation in public Southern institutions of higher education.

Research Questions

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study, answers to the following questions were sought.

I. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors?

II. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate degree? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold an earned doctorate degree?

III. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold the
master's degree or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold the master's degree or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold the master's degree or less?

IV. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors who had been employed by public Southern white institutions of higher education for seven years or less and that of white professors who had been employed by public Negro institutions of higher education for seven years or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had been employed by their respective institutions for seven years or less?

V. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors who had been employed by public Southern white institutions of higher education for eight years or more and that of white professors who had been employed by public Negro institutions of higher education for eight years or more? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors employed by their respective institutions for eight years or more?

VI. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern
white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less?

VII. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more?

VIII. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors?
IX. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors employed for various years at an institution of higher education?

X. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold different academic degrees?

XI. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had various years of academic experience?

Background and Significance of the Study

A review of the literature concerning this project reveals that more attention has been directed to faculty desegregation below the postsecondary level and to that of student desegregation of higher education. Information relative to faculty desegregation at the postsecondary level has not, for the most part, gone beyond the reporting of quantitative data. Additionally, the slow rate of faculty desegregation in Southern institutions of higher education influences the lack of literature on the topic. By 1954 several white institutions had admitted Negro students on the graduate and professional levels. Faculty desegregation at the same institutions, however, was very minimal or non-existent (21).
The recent acceleration of recruiting and hiring of "other race" faculty members and administrators has created a need to determine ways to promote job satisfaction in recently desegregated institutions of higher education. Mays (13) suggests that this can be accomplished only by making congruent the individual's and institution's goal (13, p. 226). The literature indicates that little has been done in ascertaining faculty attitudes as a means of promoting such congruency at the desegregated institution of higher education.

The Journal of Negro Education, in 1958, published a yearbook devoted entirely to reports and studies on the progress of desegregation of higher education in the several Southern states. The primary focus of the yearbook was concerned with the numbers of Negroes attending white education institutions. Though little had been accomplished in faculty desegregation, one State, Missouri, reported two Negro professors on the faculty of a Roman Catholic institution of higher education during the 1957-58 academic year. No attempts were made to determine success in terms of attitudes and job satisfaction (20). In Texas in 1958, ten white institutions of higher education indicated that Negroes were not eligible for faculty status (12, p. 321).

The faculty desegregation process was more apparent in Negro institutions of higher education. In 1956, Missouri reported fifteen full or part-time white professors at the
State's Negro institution of higher education (20, p. 293). Five Negro institutions of higher education in Texas indicated that white professors would be considered for faculty status, while one other Negro institution indicated it would consider white professors only if qualified Negro professors were not available to meet the needs of the institution (12, p. 321).

Though faculty desegregation in Southern institutions of higher education was limited as a whole by 1958, it was far more advanced in the Negro institutions than in white institutions. Faculty desegregation, however, apparently did little to improve job satisfaction among Negro professors. In a study on faculty morale, for example, Thompson (23) concluded that one-fourth of the Negro professors studied would be content to abandon teaching for nonteaching occupations (23, p. 40). The desire to abandon the teaching profession had a direct relationship to the degree of job satisfaction.

Thompson's statement regarding the dual and conflicting social roles of the Negro professor has significance for this study. Whereas Thompson indicated that Negro professors were expected to meet the same academic standards as were white colleagues, though professional esteem from white colleagues did not generally include Negro professors, this study focuses on the attitudes of the Negro and white professors involved in this condition. Thompson further concluded that the lack of professional respect and esteem from white
colleagues creates the potential for greatly decreasing the effectiveness of the Negro professor at the white institution (23, p. 41). The lack of research on the attitudes and extent of job satisfaction of white professors in Negro institutions of higher education is apparent.

Since 1954, other studies investigating the problems encountered by Negro professors in white institutions of higher education have been undertaken. Most of the studies have not been restricted to determining the attitudes of the Negro professor in the Southern white institution of higher education. The attitudes of Negro professors at institutions outside of the Southern states comprise a major part of the studies. Further, the distribution of most of these studies has been confined to Negro publications. Widespread distribution has not been evident. These studies, however, do provide more extensive information on Negro professors in white institutions than is currently available on white professors in Negro institutions. Foremost among these studies is one by Moore and Wagstaff (16). The study reveals attitudes of distrust, frustration, and loneliness by Negro professors at white institutions of higher education (16, p. 131). In another study, Moore (15) concluded that the appointment of many Negro professors by white institutions is due to a crisis situation usually precipitated by Negro students rather than by a commitment to desegregation. A majority of the other studies relating to Negro professors at white institutions of
higher education have concentrated primarily on the white institutions' prevailing attitudes and the efforts of Negro professors to cope or adjust.

One of the first reports dealing with the attitudes of white professors toward desegregation in higher education and published since the 1954 Supreme Court decisions was written in 1957 by Jenkins (11), a white professor at a Southern white institution of higher education. Jenkins asserted that many white professors who are committed to desegregation feel the need to persuade others to accept the same view. To do so, however, places the professor in the precarious situation of alienating the university and the people of the community. Further, Jenkins indicated that the ultimate action taken by the white professor will depend on the individual degree of importance attached to the beliefs and values concerning the desegregation of higher education. Most white professors are unwilling to risk personal loss to voice opinions contrary to popular acceptance (11, p. 18).

A year later, in 1958, Parsons (19), a professor, wrote that white professors whose attitudes favor desegregation should speak out regardless of the personal risk involved. Parsons stated that the answer to the desegregation problem is for the professor to "... act with integrity, and the thought will reflect that quality. In this way, integrity will arise in the heart of man, and desegregation in the relations of man to man" (19, p. 450). Expressing the
opposite view from Jenkins, Parsons contended that the white professor must be in the vanguard of developing attitudes favorable to faculty and student desegregation in Southern institutions of higher education. Ascertaining the extent of the development of that attitude is an important concern of this study. The attitudes of both Negro and white professors will influence the extent to which desegregation can be termed a success.

Certain social factors that enhance job satisfaction have been identified in several studies. For example, effective communications as a means of promoting and improving job satisfaction among educational faculties was determined in a study by Wieland and Bachman (25). Race was not a factor in the study. However, the study concluded that the frequency of social contact among colleagues improved effective communications and encouraged loyalty to the institution and the acceptance of administrative authority.

Other social factors that contribute to faculty satisfaction have been identified by Drewry and Baugher (6). The study led to the conclusion that institutional efforts to actively participate and influence community improvements relate directly to the degree of job satisfaction held by faculty members. The Drewry-Baugher study also described such institutional practices as providing faculty members with free automobile parking space, private office space, adequate secretarial assistance, and unhindered use of
institutional facilities, among other practices, as promoting job satisfaction.

Brown (3) identified certain job-related factors that cause faculty job satisfaction as evidenced by the faculty members' decision to accept a new position or remain at the present position. The three factors exerting the most influence are the location of the institution, prestige and reputation of the institution and of the department to which the faculty member will be assigned, and work assignments in terms of class size and the number of semester hours taught.

The perceived lack of participation in governance is a serious hinderance to faculty job satisfaction. The lack of participation in governance is a major factor promoting faculty demands for collective bargaining (5). Unclear or perceived unfair institutional personnel policies involving job-related issues as tenure, promotion, assignments, salaries, leave, and grievance procedures are further hinderances to faculty job satisfaction (1).

Review of the literature reveals many research studies related to quantitative data of faculty desegregation in Southern institutions of higher education, of prevailing institutional environments and attitudes as involving the Negro professor in a white institution, as well as of studies identifying certain social factors that promote and enhance job satisfaction among faculty members. The knowledge and understanding of attitudes held and the extent of job
satisfaction maintained by professors in desegregated institutions will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the faculty desegregation process in Southern institutions of higher education. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent orders and directives from the courts and the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require institutions of higher education to increase the percentage of faculty desegregation. The initial faculty desegregation process is enhanced if opposite race faculty members, because of job satisfaction, elect to remain in the faculty position.

Definition of Terms

The terms in this study are defined as follows:

1. **Negro** is defined as any native-born citizen of the United States not legally classified as a member of any other racial group.

2. **White** is defined as any native-born citizen of the United States not legally classified as a member of the Negro, American Indian, or Oriental races.

3. **Professor** is defined as a full-time teacher or administrator employed by the selected institutions of higher education included in this study.

4. **Job satisfaction** is the attitudinal response from an individual that results from the working environment of the institutions of higher education included in this study.

5. **Southern institutions of higher education** are defined as those postsecondary educational colleges and
universities granting at least the baccalaureate degree and prior to 1954 practiced de jure racial discrimination in student admissions and faculty appointments.

6. **Negro institutions of higher education** are defined as those publicly supported postsecondary colleges and universities granting at least the baccalaureate degree and which historically have had a student enrollment that was predominantly Negro.

7. **White institutions of higher education** are defined as those publicly supported postsecondary colleges and universities granting at least the baccalaureate degree and which historically have had a predominantly white student enrollment.

8. **Level of significance** for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance and for the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients is arbitrarily set at the .05 level.

**Limitation**

This study was limited to those four-year Southern institutions of higher education that practiced de jure racial segregation prior to 1954 and that since 1954 have made attempts to desegregate faculty and students. Consequently, the results of this study, as data and as conclusions from the data, are not necessarily generalizable to other regions and other types of institutions.
Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the respondents would answer the questionnaire with honesty and sincerity.

2. It was assumed that answers given on the questionnaire would reflect the respondents' attitudes toward job satisfaction at a desegregated institution of higher education.

Procedures

The thirty-three public Negro Southern institutions of higher education and a random sample of sixty-seven public white Southern institutions of higher education listed in the Directory of Higher Education were selected to participate in this study. Thus, a sample of 100 Negro and white Southern institutions of higher education was included in this study.

Contact with the chief academic officer at the institutions selected (see Appendix A and Appendix B) determined that the mean number of white professors meeting the requirements of this study at Southern Negro institutions of higher education equaled ten. The mean number of Negro professors meeting the requirements of this study at Southern white institutions of higher education equaled four. Twelve white institutions included in the sample reported either that there were no Negro faculty or that there were no Negro faculty meeting the requirements of this study. Finally, a sample of 478 Negro and white professors was selected.
Two instruments, Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale (see Appendix E) and Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire (see Appendix F), were sent by mail to the professors in the sample. A cover letter was included to explain the purposes of the study. Questionnaires returned totaled 264, a return of 55.23 percent.

The data were tabulated, coded, and entered in IBM cards. Statistical computations were completed at the Data Processing Center, North Texas State University.

Statistical analysis of the respondents' raw scores for the two instruments was accomplished by the use of two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance based on race and years at present employment, highest degree held, and years in the profession. Race category consisted of two groups: (1) Negro and (2) white. The category "Years at present employment" included two groups: (1) professors employed at the institution for two to seven years and (2) professors employed at the institution from eight to fifteen years. The category "Highest degree held" included two groups: (1) professors holding an earned doctorate degree and (2) professors holding a master's degree or less. The category "Years in the profession" consisted of two groups: (1) professors who had academic professional experience totaling two to eight years and (2) professors who had academic professional experience totaling nine or more years.
The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was computed for the following Negro and white professor groups:

1. professors with a doctorate degree,
2. professors with a master's degree,
3. professors with less than a master's degree,
4. professors with at least two, but less than nine, years of professional experience,
5. professors with at least nine, but less than sixteen, years of professional experience,
6. professors with sixteen or more years of professional experience,
7. professors employed at the same institution for at least two, but less than eight, years, and
8. professors employed at the same institution for eight or more years.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was also computed for (1) all the Negro professors in the study, (2) all the white professors in the study, and (3) all respondents included in the study.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature was undertaken for the purpose of obtaining data and information pertaining to perceived job satisfaction of faculty members within institutions of higher education and pertaining to the desegregation of faculty at institutions of higher education since the year 1954. The literature reviewed for the study was grouped into two categories: job satisfaction of faculty members and faculty desegregation in higher education.

Faculty Job Satisfaction

Several studies have identified effective communications as a factor influencing job satisfaction. Bavalas (4), in discussing group dynamics, concluded that satisfaction within the group is a function of the effectiveness and ease of communicating with the group's leader. Cartwright and Zander (13) declared that cohesive groups exhibit high levels of communications within the group. Such cohesive groups experience low turnover and there is less of a desire to leave. Likert (22) concluded that job loyalty is highly associated with the ease in which individuals are able to communicate ideas upward to the supervisor. Georgopoulos and Mann (20), in a study concerning community general hospitals, concluded
that the greatest degree of job satisfaction was held by those nurses with supervisors who evidenced the greatest degree of effective communications.

A study to determine the affects of communications and other factors on job satisfaction among college faculty members was conducted by Wieland and Bachman (37). The study included 444 faculty members from twelve liberal arts colleges. The study was an "... empirical investigation of some aspects of the departmental chairman's job and the effects of these on the satisfaction of the departmental members..." (37, p. 4). Data for the study were gathered by means of a twenty page, Likert-type scale, questionnaire. The effects of communication upon job satisfaction were obtained by determining communication practices within the departments studied. Responding faculty members gave the frequency they provided and received information concerning college affairs through means of meetings, in private, by letter, and by telephone. Further, the faculty members were asked to determine the frequency of social contact with departmental chairpersons at times other than on college matters. The survey also sought to determine the extent to which departmental chairpersons were interested in faculty ideas.

The Wieland and Bachman study examined the following as relating to faculty job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured by the faculty members' agree/disagree response to
the following statement: While no job can be expected to be perfect, there are really very few things that I would change about mine if I had the power to do so. Job satisfaction as relating to satisfaction with and acceptance of the department chairperson was measured by the faculty members' agree/disagree response to the following statement: All things considered, I am personally quite satisfied with the way my department chairman fulfills his responsibilities. Job satisfaction as relating to demonstrated loyalty to the institution was measured by the faculty members' indicating first choice of another institution of higher education where the acceptance of a position would be desirable, and the minimum salary condition would cause the faculty member to leave his/her present position. On a Likert-type scale, the responses were measured from 0 (I would accept even if it involves a twenty percent salary reduction), 5 (I would accept, given a salary increase of thirty percent or more), and 6 (I would not accept such a position, no matter how great a salary increase might be involved) (37, pp. 8-9).

The findings of Wieland and Bachman suggest that the positive relationships that exist between job satisfaction, supervisory influence, and effective communications are applicable to the educational institution. While Wieland and Bachman made no attempt to isolate faculty responses by race, they concluded that factors such as effective communications throughout the institution of higher education (including
frequency of social contact among colleagues), loyalty to the institution, and the acceptance of administrative authority are positively associated with the degree of general job satisfaction held by the faculty members from the liberal arts colleges included in the study (37, pp. 15-16).

A study by Dykes (17) involving faculty participation in the academic decision-making process supports the importance of effective communications as a factor influencing faculty satisfaction. Dykes concluded that "a feeling that the faculty is not kept adequately informed and a corollary suspicion that important decisions are frequently made without faculty knowledge or consultation are the most important sources of faculty dissatisfaction" (17, p. 15). Dykes also concluded that administrative manipulation and ineffective formal procedures by administrators to communicate downward contribute to faculty dissatisfaction.

A Taskforce of the American Association for Higher Education (2) states that faculty discontent manifested in concerns about institutional policies involving educational, personnel, economic, and other public issues and the lack of established procedures for faculty representation are identified as hindrances to general job satisfaction by faculty members. The Taskforce declares that "... there are issues that have a special relevance for the individual faculty member. Such issues include specific tenure and
promotion decisions, class assignments, individual faculty salaries, distribution of research funds, and handling of individual grievance" (2, pp. 30-31). These job-related issues are closely associated with general job satisfaction held by faculty members.

The importance of positive faculty-administration relationship as a condition for faculty job satisfaction is the topic of a conference report from the American Council on Education (1). The report points out that both casual observation and careful surveys confirm the impression that almost everywhere faculties are restive about low salaries, heavy teaching loads, lack of research and secretarial assistance, burdensome committee work, inadequate office space and laboratory facilities, faulty promotion policies, administrative arbitrariness or vacillation, and so on. Professors, in brief, do not differ materially from others in desiring higher pay, shorter hours, more job security, speedier promotion—and, in general, more satisfactory working conditions. Furthermore, a vague sense of frustration about these matters can be given a more satisfactory emotional focus when blame is attached to concrete entities such as administrative officers (1, p. 3).

The stabilization of the relationship between faculty and administration promotes morale and job satisfaction. The American Council on Education Report points out that promoting improved relationships as a means of fostering faculty job satisfaction should include (1) the utilization of the variety of individual talent among faculty members to the benefit of the institution, (2) the implementation of efforts to formulate university values and purposes shared by the total community of the institution, (3) the analysis of the
advantages to be achieved by small working groups within the college or university, and (4) the development of a formal and informal two-way communication system (1, pp. 40-42).

Drewry and Baugher (16) described certain social factors as security and morale as contributors to faculty satisfaction. The study identified the providing of a home in the most desirable section of the community as a special contributor to job satisfaction by faculty. Other important social factors contributing to faculty satisfaction described by Drewry and Baugher include the institutions' efforts to improve the local schools where faculty members' children must attend, free university parking space, provision for private office space, use of college facilities by families of faculty members, and free tickets to cultural affairs. The colleges' involvement in the improvement of community recreational and cultural facilities also contributes to the degree of job satisfaction held by faculty members. The study also led to the conclusion that communications through consultation with faculty contribute to the improvement of job satisfaction and serve to reduce friction, hostility, and secrecy within the college environment and community (16, pp. 13-14).

The study by the Taskforce of American Association for Higher Education (2) supported claims of the importance of adequate office space and clerical help in promoting faculty job satisfaction. Significantly, one of the first efforts to
establish collective bargaining procedures on campus contained the provision specifying "... that each faculty member shall have his own office, desk, and wherever possible a swivel chair" (2, p. 12). Another study by Woodburne (39) concluded that adequate funds expended on added clerical assistance would significantly increase the effectiveness and productivity of faculty members (39, p. 150).

A study was conducted by Brown (9) to determine those factors that most often cause faculty members to accept certain jobs. The factors, when evident, become the basis for faculty retention and job satisfaction. The factors, ranked in order of frequency, are as follows:

1. Location of the institution of higher education ranked first as the reason for faculty members accepting their present position.

2. The prestige and reputation of the college and department ranked second as the reason for accepting present faculty positions. However, prestige and reputation of the institution did not rank as high as a reason for faculty members deciding not to leave the present position.

3. Work assignments have a great influence on faculty members' decision to remain at their present position or leave for a new position. Ranking third as a reason for remaining at the present position, faculty members indicated greater job satisfaction when the distribution of courses
taught and the mixture of teaching, research, and administration are favorable to the individual.

4. Salary ranked fourth as a major influence in job selection, retention, and satisfaction.

5. The congeniality and competency of colleagues ranked fifth as a factor influencing job selection, retention, and satisfaction by faculty members.

6. Teaching load ranked sixth as a factor influencing faculty members' selection of a faculty position. However, the study concludes that teaching load is not a major consideration of faculty members in determining job satisfaction.

7. The affect of the college administration upon working conditions for the faculty ranked seventh in job selection. The major effect of the administrative influence is negative. Undesirable administrative influences greatly hinder faculty job satisfaction and are a major reason for faculty members leaving present faculty positions.

8. The presence of opportunities for conducting research ranked eighth in faculty job selection. However, the faculty member who is most likely to experience job satisfaction through the presence of research opportunities is described as young, aggressive, confident, and well trained.

9. The future potential that the job offers ranked a relatively unimportant ninth in job selection. However, the
opportunity for professional growth and advancement is a major factor influencing job satisfaction.

10. Academic rank, tenth, is not considered a major factor influencing job selection by faculty members (9, pp. 185-229).

In a study analyzing the academic labor market, Caplow and McGee (11) agree that institutional prestige, personal security, and professional freedom are the major reasons for faculty members selecting different employment or electing to remain at the present employment (11, p. 147). However, Caplow and McGee identified supplementary opportunities, access to financially rewarding professional assignments in addition to institutional duties, as other factors producing mobility among faculty members. The study indicates that, though such issues may be surreptitiously discussed during negotiations, such opportunities are important to faculty members and greatly enhance resulting job satisfaction (11, pp. 155-157).

The survey by Marshall (24) supported the claims of the degree of importance given to supplementary opportunities and fringe benefits as factors producing job satisfaction. Marshall suggested that liberal policies regarding research leave or sabbatical contribute significantly to job satisfaction by faculty members. A high proportion of the faculty members who participated in the Marshall survey identified sabbaticals or research opportunities as major factors
contributing to their decision to remain at current faculty positions (24, p. 107).

Bornheimer, Burns, and Dumke (8), in a study (hereafter referred to as the Bornheimer Study) conducted to examine the general functions and problems of faculty members within higher education, identified the importance of job satisfaction to faculty retention. The Bornheimer Study succinctly established the importance of faculty job satisfaction by stating that "the question of the retention of faculty members is one of the most important decisions to be made by an institution of higher education. In fact the very quality of the institution depends more upon how this decision is made than upon any other" (8, p. 161). The study concluded that salaries, including liberal fringe benefits, greatly influence faculty retention. However, teaching load flexibility, available secretarial and clerical assistance, and the perceived positive attitudes of the administration toward individual faculty members are considered factors producing high job satisfaction within the faculty ranks. Further, the study described the professional climate, professional reputation, or professional ethos of the institution as important to faculty retention and satisfaction (8, pp. 161-168).

Carr and Van Eyck (12) concluded that a faculty's dissatisfaction with existing conditions of employment is one of the conditions promoting collective bargaining on the
campuses of institutions of higher education. The conclusion by Carr and Van Eyck is supported by the results of national surveys of faculty members conducted by the American Council on Education (5, 6). The surveys sought to obtain data on the attitudes of faculty members regarding collective bargaining, salaries, teaching loads, and institutional governance, among other topics. Results of one survey revealed that fifty-nine percent of the participating faculty members accepted collective bargaining as being applicable to higher education (5). A second survey, conducted two years later, indicated only one-third of the participating faculty members opposed collective bargaining (6). Those faculty members favoring collective bargaining were also inclined to be dissatisfied with institutional salary schedules, teaching loads, and the effectiveness of faculty senates. Further, the degree of dissatisfaction was greater for younger faculty members. The greatest support for collective bargaining and the highest degree of dissatisfaction came from the faculty members of predominantly Negro institutions of higher education. These faculty members indicated greater dissatisfaction with their institutions as a whole, including salaries, working conditions, and the administration. The same faculty members revealed strong support for faculty militancy and the use of strikes (5; 12, p. 42).

Consistent with faculty attitudes revealed by the national surveys conducted by the American Council on Education,
Carr and Van Eyck (12) identified the following areas of faculty dissatisfaction as influencing the promotion of collective bargaining on the campus:

1. General dissatisfaction with faculty compensation levels,

2. General dissatisfaction with the faculty role and influence in institutional governance,

3. Conflicts emerging from divisions within the faculty, younger faculty members objecting to the influence and compensation of older faculty members, conflicts between tenured and nontenured faculty members, disagreement over the role of students in institutional governance, among other issues (12, pp. 52-60).

Other studies have determined that demands by faculty members for collective bargaining and greater involvement in institutional governance relate to efforts on the part of the faculty to achieve a greater degree of job satisfaction. Garbarino and Aussieker (19) reported in their study that faculty demands that lead to organized efforts to achieve greater job satisfaction include improved status in institutional governance, job security, salaries, and other economic conditions (19, p. 251).

Job satisfaction contributes significantly to high morale among faculty members. However, Diekhoff (15) states that faculty morale is more than job satisfaction. Though job satisfaction influences high morale and faculty
effectiveness, the conditions are not necessarily cause and effect situations (15, pp. 79-81). Thus, efforts to determine factors enhancing faculty job satisfaction are not necessarily studies involving the determination of high faculty morale.

The major differences between faculty morale and conditions enhancing job satisfaction are described by Diekhoff:

Morale is as important to teaching as to fighting or manufacturing. And the morale and effectiveness of college faculties also depend on their belief in the cause and on more basic conditions of employment than faculty clubs, newcomers clubs, faculty receptions, lunch rooms, lounges. It may be that we already have the best clothed, the best paid, the best equipped, and the best trained faculties in the world—but perhaps they do not have the best morale. . . . with reference to college professors the basic morale factor, belief in the cause, depends on their having a free voice in determining the cause and freedom to advance it (15, p. 81).

There are varied faculty attitudes and job-related factors and conditions that contribute to faculty job satisfaction. Factors that influence faculty job satisfaction include effective communications, governance involvement by faculty members, positive personnel policies, perceived image and prestige of the institution, generous fringe benefits, positive overall working conditions, positive faculty-administration relationships, and the degree of the institutions' positive influence in the community in which the institution is located.
Faculty Desegregation in Higher Education

The "separate but equal" doctrine espoused by the United States Supreme Court in the 1896 Plessy v. Ferguson decision established a pattern of racial segregation throughout the Southern United States. The effect of the ruling was the application of the doctrine to all facets of public life, including public facilities, inns, transportation, places of amusement, and educational facilities. The "separate but equal" doctrine remained consistent with the force of law for fifty-eight years.

The advent of desegregating institutions of higher education resulted from several decisions rendered by the Supreme Court. The original thrust for desegregation was aimed at admitting Negro students to previously all white institutions of higher education. However, student desegregation ultimately led to faculty desegregation. Faculty desegregation during the years the "separate but equal" doctrine was in force occurred primarily at institutions of higher education located outside of the South. These instances of faculty desegregation are detailed by Taylor (36).

A chronology of the Supreme Court decisions that collectively brought about an end to the "separate but equal" doctrine and effecting desegregation has been compiled by Ziegler (40), Bullock (10), and the Southern Education Foundation (34). The major Supreme Court decision in desegregating public education was the Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka,
Kansas, 1954. However, a number of earlier decisions directly related to higher education and challenging the "separate but equal" doctrine were rendered by the Court prior to 1954.

In 1938, the Supreme Court rendered a decision in the Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada case that ruled the United States Constitution in the Fourteenth Amendment gave to the Negro the right to require the State of Missouri "... to furnish him within its borders facilities for legal education substantially equal to those which the State there afforded for persons of the white race" (40, p. 64). The Gaines case involved the State of Missouri's practice of providing tuition fees and other expenses for Negro students from Missouri attending law schools outside of the State. The Court ruled that such a practice did not satisfy the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution. Missouri's interpretation of the decision, however, led to the establishment of a separate law school for Negroes within the State (10, pp. 227-228).

In the Sipuel v. Board of Regents case of 1948, the Court ruled that Oklahoma's decision to provide out-of-state tuition grants for Negro students attending law school also violated the Fourteenth Amendment. In this instance, Oklahoma also responded by opening a separate law school. A year later, in 1949, and pursuant to further litigation, the Negro student in the Sipuel case was admitted to the existent
University of Oklahoma Law School (10, p. 228; 34, pp. 1-2; 40, p. 65).

The Supreme Court addressed the constitutionality of the establishment of separate law schools for Negroes and the practice of segregating Negro students within an institution in decisions rendered in two 1950 cases: Sweat v. Painter and McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents. In the Sweat case, the Court ruled that the separate law school for Negroes in the State of Texas did not provide equal legal training for Negro students as that afforded white students at the University of Texas Law School. Thus, Negro students must be admitted to the University of Texas Law School (10, pp. 229-230; 34, p. 2; 40, p. 65).

The system segregating Negro students admitted to the graduate school at the University of Oklahoma was ruled in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment in the McLaurin case. The system of segregation, as devised by the University, physically separated the Negro students from other white students while in the same classroom (34, p. 2; 40, p. 65).

In each of the cases, Missouri ex rel Gaines v. Canada, Sipuel v. Oklahoma, Sweat v. Painter, and McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents, relief was granted the Negro plaintiff without the Court reexamining the "separate but equal" doctrine. However, in each instance, the cases involved graduate education, and the determination was made that equality
of educational benefits for white and Negro students was lacking.

The Supreme Court in 1954 reexamined the "separate but equal" doctrine and in its decision in the case Brown v. Board of Education ruled racial segregation in public education unconstitutional. In a unanimous decision, the Court ruled:

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment (40, p. 79).

The major impact of the Brown decision concerned the assignment of Negro and white students to educational facilities at the elementary and secondary levels. However, the decision rendered by the Court in the 1954 case Hawkins v. Board of Education, University of Florida applied the Brown decision to institutions of higher education (38, p. 16).

Though required by law, desegregation at Southern institutions of higher education was a slow process following the 1954 Brown and Hawkins decisions. Those desegregation efforts occurring at colleges and universities were concentrated almost exclusively on the enrollment of Negro students in previously all white institutions. Though some of the desegregation efforts were peaceful in nature, several student desegregation attempts in the several Southern states
resulted in violent resistance. In spite of the resistance to desegregation within higher education, the Report by the Southern Education Foundation concludes that "the significant similarity in all of these court cases and political maneuvers, . . . is that they all had to do with breaching the wall of segregation surrounding the white public colleges and universities" (34, p. 2).

The legal impetus for faculty desegregation came with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the United States Congress. Further legal requirements for faculty desegregation came with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the United States Congress. Further legal requirements for faculty desegregation were provided by the Presidential Order 11246 of 1965 (31, p. 24; 34, p. 7).

Several studies have sought to analyze the rate of progress in faculty desegregation. Elton (18) concluded from his study of a comparative analysis of Negro and white colleges that within the time frame of 1956 to 1968 no marked change occurred between Negro and white colleges on the measures studied (18, p. 116). The measures studied totaled eight, including the number of faculty members holding the doctorate, masters, and bachelors degrees. Another study by Belles and the Southern Education Reporting Service (7) determined an increase from .002 to .013 in the number of Negro faculty members at white institutions during the time frame 1945-1968 (7, pp. 23-25).
Rafky (32) stated that the survival of the Negro institution of higher education will be determined by the institution's willingness and ability to attract and hold competent faculty members of all races. Inherent in the survival and the overall rate of faculty desegregation are the attitudes toward Negro institutions held by faculty members at white institutions and their willingness to accept positions at Negro colleges and universities (32, p. 320).

Mommsen (26) aptly described the faculty desegregation dilemma by stating,

black doctorates appear to have become an extremely valued commodity in the academic marketplace. On the one hand, the need to upgrade existing black institutions is pressing. White institutions, on the other hand, have vigorously sought these same individuals as a unique form of status symbol to conspicuously represent a lack of racial prejudice (26, p. 191).

McGrath (25) surveyed Negro institutions, both public and private, in an effort to ascertain what the institutions are like, the role they play in American higher education, and to determine their standard and needs. Although the primary intent of the study was to provide a narrative and statistical analysis of the Negro institutions, the results establish the Negro institutions as an important factor in initiating faculty desegregation. McGrath stated that a viable approach for Negro institutions to accomplish instructional improvement is to implement a faculty exchange program with a white institution. The arrangements of such an exchange program as described by McGrath would include the
following: (a) opportunities for white faculty members to
teach at Negro institutions and Negro faculty members to
teach at white institutions; (b) introducing the element of
desegregation by the interracial exchange; and (c) opportuni-
ties to analyze any special problems associated with faculty
desegregation (25, p. 122).

Another view of faculty desegregation at Negro institu-
tions of higher education was offered by Staples (35). He
concluded that white professors often make up the majority of
the faculty at Negro colleges. Such a situation is attri-
buted in part to the fact that many Negro professors choose
to join the faculty ranks at white institutions. Staples
provided a generalized description of white professors at
Negro institutions as "... rejects from white schools or
missionary types who want to uplift the moral spirit of the
colored population" (35, p. 45). Staples described the
presence of the Negro professor at the white institution as
a series of hurdles encountered. The hurdles listed by
Staples are as follows:

1. The emphasis many white institutions place on pub-
lishing creates a special predicament for Negro professors
because of racist practices by the publishing industry.

2. The insistence of some white institutions that the
Negro professors successfully relate to Negro students and
keep them under control.
3. The racist minority of white students who refuse to accept the Negro professor.

4. The expectation of some Negro students that they should automatically receive a passing grade from the Negro professor.

5. The dual role of the Negro professor as a member of the Negro community and a scholarly member of the faculty at the white institution.

6. The often present philosophical differences between the Negro professor and his white colleagues (35, pp. 46-47).

A study by Decker (14) sought to determine the attitudes of white faculty members at Negro institutions of higher education. As a part of the study, questionnaires were distributed to the white faculty members as a means to obtain the following data: reasons for accepting a faculty position at a Negro institution, social relationships with Negro faculty members, and opinions regarding Negro-white relations in general (14, p. 501). The study revealed that a majority of the faculty members included in the survey had no specific or particular reason for accepting a faculty position at a Negro institution; and the relationship between white faculty and Negro administrators, between white faculty and Negro students, and between white and Negro faculty members was described as good by a high percentage of the respondents included in the survey (14, pp. 501-504). The Decker study
included fifty-five Negro institutions of higher education located in twenty states.

For the white professor, Jenkins (21) asserted that the desegregation of higher education is a moral dilemma. Professors who believe gradual desegregation is necessary are confronted with the realities of opposition to any desegregation from within the community and university. Jenkins contends that this dilemma leaves the white professor two alternatives: to speak out in favor of desegregation and risk the alienation of the community and loss of job, or to acquiesce to the acceptable position of the community and institution (21, pp. 10-13).

As an alternative, Parsons (30) encourages white faculty members to be in the vanguard of developing attitudes favorable to faculty and student desegregation of higher education. Further, Parsons stated that the institution of higher education should not function only to perpetuate culture. "It exercises or ought to exercise a critical function, laying bare the foundations of culture, defining basic problems, proposing and evaluating alternatives, and clarifying the ideals toward which the culture might move" (30, p. 440).

An historic chronology of the numbers of Negro faculty members at white institutions of higher education has been prepared by Moss (28). The study involved institutions throughout the United States and shows that at the time of the survey there were 133 Negro faculty members, including
part-time faculty members, at seventy-two white institutions of higher education (28, p. 457). The study concluded that the slow pace of faculty desegregation is attributable to the reluctance of Negro professors to apply for faculty positions, the reluctance of white faculty members to accept the Negro faculty member as a professional equal, and the lack of commitment on the part of the white institutions to recruit and attract Negro faculty members (28, p. 459).

A study by Andrulis, Iscoe, Sikes, and Friedman (3) was conducted to seek information relative to the distribution of Negro faculty members within white institutions. Variables relating to the distribution, such as age, sex, and migration patterns, were also considered. The number of Negro faculty members responding to the questionnaire used in the study totaled 405 males and 154 females from white institutions located in all parts of the United States. Regarding the mobility of Negro faculty members, the study found a high percentage of mobility from the South. From the study, twenty-four percent of the Negro faculty members were born in the South but only eight percent were currently employed at Southern white institutions of higher education. Only eleven percent of the Negro professors responding were employed at public institutions with a student enrollment larger than 25,000. Forty-eight percent of the Negro faculty members studied indicated assignments that were a combination of academic and administrative, one percent held positions of
assistants to the president, and seven percent held departmental chairmanships (3, pp. 7-9). The sex distribution of Negro faculty, as resulting from the study, was twenty-eight percent female. The distribution within academic ranks revealed an almost equal percentage of Negro male and female at the instructor and assistant professor levels. However, more females than males in the study held the rank of associate professor, while more males than females held rank at the professor level (3, p. 9). The largest percentage of Negro males employed at white institutions were in the age range of thirty to thirty-nine. A high percentage of Negro female faculty members included in the study were in the twenty to twenty-nine age range. The great majority of the Negro faculty members studied had been employed at the present position from one to three years. One-third of the Negro faculty members held the earned doctorate degree (3, pp. 7-11).

On the campus of institutions with a predominantly white student enrollment, Lyons (23) stated that the relationship between Negro student and Negro faculty member is strained. Negro students enrolled at white institutions accept the premise that all Negro faculty and administrators were employed at the demand of the Negro students. Conversely, Negro faculty members do not accept the correlation between their appointment and demands made by Negro students (23, p. 466).
The relationship between Negro faculty and Negro students adds another dimension to faculty desegregation.

A study by Moore and Wagstaff (27) surveyed Negro professors who were part of the desegregation process to determine attitudes. The survey sample included responses from 3,228 Negro faculty members at white institutions of higher education. The major intent of the survey was to ascertain perceived attitudes toward faculty desegregation as held by Negro faculty members at white institutions of higher education located throughout the United States. Based on the survey, Moore and Wagstaff present a viewpoint on faculty desegregation at white institutions as follows:

Alienation takes many forms—obscurity, insulation, isolation, and racism with its accompanying inhumanity. Many blacks feel anonymous in predominantly white colleges; they are hidden in small numbers among vast numbers of whites, but mainly they are hidden because of administrative actions and manipulations (27, p. 8).

The survey further revealed a lack of professional relationships between the Negro and white professor. Negro faculty members were found to share few social or professional activities with white colleagues even though sixty percent of the respondents from four-year institutions live in the same community with white colleagues. Overall, the study's findings identified a disparate proportion of Negro faculty in engineering, law, and dentistry (27, p. 29).

Nelson (29), in a study designed to determine attitudes of acceptance of Negroes by communities where institutions of
higher education are located, determined the existence of a strong unexpressed prejudice against Negroes. Nelson suggested that such a situation may arise from the perceived feeling of a common acceptance that Negroes are held in low esteem and further verbal reinforcement is not considered necessary (29, pp. 130-131). Though the study intended to determine existing community acceptance of Negro students, the findings have implications for Negro faculty members.

In spite of some progress, Rose (33) appraised faculty desegregation by stating "... academic institutions have not taken a position of leadership in regards to the expansion of employment opportunities for Negro educators in the academic marketplace" (33, p. 26).

In summary, the review of the literature revealed varied faculty attitudes and job-related factors and conditions that contribute to faculty job satisfaction. The review supported the conclusion that factors that contribute to faculty job satisfaction include effective intra-institutional communications, governance involvement by faculty members, positive personnel policies, perceived image and prestige of the institution, generous institutional fringe benefits for faculty, positive overall working conditions, positive faculty-administration relationships, and the degree of the institutions' positive influence in the community in which the institution is located. Further, the review revealed a paucity of literature involving the attitudes of professors.
included in faculty desegregation. The existing literature on the subject indicates that within the faculty desegregation process there is a general absence of those factors and conditions that contribute to faculty job satisfaction.


37. Wieland, George F. and Jerald G. Bachman, Faculty Satisfaction and the Departmental Chairman: A Study of Academic Departments in Liberal Arts Colleges, Washington, D. C., Office of Education.


CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The problem of this study was the analysis of the attitudes relating to job satisfaction as experienced by Negro professors at public Southern white institutions of higher education and white professors at public Southern Negro institutions of higher education. The two instruments used for obtaining the data were the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale (see Appendix E) and the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire (see Appendix F). A "Personal Data Response Sheet" was used for the specific purpose of obtaining pertinent information about each respondent (see Appendix E). The Negro professors at white institutions and the white professors at the Negro institutions included in the sample were requested to provide the pertinent information solicited by the "Personal Data Response Sheet." The classification of the personal data included

(1) number of years at present place of employment,
(2) race identification,
(3) highest earned academic degree, and
(4) number of years professional experience as an academic administrator and/or faculty member.

The information was used to analyze the relationship of the
variables as affecting the professors' current level of job satisfaction.

**Instruments**

The Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale was used to measure the way professors feel about work performed as a faculty member at a desegregated institution of higher education. The instrument was devised by Robert P. Bullock and was originally published in a 1952 Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research Monograph (1). The instrument is a criterion measure used for the separation of extreme groups in which mean scores may be derived to determine the degree of job satisfaction in relation to job dissatisfaction.

The determination of faculty job satisfaction, through the use of the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale, is not necessarily synonymous with faculty morale. Rather, the intent of the use of the instrument was to ascertain an evaluation of the present faculty position as contributing to the faculty members' pursuit and attainment of personal objectives. The professor who is a member of a desegregated faculty seeks to achieve a degree of personal adjustment within an interacting social environment that appears, at times, divergent and conflicting. Consistent with the faculty desegregation process, faculty attitudes and job satisfaction are shaped by existing cultural and status systems, professional and social pressures and influences of the institutions' formal and
informal organizational structures, and the community contacts experienced by the faculty members. Within the context of a desegregated faculty situation, the use of the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale was to provide a basis for comparing the attitudes, as relating to job satisfaction, of Negro and white professors involved in the faculty desegregation process.

The professors included in the sample were asked to select one of five responses to ten statements on the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale that would be consistent with how they felt about the work they performed at a desegregated institution of higher education. An additional item was included on the instrument to determine the extent attitudes toward job satisfaction were influenced by the professors' racial minority status at the institution of present employment. The scoring of the instrument was accomplished by the use of a five-point scale. Five points were assigned for the most favorable response and one point was assigned for the least favorable response to each question. Each item was scored consistently in terms of the attitudinal direction of each response. The sum of the scored item responses was the raw score for an individual professor. The highest possible score was fifty-five, and the lowest possible score was eleven.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between test-retest scores for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale was .94. A split-half sample application demonstrated
a correlation coefficient of .93, which was uncorrected for attenuation. Two other split-half reliability coefficients were determined, one from an ex-employee group and another from an employee group. The ex-employee test-retest reliability yielded a coefficient of .82 and when corrected for attenuation by the Spearman-Brown formula was .90. The employee group split-half reliability was .81 and when corrected for attenuation was .90 (1, pp. 25-26).

The determination of validity, estimating or judging the instrument's logical consistency with the definition of the trait to be measured, resulted in a mean satisfaction score of 34.31 for the ex-employee group and 39.10 mean satisfaction score for the employee group. The critical ratio between scale ratings and the judgments of experts resulted in a Pearsonian coefficient correlation of .38 with a standard error of .1. Such a correlation is significantly different than a zero correlation being 3.8 times its own standard error. Another test of validity was determined by relating satisfaction scores to an objective criteria associated with job satisfaction. For the group responding favorably to the objective criteria, the mean score was 41.82. For the group responding unfavorably to the objective criteria, the mean score was 36.67. The critical ratio between the two means was 4.7 (1, pp. 26-30).

The Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire was used to compare the relationship of job satisfaction with certain
social factors. The instrument was devised by Robert P. Bullock. The instrument was originally published in a 1952 Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research Monograph (1). When compared, the social factor items can represent a basis for analyzing attitudes relating to job satisfaction held by professors who are members of a desegregated faculty. The instrument consists of fifty-nine items, fifty-one of which are significant in the intent to elicit the degree to which certain social factors influence the professors' attitudes toward job satisfaction as faculty members at desegregated Southern institutions of higher education. Consequently, the instrument was used for the purpose of comparing and determining relationship and influence of certain social factors to job satisfaction.

The Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire was designed and based on the assumption that job satisfaction is greatly influenced and shaped by adjustment or lack of adjustment to those social structures involving the employing institutions and family and community associations. Thus, the instrument was used to ascertain the extent of such job-related social pressures and influences on determining the degree of job satisfaction held by Negro and white professors experiencing the faculty desegregation process. As an instrument for comparison, the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire is used to analyze the relationship of certain social factor variables between Negro and white professors
that might affect current attitudes toward job satisfaction within the desegregated faculty structure.

The professors included in the sample were asked to circle the appropriate response to each item. The choice of responses was "yes," "undecided," and "no." The scoring of the instrument was accomplished by the use of a three-point scale. Three points were given for a "yes" response, and one point was given for a "no" response. The sum of the scored item responses was the raw score for an individual professor. The highest score possible was 153, and the lowest score possible was 51.

The split-half correlation for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire was .77, with a standard error of .04. Using the Spearman-Brown formula to correct for attenuation, an estimated coefficient of reliability of .87, with an estimated standard error of .02, was obtained for the instrument (1, p. 50).

The standard error of estimate, considered to be a function of the discrepancies between Y values estimated from X values and actual observed Y values, was used as a measure of predictive validity. Predicting job satisfaction scores from observed social factor scores for the ex-employee group obtained a standard error of estimate of 4.6, and 3.8 for the employee group. To obtain the transferability of predictive ability of the instrument when applied to a new population, the standard error of estimate for the
ex-employee group, used as the first population, was 4.6, and 7.5 for the second population, the employee group, when a and b values were computed and transferred. The transfer or predictive quotient was 4.6 over 7.5, or .61 (1, pp. 50-51).

Collection of the Data

The thirty-three public Negro Southern institutions of higher education and a random sample of sixty-seven public white Southern institutions of higher education as listed in the Directory of Higher Education were selected to participate in this study. A sample of 100 Negro and white Southern institutions of higher education was included in this study.

Contact with the chief academic officer at the institutions selected (see Appendix A and B) determined that the mean number of white professors meeting the requirements of this study at Southern Negro institutions of higher education equaled ten. The mean number of Negro professors meeting the requirements of this study at Southern white institutions of higher education equaled four. Twelve white institutions included in the sample reported either that there were no Negro faculty or that there were no Negro faculty meeting the requirements of this study. Finally, a sample of 478 Negro and white professors was selected.

A "Personal Data Response Sheet" and the two instruments, Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale and the Bullock Social Factor
Items Questionnaire, were forwarded by mail to each professor via the chief academic officer at each institution included in the sample. A cover letter was included to explain the purpose of the study (see Appendix C). Each professor was requested to complete the enclosed instruments and to return them in the provided stamped envelope within a three-week period.

Treatment of the Data

Statistical analysis of the respondents' raw scores for the two instruments was accomplished by the use of two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance based on race and years at present employment, highest degree held, and years in the profession. Race category consisted of two groups: Negro and white. The category "Years at present employment" included two groups: (1) professors employed at the institution for two to seven years and (2) professors employed at the institution from eight to fifteen years. The category "Highest degree held" included two groups: (1) professors holding an earned doctorate degree and (2) professors holding a master's degree or less. The category "Years in the profession" consisted of two groups: (1) professors who had academic professional experience totaling two to eight years and (2) professors who had academic professional experience totaling nine or more years.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was computed
for the following Negro and white professor groups:

1. professors with a doctorate degree,
2. professors with a master's degree,
3. professors with less than a master's degree,
4. professors with two, but less than nine, years of professional experience,
5. professors with nine, but less than sixteen, years of professional experience,
6. professors with sixteen or more years of professional experience,
7. professors employed at the same institution for two, but less than eight, years, and
8. professors employed at the same institution for eight or more years.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the raw scores of the two instruments was also computed for (1) all the Negro professors included in the study, (2) all the white professors included in the study, and (3) all respondents included in the study.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The first seven questions of the study dealt with the level of job satisfaction held by professors as related to race, years at present employment, academic degree held, and years in the profession. Race category consisted of two groups: (1) Negro and (2) white. The category "Years at present employment" consisted of two groups: (1) professors employed at the institution for two to seven years and (2) professors employed at the institution from eight to fifteen years. The category "Highest degree held" included two groups: (1) professors holding an earned doctorate degree and (2) professors holding a master's degree or less. The category "Years in the profession" consisted of two groups: (1) professors who had professional academic experience totaling two to eight years and (2) professors who had professional academic experience totaling nine or more years.

The last four questions dealt with the relationship between certain social factors and the level of job satisfaction held by professors as related to (1) degree held, (2) years of professional experience, (3) years of employment at the present institution, and (4) race.

The findings presented are relevant to the following questions:
I. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors?

II. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate degree? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold an earned doctorate degree?

III. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold the master's degree or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold the master's degree or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold the master's degree or less?

IV. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors who had been employed
by public Southern white institutions of higher education for seven years or less and that of white professors who had been employed by public Negro institutions of higher education for seven years or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors employed by their respective institutions for seven years or less?

V. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors who had been employed by public Southern white institutions of higher education for eight years or more and that of white professors who had been employed by public Negro institutions of higher education for eight years or more? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors employed by their respective institution for eight years or more?

VI. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had been members of the
academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less?

VII. Is there a significant difference between the level of job satisfaction of Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more? Is there a significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more?

VIII. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors?

IX. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors employed for various years at an institution of higher education?

X. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold different academic degrees?
XI. What are the relationships between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had various years of academic experience?

Summary of the Response to the Study

Presented in Table I are data indicating the number of questionnaires forwarded, the number of questionnaires returned, and the percentage of questionnaires returned. An examination of Table I reveals that a total of 478 questionnaires were forwarded to Negro and white professors currently employed by Southern institutions of higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Forwared</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro Professors</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Professors</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>46.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>55.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaires returned totaled 264, a return of 55.23 percent.

The reluctance of white professors to commit their attitudes to writing exacerbated follow-up efforts to again request and encourage their participation. Personal caution against comments relevant to job satisfaction at a Negro institution of higher education being misinterpreted to
reflect a derogatory attitude toward faculty desegregation in general precluded a higher percentage of returned questionnaires from white professors. The study's limitation as set by the percent of participation by white professors is recognized. However, the study's basic assumptions that the respondents answered the questionnaire with honesty and sincerity and that the answers given on the questionnaire reflect the respondents' attitudes toward job satisfaction at a desegregated institution of higher education are applicable. Further, general attitudes derived from the data of this study regarding faculty job satisfaction at Negro institutions of higher education are not inconsistent with previous studies of the pertinent population, as reported in the review of literature.

Data Related to Questions I through VII for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale

The first seven questions of the study were concerned with the level of job satisfaction held by professors as related to race, years at present employment, academic degree held, and years in the profession. The data relevant to job satisfaction in the first seven questions of the study are presented in the following tables.

In the two-by-two factorial design, the columns indicate race. Column I contains the data for Negro professors, and Column II contains the data for white professors. The row contains data relating to the other variables included in
the study and are specified for each table. The following nine tables contain data relevant to the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale for Negro and white professors.

Table II reports a summary of the number of observations for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale according to degree held. There were seventy Negro professors who hold the master's degree or less and forty-one who hold the doctorate degree. Fifty-four white professors hold the master's degree or less, and ninety-nine hold the doctorate.

The means of the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale for professors relevant to highest degree held are presented in Table III. Negro professors who hold the doctorate degree and who are employed by white institutions of higher education had the highest mean score of 43.42. White professors who hold the doctorate degree and who are employed by Negro institutions of higher education had the lowest mean score of

TABLE II

THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE ACCORDING TO DEGREE HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Master's Degree or less</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III
THE MEANS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE ACCORDING TO DEGREE HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Master's Degree or less</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>41.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>43.42</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>40.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>41.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39.13. The mean score for all Negro professors was 43.11, and the mean score for all white professors was 39.52. The mean score for all professors was 41.05.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale relevant to race and degree held is presented in Table IV. The F-ratio for the row means was not

TABLE IV
TWO-BY-TWO FACTORIAL ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE RELEVANT TO DEGREE HELD, SUMMARY OF THE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Degree</td>
<td>6.5145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5145</td>
<td>0.1185</td>
<td>0.7309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>709.9654</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>709.9654</td>
<td>12.9141</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>40.9034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.9034</td>
<td>0.7440</td>
<td>0.3892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>14,238.8268</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>54.9762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant at the .05 level, indicating no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between professors with a doctorate degree and those professors with a master's degree. The F-ratio for the column means was statistically significant at the .05 level. This indicated that the level of job satisfaction, as reflected by the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale, was significantly higher for Negro professors than for white professors. The F-ratio for interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables race and degree held combined additively.

Table V reports the number of observations for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale according to years at present employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE ACCORDING TO YEARS AT PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Seven Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Eight to Fifteen Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 102 Negro professors who had been employed at white institutions of higher education from two to seven years and nine Negro professors who had been employed at the white institutions of higher education from eight to fifteen years. Of the white professors, there were 131 who had been employed at the Negro institutions of higher education from two to seven years and twenty-two white professors who had been employed at the Negro institutions of higher education from eight to fifteen years.

The means of the Bullock Job Satisfaction for professors relevant to years at present employment are presented in Table VI. Negro professors who had been employed at white

TABLE VI

THE MEANS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE ACCORDING TO YEARS AT PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Seven Years</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>41.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Eight to Fifteen Years</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>41.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

institutions of higher education for eight to fifteen years had the highest mean score of 44.14. White professors who had been employed at Negro institutions of higher education from two to seven years had the lowest mean score of 39.27. The mean score for all Negro professors was 43.17, and the
mean score for all white professors was 39.52. The mean score for all professors was 41.08.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale relevant to race and years at present employment is presented in Table VII. The F-ratio for the row

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Employment Years</td>
<td>34.9978</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.9978</td>
<td>0.6373</td>
<td>0.4255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>245.4984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>245.4984</td>
<td>4.4702</td>
<td>0.0354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.8275</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8275</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>14,278.7544</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>54.9183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables race and the number of years at present employment combined additively.

Table VIII reports the number of observations for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale according to years of professional experience. There were sixty-five Negro professors

<p>| TABLE VIII |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE ACCORDING TO YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Eight Years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Nine or More Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who had professional experience for two to eight years, and forty-five Negro professors who had nine or more years of professional experience. Eighty-two white professors had professional experience for two to eight years, and sixty-seven white professors had nine or more years of professional experience.

The means of the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale for professors relevant to years of professional experience are presented in Table IX. Negro professors who had nine or more years of professional experience had the highest mean score
TABLE IX

THE MEANS FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE
ACCORDING TO YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Eight Years</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>40.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Nine or More Years</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>40.98</td>
<td>42.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>39.44</td>
<td>44.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of 44.00. White professors who had two to eight years of professional experience had the lowest mean score of 38.19. The mean score for all Negro professors was 43.17, and the mean score for all white professors was 39.44.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale relevant to race and the years of professional experience is presented in Table X. The F-ratio for the row means was statistically significant at the .05 level, indicating there were significant differences in the level of job satisfaction, as reflected by the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale, between professors with two to eight years of professional experience and professors with nine or more years of professional experience. Professors with nine or more years of professional experience had a higher degree of job satisfaction than the professors with eight or less years of professional experience. Thus, job satisfaction increased
TABLE X

TWO-BY-TWO FACTORIAL ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE FOR THE BULLOCK JOB SATISFACTION SCALE RELEVANT TO YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE, SUMMARY OF THE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Experience</td>
<td>271.2255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>271.2255</td>
<td>4.9838</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>850.5446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850.5446</td>
<td>15.6289</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>29.8478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.8478</td>
<td>0.5485</td>
<td>0.4596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>13,877.4631</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>54.4214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as the length of professional experience increased. The F-ratio for the column means was significant at the .05 level. This indicated that the level of job satisfaction, as reflected by the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale, was significantly higher for Negro professors than for white professors. The F-ratio for interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables race and the number of years of professional experience combined additively.

Data Related to Questions I through VII for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire

The first seven questions of the study were concerned with job satisfaction of Negro and white professors as related to race, academic degree held, years at present employment, and years in the profession. The data relevant to job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors
in the first seven questions of the study are presented in
the following tables.

In the two-by-two factorial design, the columns indicate
race. Column I contains the data for Negro professors, and
Column II contains data for white professors. The row con-
tains data relating to the other variables included in the
study and are specified for each table. The following nine
tables contain data relevant to the Bullock Social Factor
Items Questionnaire for Negro and white professors.

Table XI reports a summary of the number of observations
for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire according
to degree held. There were seventy Negro professors who

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS FOR THE BULLOCK SOCIAL FACTOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITEMS QUESTIONNAIRE ACCORDING TO DEGREE HELD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Master's Degree or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Doctorate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hold the master's degree or less and forty-one Negro profes-
sors who hold the doctorate degree. Fifty-four white
professors hold the master's degree or less, and ninety-nine
white professors hold the doctorate degree.
The means of the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire for professors relevant to highest degree held are presented in Table XII. Negro professors who hold the doctorate degree and who are employed by white institutions of higher education had the highest mean score of 127.35. White professors who hold the doctorate degree and who are employed by Negro institutions of higher education had the lowest mean score of 119.35. The mean score for all Negro professors was 125.63, and the mean score for all white professors was 119.80. The mean score for all professors was 122.28.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire relevant to degree held is presented in Table XIII. The F-ratio for the row means was not significant at the .05 level, indicating there was no
TABLE XIII

TWO-BY-TWO FACTORIAL ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE FOR THE BULLOCK SOCIAL FACTOR ITEMS QUESTIONNAIRE RELEVANT TO DEGREE HELD, SUMMARY OF THE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Degree</td>
<td>29.0021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.0021</td>
<td>0.1213</td>
<td>0.7279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>2092.0763</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2092.0763</td>
<td>8.7511</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>249.8701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>249.8701</td>
<td>1.0452</td>
<td>0.3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>61,917.7811</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>239.0648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors between professors with a doctorate degree and those professors with a master's degree or less. The F-ratio for the column means was statistically significant at the .05 level. This indicated that the level of job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors, as reflected by the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire, was significantly higher for Negro professors. The F-ratio for interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables race and degree held combined additively.

Table XIV presents a summary of the number of observations for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire according to years at present employment. There were 102 Negro professors who had been employed at the white institutions of higher education from two to seven years and nine
### TABLE XIV

**The Number of Observations for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire According to Years at Present Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II Negro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I Two to Seven Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II Eight to Fifteen Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negro professors who had been employed at the white institutions of higher education from eight to fifteen years. Of the white professors, 131 had been employed at the Negro institutions of higher education from two to seven years, and twenty-two white professors had been employed at the Negro institutions of higher education from eight to fifteen years.

The means of the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire for professors relevant to years at present employment are presented in Table XV. Negro professors who had been
TABLE XV

THE MEANS FOR THE BULLOCK SOCIAL FACTOR ITEMS QUESTIONNAIRE ACCORDING TO YEARS AT PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Seven Years</td>
<td>125.55</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>122.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Eight to Fifteen Years</td>
<td>128.42</td>
<td>121.47</td>
<td>123.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125.73</td>
<td>119.80</td>
<td>122.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

employed at the white institutions of higher learning from eight to fifteen years had the highest mean score of 128.42. White professors who had been employed at the Negro institutions of higher education from two to seven years had the lowest mean score of 119.50. The mean score for all Negro professors was 125.73, and the mean score for all white professors was 119.80. The mean score for all professors was 122.34.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire relevant to years at present employment is presented in Table XVI. The F-ratio for the row means was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated there was no significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors between professors employed at the institutions from two to seven years and professors employed at the institutions from eight to fifteen
TABLE XVI
TWO-BY-TWO FACTORIAL ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE FOR
THE BULLOCK SOCIAL FACTOR ITEMS QUESTIONNAIRE
RELEVANT TO YEARS AT PRESENT EMPLOYMENT,
SUMMARY OF THE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Employment Years</td>
<td>115.1821</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115.1821</td>
<td>0.4816</td>
<td>0.4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>830.0182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>830.0182</td>
<td>3.4708</td>
<td>0.0636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3.9922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9922</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>0.8973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>62,177.6060</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>239.1446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

years. The F-ratio for the column means was not significant at the .05 level. This indicated there was no significant difference in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors between Negro and white professors employed at the institutions from two to seven years and from eight to fifteen years. The F-ratio for interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables of race and the number of years at present employment combined additively.

Table XVII reports the number of observations for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire according to years of professional experience. There were sixty-five Negro professors who had professional experience from two to eight years, and forty-five Negro professors who had nine or more years of professional experience. Eighty-two white
The number of observations for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire according to years of professional experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Eight Years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Nine or More Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professors had professional experience from two to eight years, and sixty-seven white professors had nine or more years of professional experience.

The means of the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire for professors relevant to years of professional experience are presented in Table XVIII. Negro professors who had nine or more years of professional experience had the highest mean score of 129.28. White professors who had

Table XVIII

The means for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire according to years of professional experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Column I Negro</th>
<th>Column II White</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Two to Eight Years</td>
<td>123.32</td>
<td>117.53</td>
<td>120.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Nine or More Years</td>
<td>129.28</td>
<td>122.01</td>
<td>124.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125.76</td>
<td>119.55</td>
<td>122.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two to eight years of professional experience had the lowest mean score of 117.53. The mean score for all Negro professors was 125.76, and the mean score for all white professors was 119.55. The mean score for all professors was 122.18.

The summary of the statistical data for the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire relevant to the years of professional experience is presented in Table XIX. The F-ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row, Experience</td>
<td>1685.2281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1685.2281</td>
<td>7.1935</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column, Race</td>
<td>2635.2932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2635.2932</td>
<td>11.2490</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>34.1830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.1830</td>
<td>0.1459</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>59,738.8351</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>234.2699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for the row means was statistically significant at the .05 level, which indicated there were significant differences in job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors, as reflected by the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire, between professors with two to eight years of professional experience and professors with nine or more years of
professional experience. The association between job satisfaction and certain social factors was greater for professors with nine or more years of professional experience. The F-ratio for the column means was statistically significant at the .05 level. This indicated that the level of job satisfaction as associated with certain social factors, as reflected by the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire, was significantly higher for Negro professors. The F-ratio for interaction was not significant at the .05 level, which indicated that the variables race and the number of years of professional experience combined additively.

Data Related to Questions VIII through XI

Questions VIII through XI of the study were concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factor items for Negro and white professors.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the raw scores of the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale and the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire were computed for the following Negro and white professor groups:

1. professors with a doctorate degree,
2. professors with a master's degree,
3. professors with less than a master's degree,
4. professors with at least two, but less than nine, years of professional experience,
(5) professors with at least nine, but less than sixteen, years of professional experience,

(6) professors with sixteen or more years of professional experience,

(7) professors employed at the present institution for at least two, but less than eight, years, and

(8) professors employed at the present institution for eight or more years.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the raw scores of the two instruments were also computed for (1) all the Negro professors in the study, (2) all the white professors in the study, and (3) all respondents included in the study.

The level of significance for the r value was arbitrarily set at the .05 level. The data relevant to the correlation coefficients for the last four questions of the study are presented in the following nine tables.

Question VIII of the study was concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for all Negro professors and all white professors included in the study. The data are reported in Table XX. There was a significant r value at the .05 level for the Negro professors included in the study, the white professors included in the study, and all professors included in the study.

Question IX of the study was concerned with the relationship of job satisfaction and certain social factors for
TABLE XX
CORRELATION DATA FOR ALL PROFESSORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>125.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>57.95</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>119.80</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Professors</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>122.34</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negro and white professors employed for various years at the institutions of higher education. As indicated in Table XXI, there was a significant r value at the .05 level for Negro

TABLE XXI
CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH TWO TO SEVEN YEARS AT PRESENT EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>125.55</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>56.22</td>
<td>39.27</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

professors employed at the white institutions for two to seven years, and a significant r value at the .05 level for white professors employed at the Negro institutions for two to seven years.
The data for Negro and white professors employed at the institutions for eight or more years are presented in Table XXII. There was a significant $r$ value at the .05 level for Negro professors employed at the Negro institutions for eight or more years, but the $r$ value was not significant at the .05 level for Negro professors employed at the white institutions for eight or more years.

Table XXII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>128.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70.97</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>121.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at .05 level

Question X of the study was concerned with the relationship of job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold different academic degrees. As revealed in Table XXIII, there was a significant $r$ value at the .05 level for Negro professors with less than the master's degree. The $r$ value for white professors with less than the master's degree was not significant at the .05 level. The data in Table XXIV reveal a significant $r$ value at the .05
TABLE XXIII
CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH LESS THAN MASTER'S DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>129.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant at .05 level.

level for Negro professors with a master's degree, and a significant r value at the .05 level for white professors

TABLE XXIV
CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH MASTER'S DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>42.52</td>
<td>123.90</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>120.37</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with a master's degree. An examination of the data in Table XXV indicates a significant r value at the .05 level for Negro and white professors with the doctorate degree.

Question XI of the study was concerned with the relationship of job satisfaction and certain social factors for
TABLE XXV
CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH DOCTORATE DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>43.42</td>
<td>127.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>70.71</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>119.35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negro and white professors who had various years of academic experience. Table XXVI reveals there was a significant r value at the .05 level for both Negro and white professors with two to eight years of professional academic experience.

TABLE XXVI
CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH TWO TO EIGHT YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44.22</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>123.32</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>117.53</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant r value at the .05 level for Negro and white professors with nine to fifteen years of professional academic experience, as indicated in Table XXVII.
### TABLE XXVII

CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH NINE TO FIFTEEN YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>128.90</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td>125.29</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XVIII reveals a significant \( r \) value at the .05 level for Negro and white professors with sixteen or more years of professional academic experience.

### TABLE XXVIII

CORRELATION DATA FOR PROFESSORS WITH SIXTEEN OR MORE YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Scale Mean</th>
<th>Social Factor Mean</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>44.39</td>
<td>129.65</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.07</td>
<td>39.92</td>
<td>116.84</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

There were three purposes of this study. The first purpose of the study was to determine the status of job satisfaction currently held by Negro professors holding academic positions for at least two years since 1954 at a public Southern institution of higher education with a predominantly white student enrollment and white professors holding academic positions for at least two years since 1954 at a public Southern institution of higher education with a predominantly Negro student enrollment. The second purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors. The third purpose was to synthesize the information and present implications and recommendations about job satisfaction related to faculty desegregation in public Southern institutions of higher education.

The two instruments used for obtaining the data were the Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale and the Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire. A "Personal Data Response Sheet" was used for the specific purpose of obtaining pertinent information about each respondent in the sample. The data were
used to analyze the relationship of variables that could influence professors' current level of job satisfaction.

The Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale was used to measure the way professors feel about work performed as a faculty member at a desegregated institution of higher education. The instrument is a criterion measure used for the separation of extreme groups in which mean scores may be derived to determine the degree of job satisfaction in relation to job dissatisfaction. An additional item was included on the instrument to determine the extent attitudes toward job satisfaction were influenced by the professors' racial minority status at the institution of present employment.

The Bullock Social Factor Items Questionnaire was used to compare the association of job satisfaction with certain social factors. When compared, the social factor items can represent a basis for analyzing attitudes relating to job satisfaction held by professors who are members of a desegregated faculty. The instrument consists of fifty-nine items, fifty-one of which are significant in the intent to elicit the degree to which certain social factors influence the professors' attitudes toward job satisfaction as faculty members at desegregated Southern institutions of higher education.

Statistical analysis of the respondents' raw scores for the two instruments was accomplished by the use of two-by-two analysis of the variance based on race and years at present
employment, highest degree held, and years in the academic profession. Race consisted of two groups: (1) Negro and (2) white. The category "Years at present employment" included two groups: (1) professors who had been employed at the institution for two to seven years and (2) professors who had been employed at the institution from eight to fifteen years. The category "Highest degree held" included two groups: (1) professors holding an earned doctorate degree and (2) professors holding a master's degree or less. The category "Years in the academic profession" consisted of two groups: (1) professors who had academic professional experience totaling two to eight years and (2) professors who had academic professional experience totaling nine or more years. The Pearson product-moment correlation between the raw scores of the two instruments was computed for the Negro and white professors for the variables of (1) degree held, (2) years of academic professional experience, and (3) years at present employment.

Question I was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level. Therefore,
there was a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between the two groups.

Question II was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate degree and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold an earned doctorate degree. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction and social factors means for Negro professors with an earned doctorate degree. Therefore, Negro professors with an earned doctorate degree and employed at Southern white institutions of higher education had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction.

Question III was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who hold the master's degree or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who hold the master's degree or less. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction and social factors means for Negro professors holding the master's
degree or less. Therefore, Negro professors with a master's degree or less and employed at Southern white institutions of higher education had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction.

Question IV was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been employed by the institution for seven years or less and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been employed by the institution for seven years or less. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction means for Negro professors who had been employed by the institution for seven years or less. Thus, Negro professors who had been employed by a Southern white institution for seven years or less had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for social factors was not significant at the .05 level. This indicated that there was no significant difference in the association of social factors with job satisfaction between Negro and white professors who had been employed at a desegregated institution for seven years or less.
Question V was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been employed by the institution for eight years or more and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been employed by the institution for eight years or more. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction means for Negro professors employed at the institution for eight years or more. Therefore, Negro professors who had been employed by a Southern white institution of higher education for eight years or more had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for social factors was not significant at the .05 level. This indicated that there was no significant difference in the association of social factors with job satisfaction between Negro and white professors who had been employed at a desegregated institution for eight years or more.

Question VI was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less and that of white professors in public
Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less. The F-ratio for column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction and social factors means for Negro professors who had been members of the academic profession for eight years or less. Thus, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for eight years or less had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction.

Question VII was concerned with the difference in the level of job satisfaction between Negro professors in public Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more and that of white professors in public Negro institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more. The F-ratio for the row means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level, indicating a significantly higher job satisfaction and social factors means for professors who had been members of the academic profession for nine or more years. Consequently, professors at public Southern desegregated institutions of
higher education who had been members of the academic profession for nine years or more had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction. The F-ratio for the column means of the two-by-two factorial analysis of the variance for job satisfaction and social factors was significant at the .05 level, indicating significantly higher job satisfaction and social factors means for Negro professors who had been members of the academic profession for nine years or more. Therefore, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education who had been members of the academic profession as faculty or administrator for nine years or more had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction.

Question VIII was concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors at desegregated institutions of higher education included in this study. The \( r \) value for all Negro professors included in this study was .70, and was significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value for all white professors included in this study was .73, and was significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value for all professors included in this study was .72, and was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro professors, white professors, and all professors included in the study.

Question IX was concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and
white professors who had been employed for various years at the present institution of higher education. The $r$ value for Negro professors employed at the white institutions of higher education for two to seven years was .72, and was significant at the .05 level. The $r$ value for white professors employed at the Negro institutions of higher education for two to seven years was .71, and was significant at the .05 level. The $r$ value for Negro professors employed at the white institutions of higher education for eight or more years was .59, and was not significant at the .05 level. The $r$ value for white professors employed at the Negro institutions of higher education for eight years or more was .79, which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro professors employed at the white institutions of higher education for two to seven years, white professors employed at the Negro institutions of higher education for two to seven years, and white professors employed at the Negro institutions of higher education for eight or more years.

Question X was concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who hold different academic degrees. The $r$ value for Negro professors with less than a master's degree was .83, and was significant at the .05 level. The $r$ value for white professors with less than a master's degree was not
significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value for Negro professors with a master's degree was .68, and was significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value of .75 for white professors with a master's degree was significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value for Negro professors with a doctorate degree was .72, which was significant at the .05 level. White professors with a doctorate degree had an \( r \) value of .71, and was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with less than a master's degree, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with a master's degree, white professors at Negro institutions of higher education with a master's degree, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with a doctorate degree, and white professors at Negro institutions of higher education with a doctorate degree.

Question XI was concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro and white professors who had various years of professional academic experience. Negro professors with two to eight years of professional academic experience had an \( r \) value of .73, which was significant at the .05 level. The \( r \) value of .70 for white professors with two to eight years professional academic experience was significant at the .05 level. Negro professors with nine to fifteen years professional academic
experience had an $r$ value of .70, which was significant at the .05 level. White professors with nine to fifteen years of professional experience had an $r$ value of .82, which was significant at the .05 level. Negro professors with sixteen or more years of professional academic experience had an $r$ value of .63, which was significant at the .05 level. White professors with sixteen or more years of professional academic experience had an $r$ value of .65, which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and certain social factors for Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with two to eight years of professional academic experience, white professors at Negro institutions of higher education with two to eight years of professional academic experience, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with nine to fifteen years of professional academic experience, white professors at Negro institutions of higher education with nine to fifteen years of professional academic experience, Negro professors at Southern white institutions of higher education with sixteen or more years of professional experience, and white professors at Negro institutions of higher education with sixteen or more years of professional academic experience.
Conclusions

The following conclusions are determined from an analysis of the findings of this study.

1. Negro professors employed at public Southern institutions of higher education with a predominantly white student enrollment have a higher level of job satisfaction when compared to white professors employed at public institutions of higher education with a predominantly Negro student enrollment.

2. The level of job satisfaction increases for Negro professors as higher academic degrees are obtained, while job satisfaction for white professors decreases as higher academic degrees are obtained.

3. The level of job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of employment at the institutions increase in number.

4. The level of job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of professional academic experience increase in number.

5. Certain social factors have a greater association with the level of job satisfaction held by Negro professors than on the level of job satisfaction held by white professors. The degree of association increases for both Negro and white professors as years of employment increase in number.
The conclusion that Negro professors at predominantly white institutions have a higher level of job satisfaction than white professors at predominantly Negro institutions is consistent with the findings of a survey of faculty members at Negro institutions of higher education conducted by the American Council on Education, as reported in the review of the literature. A major influence upon job satisfaction held by professors, as determined by several studies, is an institution's professional reputation and the recognized level of institutional prestige. Consequently, an institution's level of professional prestige can promote or become a barrier toward the achievement of faculty job satisfaction. Such is further evidenced by this study's conclusion that the level of job satisfaction increases for Negro professors at predominantly white institutions as higher academic degrees are obtained, and job satisfaction for white professors at predominantly Negro institutions decreases as higher academic degrees are obtained. While it is recognized that work assignments and salary influence job satisfaction to a lesser degree, implications of the conclusion suggest that professional self-satisfaction, as pertaining to professional growth, is not readily achievable at institutions viewed with an unacceptable level of regard and esteem by professional peers and colleagues. Therefore, a primary and concerted effort on the part of administrators at predominantly Negro institutions of higher education should involve
initiating approaches designed to improve the level of professional esteem generated by the institution as a means toward improving faculty job satisfaction among the members of the desegregated faculty.

The conclusions that job satisfaction increases for both Negro and white professors as years of employment and professional experience increase suggest that the potential for dissatisfaction vis-à-vis satisfaction is more acute during the beginning years of professional employment. Accordingly, administrators at predominantly white institutions, where faculty job satisfaction was found to be higher, are encouraged to continue to give careful consideration to job satisfaction producing criteria such as work assignments, teaching loads, salaries, opportunities for professional and social exchanges, and entry-level rank assignments as a means toward promoting faculty desegregation. Administrators at predominantly Negro institutions, where the level of faculty job satisfaction was lower, should give more attention to implementing and effectuating the job satisfaction producing factors enumerated as a means toward improving the job satisfaction of its desegregated faculty.

The implications of the conclusion that certain social factors have a greater association with the level of job satisfaction held by Negro professors than with the level of job satisfaction held by white professors suggest that the predominantly white institutions' external and surrounding
environments influence, to a greater extent, the level of job satisfaction of Negro members of the desegregated faculty. Implications further suggest that the processes of faculty desegregation and job satisfaction at predominantly white institutions have a greater association with external social factors than the desegregation and job satisfaction processes at predominantly Negro institutions. As a means toward improving the processes, administrators at predominantly white institutions of higher education are encouraged to recognize that faculty desegregation and the accompanying job satisfaction are not achievable exclusive of the institutions' external environs. A more successful approach to faculty desegregation suggests that administrators at predominantly white institutions initiate a cooperative relationship with community leaders to promote professional and social interactions and other social involvement by Negro members of the desegregated faculty.

Recommendations

The following recommendations for further research are made on the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Further study is needed to determine the causes of job dissatisfaction among white faculty members employed at institutions of higher education with a predominantly Negro student enrollment.
2. Negro professors employed at white Southern public institutions of higher education have a higher degree of job satisfaction, but Negro institutions of higher education have a higher rate of success in attracting white faculty members. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be conducted to determine the causes for the success of Negro institutions of higher education, in terms of percentage, in recruiting white faculty and the limited success of white institutions of higher education, in terms of percentage, in recruiting Negro faculty.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF COVER LETTER TO CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER
NEGRO PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Dear Sir:

Your assistance in helping me complete a study useful to higher education is requested. The study is a doctoral dissertation and is being completed under the direction of Dr. R. C. DuChemin, Professor of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.

The study involves an analysis of the attitudes of southern college and university professors who are part of the faculty desegregation process. A questionnaire will be forwarded to those black American professors currently holding a faculty or administrative position at selected southern institutions of higher education with a predominantly white American student enrollment. Further, a questionnaire will be forwarded to white American professors holding a faculty or administrative position at those public institutions of higher education with a predominantly black American student enrollment.

All of the traditionally black American public institutions of higher education have been selected to be included in this study. It is requested that the enclosed packet including a letter, questionnaire and return envelope be forwarded by campus mail to ten full-time white American faculty members or administrative officers who have been at your institution for a period of at least two academic years. For the purposes of this study, white American is defined as any native born citizen of the United States not legally classified as a member of the Negro, American Indian or Oriental races.

Your consideration in forwarding the packets to enable me to meet a May 15 schedule will be most appreciated.
Institutions and individuals will not be identified in the dissertation or any publication resulting therefrom. If you should desire and request a copy of the conclusions reached by this study, I would be pleased to forward such to you.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Hodge, Doctoral Candidate
19 Lakeside Drive
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE OF COVER LETTER TO CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER
WHITE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Dear Sir:

Your assistance in helping me complete a study useful to higher education is requested. The study is a doctoral dissertation and is being completed under the direction of Dr. R. C. DuChemin, Professor of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.

The study involves an analysis of the attitudes of southern college and university professors who are part of the faculty desegregation process. A questionnaire will be forwarded to those black American professors currently holding a faculty or administrative position at selected southern institutions of higher education with a predominantly white American student enrollment. Further, a questionnaire will be forwarded to white American professors holding a faculty or administrative position at those public institutions of higher education with a predominantly black American student enrollment.

Your institution has been randomly selected to be included in this study. It is requested that the enclosed packet including a letter, questionnaire and return envelope be forwarded by campus mail to four full-time black American faculty members and/or administrative officers who have been at your institution for a period of at least two academic years. For the purposes of this study, black American is defined as any native born citizen of the United States not legally classified as a member of any other racial group.

Your consideration in forwarding the packets to enable me to meet a May 15 schedule will be most appreciated.
Institutions and individuals will not be identified in the dissertation or any publication resulting therefrom. If you should desire and request a copy of the conclusions reached by this study, I would be pleased to forward such to you.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Hodge, Doctoral Candidate
19 Lakeside Drive
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE OF COVER LETTER

Dear Faculty Member/Administrator:

Your assistance in helping me complete a study useful to higher education is requested. The study is a doctoral dissertation and is being completed under the direction of Dr. R. C. DuChemin, Professor of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.

The study involves an analysis of the attitudes of southern college and university professors who are part of the faculty desegregation process. A questionnaire is being forwarded to those black American professors currently holding a faculty or administrative position at selected southern institutions of higher education with a predominantly white American student enrollment. Further, a questionnaire is being forwarded to white American professors holding a faculty or administrative position at those public institutions of higher education with a predominantly black American student enrollment.

All of the traditionally black American public institutions of higher education have been selected to be included in this study. All other institutions included in this study were randomly selected.

You are asked to take the few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire, place it in the envelope provided and return to me. Though some questions may seem inappropriate to your situation, I urge you to answer each question as well as you can.

I hope you will find the questionnaire interesting to answer and that you will give consideration to returning it within a two week period. Your assistance in this instance will be greatly appreciated.
Institutions and individuals will not be identified in the dissertation or any publication resulting therefrom. If you should desire and request a copy of the conclusions reached by this study, I would be pleased to forward such to you.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Hodge, Doctoral Candidate
19 Lakeside Drive
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
SAMPLE OF LETTER FROM WHITE INSTITUTIONS HAVING NO BLACK FACULTY MEMBERS

Mr. Charles M. Hodge
19 Lakeside Drive
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

Dear Mr. Hodge:

College currently does not have black American faculty members who have been with the institution for two academic years. Therefore, you will not be receiving copies of your questionnaire from anyone in this institution.

I am sorry that we are not in a position to assist you. Despite our best efforts to recruit minority groups we have been relatively unsuccessful in attracting and keeping black American faculty members.

Sincerely,

Vice President for Academic Affairs
APPENDIX E

JOB SATISFACTION SCALE

PERSONAL DATA RESPONSE SHEET

The following statements will help you describe how you feel about your position. Think about your experience while on this job and check those statements which most accurately and honestly tell how you feel about it.

1. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how good a job you have.
   ___ A. The job is an excellent one, very much above the average.
   ___ B. The job is a fairly good one.
   ___ C. The job is only average.
   ___ D. The job is not as good as average in this kind of work.
   ___ E. The job is a very poor one, very much below the average.

2. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best describes your feelings about your job.
   ___ A. I am very satisfied and happy on this job.
   ___ B. I am fairly well satisfied on this job.
   ___ C. I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied—it is just average.
   ___ D. I am a little dissatisfied on this job.
   ___ E. I am very dissatisfied and unhappy on this job.

3. Check one of the following statements to show how much of the time you are satisfied with your job.
   ___ A. Most of the time.
   ___ B. A good deal of the time.
   ___ C. About half of the time.
   ___ D. Occasionally.
   ___ E. Seldom.
4. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells what kind of an organization it is to work for.
   ___ A. It is an excellent organization to work for—one of the best organizations I know of.
   ___ B. It is a good organization to work for but not one of the best.
   ___ C. It is only an average organization to work for. Many others are just as good.
   ___ D. It is below average as an organization to work for. Many others are better.
   ___ E. It is probably one of the poorest organizations to work for that I know of.

5. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how your feelings compare with those of other people you know.
   ___ A. I like my job much better than most people like theirs.
   ___ B. I like my job better than most people like theirs.
   ___ C. I like my job about as well as most people like theirs.
   ___ D. I dislike my job more than most people dislike theirs.
   ___ E. I dislike my job much more than most people dislike theirs.

6. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how you feel about the work you do on your job.
   ___ A. The work is very enjoyable. I very much like to do the work called for on this job.
   ___ B. The work is pleasant and enjoyable.
   ___ C. The work is just about average. I don't have any feelings about whether it is pleasant or not.
   ___ D. The work I do is not pleasant.
   ___ E. The work I do is very unpleasant. I dislike it.

7. Check one of the following which best describes any general conditions which affect your work or comfort on this job.
   ___ A. General working conditions are very good, much better than average for this kind of job.
   ___ B. In general, working conditions are good, better than average.
   ___ C. General conditions are about average, neither good nor bad.
   ___ D. General working conditions are poor—not as good as the average for this kind of job.
   ___ E. General working conditions are very bad.
8. Check one of the following statements which best tells how you feel about changing your job.

___A. I do not want to change jobs even for more money because this is a good one.
___B. I am not eager to change jobs but would do so if I could make more money.
___C. This job is as good as the average and I would just as soon have it as any other job but would do so if I could make more money.
___D. I would take almost any other job in which I could earn as much as I am earning here.
___E. I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do.

9. Suppose you had a very good friend who is looking for a job in your line of work and you know of a vacancy in this organization which your friend is well qualified to fill. Would you:

___A. Recommend this job as a good one to apply for?
___B. Recommend this job but caution your friend about its shortcomings?
___C. Tell your friend about the vacancy but not anything else, then let him decide whether to apply or not?
___D. Tell your friend about the vacancy but suggest that he or she look for other vacancies elsewhere before applying?
___E. Try to discourage your friend from applying by telling the bad things about the job?

10. Place a check mark to show how well satisfied you are with this job.

___A. Completely satisfied.
___B. More satisfied than dissatisfied.
___C. About half and half.
___D. More dissatisfied than satisfied.
___E. Completely dissatisfied.

11. To what extent do you believe your situation in a minority status influences your attitude?

___A. Influences my attitude very much.
___B. Influences my attitude to a marginal extent.
___C. Influences my attitude very little.
___D. Exerts no influence.
PERSONAL DATA

Number of years at present place of employment

Race

Highest earned academic degree

Number of years professional experience as an academic administrator, and/or faculty member

COMMENTS: Please feel free to make any statements you consider pertinent to obtaining a clearer understanding of your attitudes and experiences relative to faculty desegregation at your institution.
APPENDIX F

SOCIAL FACTOR ITEMS QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions will help describe your position or how you feel about it. Each of the questions has Y, a question mark and an N in front of it. Please indicate your answers in the following way:

Draw a circle around "Y" if your answer is "yes,"
Draw a circle around "N" if your answer is "no."
Draw a circle around the question mark if you are undecided or if you do not know. Circle one answer for each item.

Y ? N 1. Is your position full-time?
Y ? N 2. Do most of your friends think this is a good job?
Y ? N 3. Do the members of your family think this is a good job for you?
Y ? N 4. Are most of your friends people who work for this organization?
Y ? N 5. Do you often meet other employees of this organization anywhere except at work?
Y ? N 6. Are your recreational activities mostly with people who do not work for this organization?
Y ? N 7. Do you like most of the people whom you know that work for this organization?
Y ? N 8. Do you think that most of the other employees like you?
Y ? N 9. Do you feel free to ask other employees to help you if you need assistance at your job?
Y ? N 10. Are any of the supervisors or department heads among your special friends?
Y ? N 11. Are any of the employees "eager beavers" or "favorites" or "teacher's pets"?
Y ? N 12. Do any of the other employees ever come to you for help or advice?
Y ? N 13. Is good work generally recognized and commended or rewarded by supervisors or department heads?
Y ? N 14. Do department heads and "top executives" mingle freely with most of the employees?
Y ? N 15. Do you feel that it would be all right for you to go in and talk with any of the executives or department heads about something you do not like?
Y ? N 16. Is your real worth and merit recognized by other employees?
Y ? N 17. Do certain employees go around together and form small groups from which you are excluded?
Y ? N 18. Do you feel free to express your real opinions among the other employees?
Y ? N 19. Is it true that only certain kinds of ideas or opinions can be expressed freely before supervisors or department heads or executives?
Y ? N 20. Since working here, have you had any pay raise or promotion?
Y ? N 21. Do other employees think you do your work well?
Y ? N 22. Does your family live about the same way as that of most of the other employees?
Y ? N 23. Does it make any difference what other employees think about you since they have no authority over you?
Y ? N 24. Is your job important to the smooth operation of your department?
Y ? N 25. Do you feel that you are quite competent on your job?
Y ? N 26. Does your job allow you to live where you want to?
Y ? N 27. Do you belong to any lodge, club, or social organization not connected with your job?
Y ? N 28. Do neighbors where you live treat you as though they were glad to have you there?
Y ? N 29. Do your neighbors and friends where you live think your job is a good one?
Y ? N 30. Where you live, are you able to find the kind of recreation you enjoy most?
Y ? N 31. In general, do you like the neighborhood where you live?
Y ? N 32. Do any of your relatives work for this organization?
Y ? N 33. Are you able to find the kind of friends you like in the area where you live?
Y ? N 34. Have you ever turned down a job offer from another company or organization since you started working here?
Y ? N 35. Does this job give you a chance to make the best success you are capable of?
Y ? N 36. Are the employees of this organization kept well informed about the various activities of the organization?
Y ? N 37. Do other employees give you credit for work which you do quite well?
Y ? N 38. Does it make any difference to the other employees whether you do your work well or not?
Y ? N 39. Do you have any feeling, when you do your work, that the whole organization is sort of a team whose success depends partly on you?
Y ? N  40. Do you have enough opportunity for advancement with this organization?

Y ? N  41. Is your work usually interesting?

Y ? N  42. Do the people who run the organization exert very much effort to make you feel that you are an important part of the organization?

Y ? N  43. Do you generally know how well your supervisors think you are getting along on the job?

Y ? N  44. Do your supervisors or department heads generally tell you in advance about any changes that affect you or your work?

Y ? N  45. Do you feel that your supervisors have any personal interest in you or your success?

Y ? N  46. Do other employees ever do anything to make you think they do not like you or the way you do your work?

Y ? N  47. Does your job give you valuable experience?

Y ? N  48. Does your boss get all the credit when you do good work?

Y ? N  49. Before you took this job, was it explained clearly to you in advance by the persons who employed you?

Y ? N  50. Have you ever recommended this organization or a job with this organization to one of your friends?

Y ? N  51. Would you rather work in some other section or department than the one you work in now?
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